

Brisbane City Plan 2014

**Amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* –
Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP amendment 1B)**

Consultation report

Brisbane City Council

OCTOBER 2024



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

This report has been produced by:

City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, Brisbane City Council
Brisbane Square, 266 George Street, Brisbane QLD 4000
GPO Box 1434, Brisbane QLD 4001

Table of contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	4
1.0 Introduction	5
2.0 Engagement activities	5
3.0 LGIP submissions	5
3.1 Road network	6
3.2 Active and public transport network	65
3.3 Ferry terminal network	92
3.4 Stormwater network	94
3.5 Parks network.....	105
3.6 Land for community facilities network	138
3.7 General.....	142

Abbreviations and acronyms

Term	Description
ADF	Australian Defence Force
BNO	Bicycle network overlay
City Plan	<i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i>
Council	Brisbane City Council
DSS	Desired standards of service
GDA94	Geocentric Datum of Australia 1994
LGIP	Local government infrastructure plan
LGIP amendment 1B	Amendment to <i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i> : Local government infrastructure plan
LTIP	Long term infrastructure plan
LTIP amendment 1B	Tailored amendment to <i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i> : Long term infrastructure plan
MGR	<i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i>
PIA	Priority infrastructure area
Planning Act	<i>Planning Act 2016</i>
TMR	Department of Transport and Main Roads
VPO	Vegetation protection order
WGS84	World Geodetic System 1984
WACC	Weighted average costs of capital
SOW	Schedule of works
TPO	Transport Planning and Operations

1.0 Introduction

Brisbane City Council proposed the Local government infrastructure plan amendment 1B (LGIP amendment 1B) to ensure managed growth plans are current and relevant for the increasing demand on trunk infrastructure such as transport, stormwater, parks and land for community facilities. Statutory public consultation on amending *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) was undertaken between 3 August and 14 September 2023.

Council received 695 submissions on the LGIP amendment 1B. Submissions received after the closing date were still given full consideration.

Council has proposed changes to the LGIP amendment 1B in response to submissions. It is important to note that the LGIP amendment 1B may be subject to further changes by the Queensland Government after the Minister's consideration to adopt the proposed planning scheme changes.

2.0 Engagement activities

Council notified the proposed amendments in the following manner:

Newspaper notification	Public notice in <i>The Courier-Mail</i> on 3 August 2023 .
Council website	Web page of the proposed amendments details published and maintained from 3 August 2023 .
Public Display	Amendment package details displayed at Council's Library and Customer Centre, Brisbane Square.
Email	Email to City Plan updates subscribers on 3 August 2023 .
Letters	Letter to affected landowners dated 3 August 2023 . Letter with additional advice to affected landowners dated 15 August 2023 .

Council included the following community consultation events during the public notification period:

Talk to a planner session, Garden City Library	10 August 2023
Talk to a planner session, Carindale Library	24 August 2023
Talk to a planner session, Brisbane Business Hub	30 August 2023
Talk to a planner session, Chermside Library	7 September 2023
Talk to a planner session, Brisbane Business Hub	13 September 2023
Talk to a planner session, Toowong Library	21 September 2023
Talk to a planner session, Brisbane Business Hub	27 September 2023
Talk to a planner session, Brisbane Business Hub	15 November 2023

People and businesses were also able to book phone and online meetings with the Project Team during the public consultation period to discuss the LGIP amendment 1B.

3.0 LGIP submissions

Council received 695 submissions on the LGIP amendment 1B. Information about the submissions and how Council has considered and responded to them is provided in the tables below. Submission responses are arranged according to infrastructure network. Responses to submissions with no specified network are grouped in the general submissions table at the end of this section.

Every submitter to the LGIP amendment 1B has been allocated a submitter reference number. Submitters can find how Council responded to their submissions by searching the Submission reference column below.

3.1 Road network

Brisbane is at the centre of one of the fastest growing regions in Australia. As the city grows, Council must maintain the transport network to accommodate current and future demand.

The purpose of the LGIP is to forecast potential future growth and the infrastructure that may be required to support it. It informs financial planning and long term strategy. The LGIP does not pre-empt final infrastructure planning and each future project will be subject to detailed assessment and design if and when it is required.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
211.1 614.1	<p>Submitters commented on the inclusion of the Sandgate Rd/Albion Overpass Rd intersection project (ALB-RI-006), Hudson Rd/Albion Rd intersection (ALB-RI-002), and Sandgate Road (Albion Overpass to Anstey St (ALB-RC-011) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • disruption to the flow of traffic. <p>One submitter raised further concerns including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential environmental impacts • pedestrian safety • disruption to businesses • resources should be allocated for public transport to reduce the traffic. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These items have been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
028.1 048.1 056.1 124.1 136.1 169.1 209.1 317.1 327.1 473.1 489.1 607.1 620.1 657.1 673.1	Submitters raised concerns in relation to the Ipswich Rd upgrade projects (WOO-RC-001, WOO-RI-002, ANN-RC-003, ANN-RC-004, ANN-RC-002, ANN-RC-005, ANN-RI-003, ANN-RC-006, ANN-RI-002, ANN-RC-007, MKA-RC-002, MKA-RI-001, MKA-RC-001) such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential impacts to private properties • potential land resumption • loss of car parking • noise pollution • safety • decreased land value • environment impacts • safety of pedestrians with impairment • lack of need • reduced walkability/pedestrian and cyclist safety • reduced housing availability. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These items have been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
130.1 320.1 380.1 391.1 393.1 461.1 472.1 561.1 602.1	Submitters have commented on the following Beams Rd corridor projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beams Rd (Ridley Rd to Gympie Rd), Carseldine (CDE-RC-007) • Beams Rd (Bridgeman Rd to Ridley Rd), Bridgeman Downs (BRD-RC-002) • Graham Rd (Stirling St to Ridley Rd), Bridgeman Downs (BRD-RC-003) • Beams Rd (Church Rd to Handford Rd), Taigum (TAI-RC-004). Raising the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumption 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These items have been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased traffic traffic diverted to Beams Rd after the Linkfield Rd overpass closure decreased property value property accessibility loss of street parking. <p>One submitter suggested the following alternative methods to address the road corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain current property access maintain on-street parking install a no standing zone from the intersection of Beams Rd and Ridley Rd install a red-light camera at intersection of Beams Rd and Ridley Rd that the four lanes of traffic be achieved on the existing road reserve. <p>One submitter raised concerns that widening Beams Rd to four lanes will increase the safety risk.</p> <p>One submitter requested confirmation of the land valuation method.</p>	<p>site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>It is noted that the Queensland Government is responsible for state roads, including the Linkfield Rd overpass.</p> <p>The Schedule of Works (SOW) indicates the total estimated land area required for the proposed corridor project, not the land required from individual sites.</p> <p>No standing zones are outside the scope of the LGIP however this suggestion has been forwarded to Transport Network Operations (TNO) for consideration within other programs.</p> <p>Red light cameras are the responsibility of TMR and not included in an LGIP. TMR can be contacted via phone on 13 74 68 or online via https://www.qld.gov.au/contact-us</p> <p>Land valuation rates were calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Extrinsic Material, which considers the area needed and a valuation rate by square metre. All land valuations in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021 and are only used for long term financial planning and development assessment purposes.</p>	
330.1 605.1	<p>Submitters commented on the Fig Tree Pocket Rd (Centenary Mwy on-ramp to Winking St) road corridor project (CHL-RC-001) and have raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased traffic and safety issues loss of parking impacts to wildlife. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
<p>193.1 213.1 454.1 476.1 478.1</p>	<p>Submitters supported the inclusion of Montague Rd projects (SBR-RC-001, WES - RC-020, WES-RC-021, WES-RC-022, WES-RI-003, SBR-RI-002, SBR-RI-003), and requested WES-RC-021 and SBR-RC-001 delivery be brought forward to within the 2021 - 2026 timeframe.</p> <p>Submitters requested the inclusion of the following road intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ferry Rd/Drake St/Montague Rd • Dornoch Tce/Hardgrave Rd/Ganges St • Wellington Rd (between Baines St and Mowbray Tce) • Dornoch Tce (between Boundary St and Colton St). <p>Submitters supported the inclusion of several road intersection projects but objected to any intersection upgrade increasing the number of lanes.</p>	<p>Support for SBR-RC-001, WES-RC-020, WES-RC-021, WES-RC-022 noted.</p> <p>A review of the Montague Rd corridor projects (WES-RC-021 and SBR-RC-001) indicates these upgrades will be required in the timeframe currently specified (2026-2031).</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
583.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Upper Kedron Rd (Nelson Pl to Transfer Station Rd) road corridor project (UKE-RC-003) and raised concerns about possible land resumptions.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
310.1 506.1 563.1 608.1 632.1	<p>Submitters commented on the Stanley St E (Caswell St to Lisburn St) road corridor project (EAB-RC-006) and have raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumptions • loss of character • traffic impacts. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
182.1 314.1 356.1 426.1 491.1 532.1	<p>Submitters commented on the inclusion of the Vulture St E (Kingfisher Lane to Stanley St East) road corridor project (EAB-RC-012) and have raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumptions • traffic impacts • pedestrian safety • lack of active and public transport. 	<p>The Vulture St E (Kingfisher Lane to Stanley St E) road corridor project is proposed to be reduced to remove the portion of the road corridor from Kingfisher Lane to 569 Vulture St E.</p> <p>The road section through the bends at Caswell St to Stanley St E has been retained to improve the geometry and increase safety in this area.</p> <p>The next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site specific impacts and constraints such as: topography, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management.</p>	<p>Amend project EAB-RC-012 – Vulture St E (Kingfisher Lane to Stanley St E). Remove section from Kingfisher Lane to 569 Vulture St E from amendment package.</p> <p>Retain section from 575 Vulture St E to Stanley St E, and update project description to reflect the new project extent.</p>
469.1 470.1	<p>Submitters have raised concerns regarding the Padstow Rd (Logan Rd to Warrigal Rd) road corridor project (EMP-RC-003) including possible conflict with existing development applications and potential land resumption.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p>	
268.1 269.1 664.1 702.1	<p>Submitters commented on the Warrigal Rd (Daw Rd to Padstow Rd) road corridor project (EMP-RC-004) and have raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumptions • loss of street parking. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
500.1 518.1	<p>Submitters have raised concerns regarding the Underwood Rd (Levington Rd to Millers Rd) road corridor project (EMP-RC-007) including potential land resumption.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
<p>430.1 511.1</p>	<p>Submitters commented on the Robinson Rd West/Murphy Rd road intersection project (GEE-RI-002) with concerns of land resumption and access to property.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>084.1 191.1 291.1 292.1 527.1 548.1 009.1 011.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the Sherwood Rd (Oxley Rd to Oxley Creek) (SWD-RC-001), Oxley Rd (Sherwood Rd to Long St East) (SWD-RC-002) and Oxley Rd (Long St East to Graceville Avenue) (GRA-RC-001) road corridor projects and have raised the following concerns:</p>	<p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed and both the Oxley Rd projects are unlikely to proceed within the planning horizon of the LGIP. It is proposed both projects be removed from the LGIP amendment 1B.</p> <p>Oxley Rd/Long St E intersection is included in the LGIP as GRA-RI-001.</p>	<p>Remove GRA-RC-001 and SWD-RC-002 from amendment package</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
040.1 045.1 086.1 121.1 122.1 137.1 139.1 236.1 353.1 409.1 459.1 499.1 530.1 573.1 659.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumptions • property value impacts • potential loss of street parking • encouraged speeding • impacts to existing access • pedestrians and cyclists' safety • decreased parking • negative impact on ecosystems • increased traffic and noise pollution. <p>One submitter suggests the inclusion of a second vehicle crossing on the Brisbane River at Indooroopilly.</p> <p>One submitter requested the upgrade of Long St E/Oxley Rd intersection, widening of Honour Ave (Long St E and Walter Taylor Bridge) and duplication of the Walter Taylor Bridge.</p> <p>One submitter raised concerns regarding traffic at Indooroopilly Bridge and the bottleneck of Coonan St, speeding, and motorists running red lights at Graceville Fiveways intersection.</p> <p>Some submitters requested funding to be spent on improving public and active transport instead of road upgrades.</p>	<p>Support for a second bridge crossing at Indooroopilly is noted, however, has not been included as part of this LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Transport for Brisbane for consideration under other programs.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These items have been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Council has an extensive Active and Public transport network with multiple projects included within the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of future active and public transport projects. You can view other Council's Traffic and Transport projects by visiting Council's website.</p> <p>Offences relating to speeding and red lights are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. Please contact TMR via phone on 13 74 68 or online via https://www.qld.gov.au/contact-us</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
016.1 504.1	Submitters requested Council deliver the Hemmant Tingalpa Rd (Oswald St to Youngs Rd) road corridor project (HEM- RC- 007) sooner and finalise conditioned land acquisition as part of the development application.	<p>Council uses growth models to estimate infrastructure delivery by the likelihood of when it would be needed. Development that occurs before or after the estimated timing affects when some or all infrastructure projects may be delivered.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the proposed LGIP and are subject to the processes under City Plan and the Planning Act. Conditions of current development approvals over sites prevail. This suggestion for finalisation for land acquisition has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	No change
026.1 116.1 255.1 318.1 326.1 474.1 481.1 490.1 520.1 522.1 603.1	<p>Submitters have concerns with the Cavendish Rd (Nursery Rd to Coolong St) road corridor project (MGE-RC-002), specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts to the environment and wildlife • increased noise • potential land resumptions • loss of street parking • difficulty in accessing the properties and safety risks. <p>One submitter requested inclusion of line markings on this stretch of Cavendish Rd to show where cars can park outside houses.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Line marking is outside the scope of the LGIP however this suggestion has been noted for further consideration.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
647.1 658.1	<p>Submitters raise concerns with the Lytton Rd (Creek Rd to Gateway Motorway) road corridor project (MUR-RC-002) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential increase in noise pollution • traffic impacts • land resumption • changes to property access. <p>One submitter suggested the inclusion of a slip lane for residents.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
293.1 594.1 646.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Ritchie Rd (139 Ritchie Rd to Sweets Rd) road corridor project (PAL-RC-006), raising concerns about potential land resumptions.</p> <p>One submitter also raised concerns about potential conflicts with an existing development approval that showed two lanes road where the LGIP project showed four lanes.</p>	<p>This project has been identified to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. Standard assumptions based on the road hierarchy inform project details in the LGIP such as anticipated lanes, however these assumptions may not apply in all cases, particularly as projects are subject to further design considerations. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, car parking, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p>	No change
073.1 352.1 364.1 395.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Rainbow St/Palm Ave road intersection project (SGT- RI-003) including increased traffic on adjacent streets, and lack of demand.</p> <p>Submitters suggested alternative options including speed calming features or a roundabout.</p>	Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project. Given the lack of demand for an intersection upgrade at Rainbow St and Palm Ave, it is recognised the project is not anticipated to be constructed within the planning horizon and it is proposed to remove the project from the LGIP amendment 1B.	Remove SGT-RI-003 from amendment package
105.1 108.1 304.1 365.1 429.1	<p>Submitters have raised concerns with the Kianawah Rd (Wynnum Rd to Sibley Rd) road corridor project (WYW-RC-009) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • changes to property value • construction noise and pollution • impacts to the environment. • traffic impacts. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This project has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>One submitter commented that the project would increase flooding due to poor drainage on Kianawah Rd.</p>	<p>infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
<p>017.1 412.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the Beatty Rd (Bowhill Rd to Mortimer Rd) road corridor project (ACR-RC-002) and have raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • difficult to sell the property • potential impacts to property value. <p>Submitter requests Council acquire private property at market value.</p> <p>One submitter requested the Beatty Rd Bridge (over Oxley Creek) road bridge project (ACR- RB-002) and Beatty Rd (Bowhill Rd to Mortimer Rd) road corridor project (ACR- RC- 002) include a pedestrian underpass under the bridge crossing Oxley Creek to allow for foot/bike traffic to safely get from one side of Beatty Rd to the Success St Park.</p>	<p>Council is focused on keeping Brisbane a safe, convenient and connected place to live, work and visit and agrees improved transport networks are vital infrastructure for current and future generations.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>A submitter suggestion for a pedestrian underpass has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.	
486.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns with the timing of the Beatty Rd road corridor project (AFD- RC- 002, AFD-RI-003, AFD-RC-006, AFD-RI-001, AFD-RC-005, AFD-RI-002, AFD- RC-004, ACR-RI-003, ACR-RC-002) and request it to be completed sooner including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased demand • increased traffic congestion • cyclist and pedestrian safety. 	<p>The Beatty Rd upgrade is a large corridor project requiring additional land. Completion before 2026 is not achievable. However, earlier completion of key intersections followed by construction of the mid-block sections in later stages is considered an achievable implementation improvement.</p>	No change
120.1	<p>Submitter supports the removal of the Hudson Rd road corridor projects ALB-RC-007 and ALB-RC-009.</p> <p>Submitter suggested prioritising Sandgate Rd, Albion.</p>	<p>Support noted for removal of the Hudson Rd corridor.</p> <p>Sandgate Rd has a number of infrastructure projects included in the LGIP, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandgate Rd (Anstey St to Abbotsford Rd/Frodsham St/Crosby Rd) (ALB-RC-012) • Abbotsford Rd (Crosby Rd to Collingwood St) (ALB- RC- 004) • Sandgate Rd/Albion Overpass Intersection (ALB- RI- 006) • Sandgate Rd/Frodsham St Intersection (ALB-RI-005) • Sandgate Rd/Collingwood St Intersection (ALB-RI-007). <p>The request to prioritise these projects have been noted, however the estimated timing of these projects is based on land use and demand modelling across the city. Council</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		must ensure that the timeframes in the LGIP reflect citywide priorities and can be delivered in an efficient and cost effective way.	
413.1 477.1 596.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the inclusion of the Frodsham St (Sandgate Rd to Abbotsford Rd) road corridor project (ALB- RC- 013) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase noise and pollution • decrease in land value • impacts to accessibility. <p>Some submitters suggest an alternative option of one extra lane being added down the left - hand side of Frodsham St, when travelling toward the city in the southern direction, as this option is the least disruptive.</p> <p>One submitter raises concerns that there is no information regarding the potential impact on the subject property.</p> <p>One submitter has requested clarification of the land valuation method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Land valuation rates were calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, which considers the area needed and a valuation rate by square metre. All land valuations in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	No change
084.1 092.1 114.1 145.1 146.1 147.1 148.1 149.1	<p>A range of submitters have supported the inclusion of the following projects in the LGIP:</p> <p><u>Road Intersections projects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANN-RI-003 - Ipswich Rd/Venner Rd/Waterton St (request increase of the establishment cost) 	<p>Support for some projects noted.</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects</p>	<p>Retain CLR-RI-001 in LGIP.</p> <p>Remove GRA-RC-001 from amendment package</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
150.1 157.1 161.1 187.1 205.1 208.1 215.1 222.1 243.1 248.1 252.1 260.1 261.1 265.1 305.1 315.1 319.1 323.1 335.1 336.1 338.1 345.1 346.1 348.1 355.1 359.1 361.1 372.1 374.1 376.1 386.1 387.1 388.1 389.1 399.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANN-RI-002 - Ipswich Rd/Cracknell Rd/Villa St • FFD-RI-001 - Annerley Rd/Cornwall St/Noble St • OXY-RI-007 - Oxley Rd/Cliveden Ave (request increase of establishment cost) • GRA-RI-001 - Oxley Rd/Long St E • OXY-RI-006 - Oxley Rd/Cook St <p><u>Road corridor/bridge projects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROK-RB-001 - Sherwood Rd (over Oxley Creek) road bridge upgrade • ROK-RC-001 - Sherwood Rd (Oxley Creek to 250 Sherwood Rd) road corridor upgrade • SWD-RC-001 - Sherwood Rd (Oxley Rd to Oxley Creek) road corridor upgrade • YER-RB-001 - Cardross St Bridge (between Wilkie St and Fairfield Rd) <p>Some submitters raise concerns with the inclusion of the following projects in the LGIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GRA-RC-001 - Oxley Rd (Long St E to Graceville Ave) road corridor project • SWD-RC-002 - Oxley Rd (Sherwood Rd to Long St E) road corridor project • SWD-RC-001 - Sherwood Rd (Oxley Rd to Oxley Creek) road corridor project • WOO-RC-001, WOO-RI-002, ANN-RC-003, ANN-RC-004, ANN-RC-002, ANN-RC-005, ANN-RI-003, ANN-RC-006, ANN-RI-002, ANN-RC-007 - Ipswich Rd widening (School Rd to O'Keefe St) and request the feasibility study for a tunnel under Annerley junction instead. 	<p>generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p> <p>Lack of support for upgrading Oxley Rd (GRA-RC-001) is noted. The project is proposed to be removed.</p> <p>Coonan St/Wharf St intersection (CLR-RI-001) is proposed to be retained. The reason for the initial removal was the potential duplication of the Walter Taylor Bridge which is now unlikely to proceed on a nearby alignment within the medium term.</p> <p>Road signage is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport Planning section for consideration.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
405.1 418.1 419.1 420.1 425.1 428.1 434.1 435.1 436.1 437.1 438.1 439.1 440.1 441.1 443.1 452.1 455.1 456.1 465.1 479.1 509.1 537.1 555.1 556.1 560.1 562.1 569.1 600.1 609.1 622.1 688.1 701.1	<p>Some submitters have requested the inclusion of the following projects in LGIP amendment 1B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ekibin Rd/Ipswich Rd intersection • Oxley Rd/Graceville Ave intersection upgrade (pedestrians) • reinstate the Coonan St/Wharf St intersection (CLR-RI-001) • Graceville Ave/Oxley Rd intersection upgrade instead of Oxley Rd widening • Fairfield Rd/Venner Rd intersection (roundabout) • Fairfield pedestrian safety upgrade at Victoria/Princess St • Colwell St/Oxley Rd intersection upgrade (traffic lights) • Englefield Rd/Oxley Station Rd, Oxley Intersection Upgrade • Seventeen Mile Rocks Rd/Cook St corridor upgrade • Oxley - rail bridge realignment and widening • Sherwood Rd widening including off road pathways • Sherwood/Jerold St intersection upgrade (traffic lights) • Cansdale St/Hyde Rd intersection upgrade • widening School Rd at Ipswich Rd, Yeronga. • Hyde Rd/Fairfield Rd intersection upgrade, Yeronga. 		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	One submitter requested to include more "Slow for Sam" signs along Vivian St, Tennyson.		
396.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns that the location of emergency services operations may be impacted by some projects and seeks detailed engagement closer to delivery on the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANN-RC-004 - Ipswich Rd (Juliette St to Annerley Rd) • CHE-RC-012 - Hamilton Rd (Webster Rd to Farnell St) • TAI-RC-003 - Beams Rd (Muller Rd to Church Rd) • CLL-RI-004 - Wynnum Rd/Southgate Ave/Cannondale St intersection • UMG-RI-003 - Newnham Rd/Dawson Rd intersection 	<p>This project has been identified to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows.</p> <p>Detailed consultation and planning are undertaken prior to project delivery to ensure uninterrupted property access. Emergency Services will be involved in any temporary road closures required during the construction phase. Additionally, as part of the consultation process, Council will ensure that any special medical requirements of affected residents are considered.</p> <p>The next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as potential land resumption, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management.</p>	No change
270.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the proposed Ipswich Rd (Waterton St to Cracknell Rd) road corridor project (ANN-RC-006), including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its delivery timeframe • the potential impacts on their property including tenancy sustainability • property value. 	<p>The <i>Planning Act</i> specifies the planning horizon for which Council needs to plan its trunk infrastructure. The timing of the project reflects the anticipated need as it falls within the planning horizon.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
567.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns about lack of infrastructure investment in the south-west of Brisbane.</p> <p>Submitter requests the following projects be included in the LGIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • road/rail overpass at Boundary Rd, Coopers Plains • intersection upgrade at Ipswich Rd, Venner Rd and Waterton St, Annerley • intersection upgrade at Kerry Rd/Beatty Rd, Archerfield • road corridor upgrade - Beatty Rd, Archerfield • pedestrian overpass for Ipswich Rd to Moorooka Railway station. 	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback received and would like to highlight the following projects which have been included in LGIP amendment 1B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COP-LC-001 - Boundary Rd Open Level Crossing, Coopers Plains • ANN-RI-003 - Ipswich Rd/Venner Rd/Waterton St intersection upgrade • AFD-RI-002 - Beatty Rd/Kerry Rd intersection upgrade • AFD-RC-002, AFD-RC-004, AFD-RC-005, AFD-RC-006 and ACR-RC-002 - Beatty Rd corridor. <p>An overpass for Ipswich Rd to Moorooka Railway station would need to be a joint project with the Queensland Government and Queensland Rail.</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
381.1	<p>Submitter supports the removal of projects ASH-RI-003, GAP-RI-001, and KRR-RI-001 from the LGIP and support the inclusion of GAP-RC-001.</p> <p>However, request changes to timings for the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASH-RI-004 – 2024-2028 • ASH-RI-005 – 2024-2028 • FGR-RB-001 – 2024-2026 • FGR-RC-003 – 2024-2026 • GAP-RI-002 – 2026-2031 • KRR-RC-002 – 2026-2031 • UKE-RC-001 – 2024-2026 • UKE-RC-002 – 2023-2024 • UKE-RC-003 – 2024-2026 • UKE-RI-001 – 2023-2024. 	<p>Timing for projects identified in the submission has been reviewed and proposed to be updated as follows:</p> <p>ASH-RI-004: This intersection upgrade will be brought forward to 2026-2031 period to respond to recent development activity in the local area.</p> <p>KRR-RC-002: Recent development activity in the local area has changed the traffic projections for this corridor. A DA has been approved over the former quarry site, which will generate significant additional traffic ahead of the original planned timeframe. As such, this project is proposed to be divided into two new projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settlement Rd (Mungarie St to 407 Settlement Rd), which will be delivered in 2021-2026 • Settlement Rd (407 Settlement Rd to Kilbowie St), which will not change from the proposed timeframe of 2031-2036. 	<p>Amend timeframe for ASH-RI-004 from 2031-36 to 2026-31.</p> <p>Split KRR-RC-002 into two projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KRR-RC-003 – Settlement Rd (Mungarie St to 407 Settlement Rd), delivery timeframe 2021-26 • KRR-RC-004 – Settlement Rd (407 Settlement Rd to Kilbowie St), delivery timeframe 2031-36.
446.1	<p>Submitter supports the Settlement Rd (Kilbowie St to Mungarie St) road corridor project (KRR- RC-002) but suggests as an alternative to split into two separate projects to be delivered between 2021-2026 (phase 1) and 2031-2036 (phase 2) to ensure that the LGIP reflects the current intentions for adjoining development.</p>	<p>Recent development activity in the local area has changed the traffic projections for this corridor. As such, this project is proposed to be divided into two new projects, one being - Settlement Rd (Mungarie St to 407 Settlement Rd) which will be delivered in 2021-2023 and two being - Settlement Rd (407 Settlement Rd to Kilbowie St) which will not change from the proposed timeframe of 2031-2036.</p>	<p>Split KRR-RC-002 into two projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KRR-RC-003 – Settlement Rd (Mungarie St to 407 Settlement Rd), delivery timeframe 2021- 26 • KRR-RC-004 – Settlement Rd (407 Settlement Rd to Kilbowie St), delivery timeframe 2031-36.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
633.1	<p>Submitter raised concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Robinson Rd W/Kirby Rd (ASP-RI-002) Intersection in Aspley, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumptions • noise and light pollution specifically if the intersection is to be signalised. <p>They request that if the proposed upgrade of Robinson Rd in Aspley proceeds, it should be expanded to four lanes.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made general assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>In terms of final road intersection upgrade plans and layouts, each project is still subject to detailed assessment and design.</p> <p>The suggestion regarding the upgrade of Robinson Rd has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	No change
322.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns to the proposed inclusion for the Meadowlands Rd (Wright St to Belmont Rd) road corridor project (BEL- RC- 002) including increase of traffic and noise pollution.</p>	<p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
102.1	<p>Submitter requests to retain the existing footpath vehicle crossover on their property in any plans for upgrading the Beams Rd (Gympie Rd to Lacey Rd) road corridor project (CDE-RC-004). They also request a detailed design showing the potential land area for resumption when available.</p>	<p>In terms of final road corridor upgrade plans and layouts, each project is still subject to detailed assessment and design.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made general assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
001.1 624.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Hamilton Rd (Pfingst Rd to Newman Rd) (CHE-RC-011) and Hamilton Rd (Webster Rd to Farnell St) (CHE-RC-012) road corridor projects raising the following concerns:</p>	<p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made general assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the property value • seek fair and reasonable compensation in the event of any land resumption • impact the existing street parking. <p>One submitter raises concerns regarding impacts to private property, if the project requires enough land to impact the development potential of the site, they request Council to consider full property resumption</p>	<p>site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. If land acquisition is required, it will take place in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
417.1	<p>Submitters have commented on Hamilton Rd (Streisand Dr to Beckett Rd) road corridor project (MDW-RC-003) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the property value • increased noise • health hazards. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. If land acquisition is required, it will take place in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
033.1 229.1	<p>One submitter raises concerns to any resumption of land due to the Rode Rd (Maundrell Tce to Webster Rd) road corridor project (CHW-RI-003) However, they support the road intersection work without land resumption.</p> <p>Another submitter raises concerns with the Rode Rd (Maundrell Tce to Webster Rd) road corridor project (CHW-RC-004) and Rode Rd (Maundrell Terrace to bridge over Downfall Creek) (CHW-RC-003) with request to undertake widening on southern side of the road to avoid impact to existing residential properties.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
308.1	<p>Submitter requests update of the size and costs of land for road corridors, road bridges that were calculated using the incorrect spatial data projection (WGS84 instead of GDA94 Zone 56).</p>	<p>Suggestion noted. Datasets will be amended to GDA94 Zone 56 and the land costing for affected projects will be recalculated to reflect the most accurate cost estimates as at the base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	Amend land area and costings for impacted projects using correct spatial projection, and update values in the SOW.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	Also request the inclusion of the updated land areas and associated costs for some road intersections that are incorrectly amended as a part of the draft LGIP amendment 1B.		
104.1	Submitter raises concerns that the Wynnum Rd/Southgate Ave/Cannondale St road intersection project (CLL-RI-004) may require land resumption.	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
184.1	<p>Submitter has commented about resumption of land as a part of the Cavendish Rd (Wakefield St to Stanley St E) road corridor upgrade (COO-RC-006) and raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land has already been resumed on the opposite side • increase of traffic. <p>Submitter also suggests upgrading Main Ave and increasing pedestrian green zone along Cavendish Rd instead.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
099.1 540.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns that the Cavendish Rd (Old Cleveland Rd to York St) road corridor project (COO-RC-009) will increase traffic and property access issues.</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council consider including a pedestrian crossing or pedestrian refuge crossing along Cavendish Rd.</p>	<p>The Cavendish Road (Old Cleveland Rd to York Street) project is proposed to be removed from the LGIP amendment 1B. There is little support for the project, and there are many alternative roads for traffic to use if congestion increases in the future.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing points are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	Remove COO-RC-009 Cavendish Rd (Old Cleveland Rd to York St) from amendment package
403.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns about the proposed Cavendish Rd/Stanley St E Rd road intersection project (COO-RI-001) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • loss of parking • reduced accessibility during works. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
414.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns that Boundary Rd (Troughton Rd to Babbidge St) road corridor project (COP-RC-001) is likely to be for a new shopping centre.</p> <p>Submitter provides some suggestions for consideration during detailed design to protect the amenity of residents.</p>	<p>COP-RC-001 (Boundary Rd) proposed in the LGIP amendment 1B is road corridor project and unrelated to any potential shopping centre. Any amenity matters arising from a future development are dealt with as part of the development application process.</p> <p>Development applications are considered under the legislative framework applicable at the time. Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the sites prevail.</p>	No change
618.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns regarding the location of the Ormskirk St (Benhiam St to Hamish St) road corridor project (CVE-RC-002) and that it differs previous Council advice.</p> <p>Submitter requests the alignment of the project be revised to reflect the agreed location.</p>	<p>The alignment of CVE-RC-002 is proposed to be adjusted. The LGIP shows a strategic intent to upgrade infrastructure and further detailed planning for each project will consider specific impacts to properties and constraints.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. If land acquisition is required, it will take place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	Adjust spatial alignment of CVE-RC-001 to the north to avoid an existing house
639.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the inclusion of Nottingham Rd (Benhiam St to Appleby St) road corridor project (CVE-RC-010) and Nottingham Rd/Benhiam St road intersection project (CVE-RI-001) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise pollution 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of privacy decrease of the property value. 	<p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
392.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with changes to timeframes on several projects as they are related to an existing development approval.</p> <p>Submitter requests the reinstatement of the removed Harcourt Rd (Winslow St to Ipswich Rd) (DAR-RC-008) and Harcourt Rd (Railway Pde to Winslow St) (DAR-RC-007) road corridor projects and the Harcourt Rd/Winslow St road intersection project (DAR-RI-004) in the LGIP amendment 1B as they are related to an existing development approval.</p> <p>Submitter also requests any future roadworks undertaken along Boundary Rd (Kimberly St to Blunder Rd) road corridor project (OXY- RC- 009) to consider adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback received and it is proposed to retain the following projects in LGIP amendment 1B, which align with development approvals in the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DAR-RC-007 – Harcourt Rd (Railway Pde to Winslow St) DAR-RC-008 – Harcourt Rd (Winslow St to Ipswich Rd) DAR-RI-004 – Harcourt Rd/Winslow St. <p>Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the sites prevail.</p>	<p>Retain DAR-RC-007, DAR-RC-008 in LGIP with same timeframe.</p> <p>Retain DAR-RI-004 in LGIP with updated timeframe of 2021-2026.</p>
449.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the Stanley St E (Lisburn St to Wellington Rd) road corridor project (EAB-RC-007) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need for the project possible land resumption 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the cost of the project outweighing the benefits of the project consistency with future planning such as the Olympic Priority Development Area (PDA) and the Woolloongabba and East Brisbane precincts. 	<p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Any State Government delivered in Priority Development Areas are outside the scope of the LGIP.</p>	
681.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the Boundary Rd (Skepper St to Formation St) road corridor project (ELG-RC-002) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact to existing residential property potential loss of property value increased traffic noise. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
677.1	Submitter raises concerns with the Underwood Rd (Warrigal Rd to Gaskell St) road corridor	This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	project (EMP-RC-005) including potential land resumption.	city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
651.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Settlement Rd (Waterworks Rd to Bromwich St) road corridor project (GAP-RC-001) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased traffic • safety issues • difficulty accessing property • potential property resumption. 	This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	No change
619.1	<p>Submitter has commented on land resumption for Robinson Rd E/Bilsen Rd road intersection upgrade (GEE-RI-003) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential impacts to an existing on-site landscaping • erosion of high-quality amenities expected by the property tenants. <p>Submitter suggests utilising space on the existing road reserve to accommodate road widening works.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
453.1	Submitter requests the inclusion of the Oxley Rd/Long St E road intersection project (GRA RI-001) including the installation of traffic monitoring camera.	The Oxley Rd/Long St E intersection is included in the LGIP as GRA-RI-001. Traffic monitoring cameras are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.	No change
482.1	Submitter supports the Oxley Rd/Long St E road intersection project (GRA-RI-001) provided it is well-designed.	Support noted.	No change
468.1	Submitter has commented on the New Cleveland Rd (Grassdale Rd to Chelsea Rd) road corridor project (GUM-RC-005) and New Cleveland Rd/Chelsea Rd road intersection project (GUM-RI-003) and raised the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoidance of flooding issues • maintenance of the safety and integrity of the property. 	This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, flooding, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	No change
503.1	Submitter has commented on the Hawthorne Rd/Orchard St road intersection project (HAW- RI-003) and requested detailed plans.	This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
571.1	Submitter commented on the Wadeville St (Stapylton Rd to Parkwood Dr) road corridor project (HEA-RC-009) and raised concerns regarding potential land resumption and impacts to the property.	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
171.1	<p>Submitter supports the Hemmant-Tingalpa Rd corridor and intersection projects (HEM- RC- 007, HEM-RI-007, TIN-RI-004) and requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further corridor upgrades along the whole length of Hemmant-Tingalpa Rd through to Wynnum Rd • detailed trunk road designs • actual land acquisition required to deliver projects 	Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed costing of the projects reflective of current industry. 	<p>for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p> <p>The LGIP also prioritises the sequence of delivery for infrastructure to meet the expected pace and location of future development and includes estimates of the costs of delivering the infrastructure needed.</p> <p>Land valuation rates were calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3, which considers the area needed and a valuation rate by square metre. The method considers how much land is needed and applies a valuation rate by square metre. All land valuations in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	
653.1	<p>Submitter seeks confirmation from Council that there are no expected future upgrades to the Partridge Rd/Wirraway Pde road intersection project (INA-RI-004).</p>	<p>Currently, no further upgrades to the intersection are planned based on anticipated growth. However, the LGIP is not exhaustive, and future projects may still be funded as needed to support Brisbane's road network. If necessary, the intersection could still be upgraded in the future.</p>	No change
177.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the changes to Lambert Rd/Clarence Rd road intersection project (IND-RI-004) that it is inconsistent with the existing development approval.</p>	<p>There is no conflict between the LGIP and existing development approvals.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory plan, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that will support Brisbane as it develops. The LGIP is primarily used in development assessment, to advise applicants where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, car parking, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the LGIP scope. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail. Any acquisition will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>.</p>	
551.1	<p>Submitter supports the Witton Rd/Kate St road intersection project (IND-RI-006).</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>
593.1	<p>Submitter supports Lambert Rd/Harts Rd road intersection project (IND-RI-007) in the LGIP.</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council maintain current levels of on-street parking in Fairley St as it is a valuable public resource and relied upon by patrons of St Andrew's.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, car parking, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p>	<p>No change</p>
432.1	<p>Submitter requests the inclusion of a signalised pedestrian crossing near the Mowbray Tce intersection.</p>	<p>Signalised Pedestrian crossings are not considered trunk infrastructure and are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	
543.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns of how the Kelvin Grove Rd/Windsor Rd road intersection project (KGR-RI-002) will impact pedestrian safety and accessibility.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		Pedestrian crossings are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.	
263.1	Submitter commented on the Lutwyche Rd (Chalk St to Bradshaw St) road corridor project (LUT-RC-001) raising concerns that any potential land acquisition through a Development Application process requiring the owner to "supply land free of cost" would be unreasonable given the proposed DA does not bring forward the required infrastructure.	<p>The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on property.</p> <p>The SOW indicates the total land area required for the proposed corridor project, not the land required from individual sites.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions for infrastructure delivery will be issued in accordance with the Planning Act. Any land acquisition required will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>.</p>	No change
510.1	Submitter commented on the Rode Rd (Pleshette PI to Foambark St) road corridor project (MDW-RC-002) and raising concerns that potential land resumption for road widening would significantly impact the childcare centre's value and capacity.	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
094.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Osborne Rd (Brookside Shopping Centre access to bridge over Kedron Brook) road corridor upgrade (MIT-RC-003) and raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts to the business • safety • accessibility • parking availability • potential land resumption. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
645.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns about the Ipswich Rd (Hamilton Rd to Gainsborough St) road corridor project (MKA-RC-001) and Ipswich Rd/Gainsborough St road intersection project (MKA-RI-001) and requests the work be confined to the land identified in the current development application over the site.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the sites prevail.</p>	
109.1	<p>Submitter commented on the Richmond Rd/Molloy Rd road intersection project (MOR- RI-005) and raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on traffic • noise and light pollution • changes to access • potential loss of parking. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
103.1	<p>Submitter seeking confirmation that the proposed Lytton Rd (Junction Rd to Creek Rd) road corridor project (MUR-RC-001) will not impact the approved development on the subject site.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the LGIP scope. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p>	
349.1	<p>Submitter requests for upgrades to Colmslie Rd to be included in LGIP in addition to Lytton Rd (Junction Rd to Creek Rd) road corridor project (MUR-RC-001).</p>	<p>Submitter suggestions have been reviewed and noted. Colmslie Rd is currently classed as a minor road. Trunk infrastructure for Transport is for a Council controlled major road, being an arterial road, a suburban road or a district road identified on the Road hierarchy overlay map.</p> <p>Therefore, Colmslie Rd is currently not considered trunk infrastructure and is outside the scope of the LGIP.</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.	
144.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the St Vincents Rd (Childs Rd to Hayden St) (NUD- RC-003) and St Vincents Rd (Childs Rd to Hayden St) (NUD-RC-004) road corridor projects and St Vincents Rd/Childs Rd Intersection projects (NUD-RI-001).</p> <p>Submitter requests the Catholic cemetery be given consideration during design of the project.</p> <p>Submitter is seeking further information to the spatial extent of works to assist in planning for any impact to the property.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
648.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Nudgee Rd (Crockford St to Raubers Rd) road corridor project (NOG-RC-002).</p> <p>Submitter is seeking further information to the spatial extent of works to assist in planning for any impact to the property.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
373.1	Submitter requests a new wombat crossing on Frasers Rd to connect from the playground to Oakleigh State School via Tay St.	The suggestion for a wombat crossing on Frasers Rd is noted. Pedestrian crossings are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.	No change
488.1	Submitter requests the inclusion of traffic calming in and around Chelmer, in particular around Graceville State School.	<p>Minor roads and traffic calming are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration within other programs.</p> <p>The LGIP shows a strategic intent to upgrade infrastructure; detailed planning for each project will consider specific impacts to properties and elements such as flooding at the time of design.</p>	No change
550.1	Submitter requests Cavendish Rd be earmarked for a bikeway.	Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.	No change
568.1	Submitter acknowledges the proposed amendment for the Wacol Station Rd	The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	(Grindle Rd to Wacol Station Rd Rail Crossing) road corridor project (WCL-RC-020) and would like to be kept informed of any impact to their property.	<p>support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
621.1	Submitter requests the inclusion of the section of Ritchie Rd (Sweets Rd and Vied Rd) for road upgrade in the LGIP.	Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.	No change
163.1	Submitter has commented on the Wynnum Rd/Norman Ave road intersection project (NRP- RI-005), raising the following concerns:	The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument , which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> concerned increase in pollution and noise possible land resumption increase in traffic and delays. 	<p>LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
050.1 553.1	<p>One submitter has commented on the Melton Rd (Masfield St to Buckland Rd) road corridor project (NUN-RC-002) and Melton Rd/Buckland Rd Intersection (NUN-RI-001) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> lower property values increase traffic issues on local roads. <p>One submitter requests fair and reasonable compensation should the project proceed.</p> <p>Additional request for removal of a Vegetation Protection Order (VPO) over neighbour's fig tree which encroaches their property.</p>	<p>The LGIP shows a strategic intent to upgrade infrastructure; detailed planning for each project will consider specific impacts to properties at the time of design.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Should land acquisition be required, it will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>The request for removal of VPO over neighbour's fig tree is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Natural Environment Water and Sustainability (NEWS) Branch for consideration.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
174.1	<p>Submitter has commented on Newmarket Rd/Wilston Rd road intersection project (NWM- RI-001) and that it may result in reduction of land value.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
350.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns that the Oxley Rd/Cook St road intersection project (OXY- RI- 006) may impact access to property and requests any resumption be limited to one metre only.</p> <p>Submitter also requests Council to consider purchase of whole property.</p>	<p>The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on private properties where possible.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
051.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Oxley Rd/Cliveden Ave road intersection project (OXY-RI-007) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts on existing residential property • potential land resumption • additional pollution and noise. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
035.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Rickertt Rd (Green Camp Rd to bridge over Lota Creek) road corridor project (RAN-RC-002) and suggested building a new Tingalpa Creek crossing adjacent to the existing bridge. Submitter raises the following benefits of the alternate corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more cost efficient than upgrading the existing corridor • will support expected growth • reduces impact to existing residential properties. 	<p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
175.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the Boundary Rd (Kimberley St to Acanthus St) road corridor project (RIC-RC-008) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential loss of parking • reduce property value • requires underground infrastructure realignment • impacts private property. <p>Submitter suggests the opposite side as a better alternate location for resumptions.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
667.1	<p>Submitter has commented on Miles Platting Rd (Gardner Rd to School Rd) (ROC-RC-027), Gardner Rd (Miles Platting Rd to School Rd) (ROC-RC-036) road corridor projects and Miles Platting Rd/Gardner Rd Intersection (ROC-RI-002) with the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumptions • implications of the existing development approval. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the sites prevail.</p>	
547.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Rochedale Rd (Ford Rd to School Rd) road corridor project (ROC-RC-031), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it may impact future re-development • affect the value of land • no indication given for the role and function of this proposed infrastructure. • difficulty to establish the implication of the proposed amendments on the DA currently on the site. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>The role and purpose of roads in the network is described in Chapter 2 of the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy within City Plan. Road projects identified in the LGIP amendment 1B were selected based on several criteria detailed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material.</p> <p>Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the sites prevail.	
549.1	Submitter has raised concerns about the Gardner Rd (Underwood Rd to bridge over waterway) road corridor project (ROC-RC-040) and School Rd/Gardner Rd Extension Intersection (ROC-RI-010), highlighting a potential conflict between an existing development approval and the LGIP.	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
074.1	Submission supports timing of the Gardner Rd (Farley Rd to Interchange PI) road corridor project (ROC-RC-044).	Support noted.	No change
447.1	<p>Submitter supports the Farley Rd (Gardner Rd to Rochedale Rd) road corridor project (ROC-RC-046) in the LGIP. However, request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> bring the delivery timeframe to 2021— 2026 to along with the timing for the Gardner Rd/Prebble St road intersection project (ROC-RI-004) request the inclusion of new road corridor from the ROC-RC-046 to Rochedale Rd 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rochedale Rd/Farley Rd intersection. 	<p>accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	
448.1	<p>Submitter requests the split of the Ford Rd (Rochedale Rd to Wanless Way) road corridor project (ROC-RC-049) to reflect the landownership. Also requests to bring forward the timing of the projects to 2021-2026 to align with the timing of stormwater pipes.</p>	<p>Council has reviewed the timing of ROC-RC-049 and it is to remain in 2026-2031, this is consistent with the planning assumptions and the existing state of development approvals over affected sites.</p> <p>The road corridor project ROC-RC-045 remains partially undelivered as of 30 June 2021 due to the incomplete western verge, therefore it will remain in the LGIP.</p>	No change
655.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns with the Rochedale Rd (Grieve Rd to Prebble St) road corridor project (ROC-RC-007) and Grieve Rd/Rochedale Rd road intersection project (ROC-RI-016) being moved to LTIP including a more urgent need for a safer and better designed road and intersection. Also suggests additional signage on Grieve Rd.</p>	<p>Road projects identified in the LGIP were selected based on several criteria detailed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. Although the Rochedale Rd and Grieve Rd project was previously in the LGIP the latest planning assumptions do not support it being in the updated LGIP.</p> <p>The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of future road projects. Other projects will be assessed and may be selected for future funding as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p> <p>The request for signage is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	No change
570.1	<p>Submitter supports the Warrigal Rd Open Level Crossing project (RUN-LC-001) including potential to improve traffic conditions, and safe access to property during peak times. Suggests</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory plan, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that will support Brisbane as it develops. The</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>a "clear zone" at the T intersection during the design. However, does have concerns for impacts to development of the property in the future.</p>	<p>LGIP is primarily used in development assessment, to advise applicants where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, car parking, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Please contact Council's Development Services branch regarding development of land.</p>	
700.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns over the inclusion of the Warrigal Rd Open Level Crossing project (RUN-LC-001) including potential land resumption and impacts to property value.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
185.1	<p>Submitter has commented on SBR-RI-004 - Gloucester St and Stephens Rd intersection project and raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential impacts to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists • loss of parking • increase in noise and pollution • reduction of existing setbacks. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
638.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Appleby Rd/Wilgarning St road intersection project (STH-RI-001) raising concerns regarding any potential land resumption.</p> <p>Submitter suggests alternative resumption on the other side of the road.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
462.1	<p>Submitter requests a new road intersection upgrade (roundabout) at West St and Farmers St, Rochedale, to be included in the LGIP.</p>	<p>Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. The suggested projects generally do not meet the criteria outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, or are unable to be accommodated as a priority within the planning horizon of the LGIP. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	No change
484.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the Mains Rd/Elva St road intersection project (SUN-RI-001) - including potential land resumption as the house is close to boundary.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
228.1 332.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Manly Rd (Wynnum Rd to Castlerea St) road corridor project (TIN-RC-010), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • process for land resumption • timing • road flooding • resource allocation • quality of maintenance. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>One submitter requests clarity on the property valuation process that reflect current market value and inquiries about opportunities for residents to negotiate reimbursement and compensation for land acquisition or resumption, as well as relocation expenses.</p>	<p>infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Land valuation rates were calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Extrinsic Material, which considers the area needed and a general valuation rate by square metre. The method considers how much land is needed and applies a valuation rate by square metre. All land valuations in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
539.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns about adverse effects that multiple road projects (TOO-RC-002, TOO-RC-003, TOO-RI-001, TOO-RI-004, TOO-RI-005, TOO-RI-007, TOO-RI-008) may have on accessing Toowong Village Shopping Centre, and the profitability of the centre. Mentions lack of information about specific plans for these projects.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
552.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns regarding the potential resumption of land for the Milton Rd/Croydon St road intersection upgrade (TOO-RI-001).</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
239.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the Newnham Rd/Dawson Rd road intersection project (UMG-RI-003) to enhance safety and improve traffic flow and make the following requests:</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Traffic signal operation is not considered trunk infrastructure therefore this request is outside the scope of the LGIP. However, this suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> remove the green left turn arrow on Dawson Rd into Newman Rd include red, yellow and green turn arrows on the other side of the road instalment of red light and speed cameras. 	<p>Red light cameras are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. Please contact TMR via phone on 13 74 68 or online via https://www.qld.gov.au/contact-us</p>	
524.1	<p>Submitter commented on possible land acquisition for the Camp Rd (Rickertt Rd to Molle Rd) road corridor project (WAK-RC-001) widening. Submitter also raises the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> noise and pollution potential impacts to private properties impact to adjacent park safety impacts to property access changes to traffic. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	No change
054.1	<p>Submitter commented on the New Cleveland Rd/Stanborough Rd/Ingleston Rd road intersection project (WAK-RI-006), with concerns regarding potential land resumption, negative impacts on the land value.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of the City Plan 2014, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p>	
245.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the removal of the Wacol Station Rd (Wolston Rd to Wacol Station Rd Rail Crossing) road corridor project (WCL-RC-008) due to a development condition to dedicate land to road with B-double access.</p>	<p>The section of Wacol Station Rd (WCL-RC-008) included on the current B-double network has been reinstated to the LGIP to better align with the industrial nature of businesses in the area.</p>	<p>Retain WCL-RC-008 in LGIP with updated timeframe of 2026-2031</p>
075.1 542.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Boundary Rd (Garden Rd to Anderson Dr) road corridor project (WCL-RC-014) raising concerns if any land resumption is required.</p> <p>One submitter requests clarification on what the reference is to "Garden Rd to Anderson Drive" and its significance.</p> <p>One submitter requested new planning information mentioned in Council correspondence, including proposed corridor land area.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>The reference to "Garden Rd to Anderson Drive" is an administrative error carried over from the existing LGIP. It</p>	<p>Update project description for WCL-RC-014 to Boundary Rd (Centenary Motorway to Macgregor PI)</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>should read "Boundary Rd (Centenary Motorway to Macgregor PI" this means the project will occur between Centenary Motorway to Macgregor PI along Boundary Rd.</p> <p>The land area included on Council's letter is an indication of the total required for the entire corridor. It is not the amount required from the individual site.</p>	
<p>101.1 347.1 528.1 538.1</p>	<p>Submitter raises concerns regarding the Montague Rd road corridor and intersection projects (SBR-RC-001, WES-RC-021, WES-RC-022, WES-RC-020, WES-RI-004) suggesting the works to be completed within existing road reserve.</p> <p>One submitter raises concerns on the lack of detail on the proposed road corridor upgrade.</p> <p>One Submitter raises concerns on the road having heavy vehicle movements, lacking pedestrian and cyclist safety, lack of shade and parking.</p> <p>Submitter suggests if upgrades proceed the speed limits be maintained or reduced, establish bicycle lanes, enforce parking restrictions, ensure appropriate building setbacks and provide greening improvements.</p> <p>One submitter provided comments in relation to the widening of Montague Rd between Jane and Vulture St (WES-RC-022). The submitter has suggested that any land requirements be taken on Davies Park (western) side of road to avoid impacting privately owned land.</p>	<p>Projects in the LGIP have been identified as required to accommodate Brisbane's growth in the years to 2036.</p> <p>Road projects identified in the LGIP were selected based on several criteria detailed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. A review of the LGIP project indicates that an upgrade will be required in that timeframe. Accordingly, the project is to be retained in the LGIP. Impacts to individual properties will be considered at the time of design.</p> <p>The LGIP shows a strategic intent to upgrade infrastructure; detailed planning for each project will consider specific elements, including facilities for all users and shading, at the time of design. Note that the addition of cycle facilities in the road corridor are classified as a road project due to the nature of the LGIP.</p> <p>Speed limits, parking restrictions and enforcement, and development-related issues are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
309.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns over the Newmarket Rd/Green Tce road intersection project (WSR- RI-003), specifically changes to existing property access, increase in traffic, loss of parking, safety of members, and impacts to existing signage located near the road.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Road projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	No change
660.1	<p>Submitter commented on the Wondall Rd (Randall Rd to Bonniebrae St) road corridor project (WYW-RC-010), Wynnum West, road corridor project raising concerns regarding impact to pedestrian safety, changes to access, and impact to property value.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.	
276.1	Submitters raises concerns with the speed limits along Bridgeman Rd, Bridgeman Downs.	The setting of speed limits is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.	No change
575.1	Submitter raises concerns with the safety of Alexandra Rd and pedestrians trying to cross at Wagner Rd. Submitter suggests A no through road is implemented to allow for more greenspace and to provide much needed safety for pedestrians.	Upgrading of a local road is not considered trunk infrastructure therefore this request is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.	No change

3.2 Active and public transport network

Trunk infrastructure for the transport network (pathway network) projects identified in the LGIP were selected based on several criteria detailed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. These criteria include:

- are primary routes or secondary routes in the BNO
- pathways serving areas that are expected to experience a high percentage growth in population and employment from 2021 to 2036
- completion of 'missing links' in the pathways network
- projects that require land acquisition.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
205.1 222.1 335.1 338.1 345.1 346.1 361.1 537.1 560.1 569.1	Submitters have requested the inclusion of Wharf St, Chelmer bikeway connection to Jack Pesch Bridge.	Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. In this case, Council will not be proposing any additional changes to incorporate this project. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.	No change
203.1	Submitter requests the Bicycle network overlay be updated to remove the bikeway through 124 Maundrell Tce, Chermside West, to reflect the proposed removal in LGIP amendment 1B of CHW-SP-002.	The proposed LTIP amendment 1B does not remove the cycle route, it proposes to change the existing secondary cycle route to a local cycle route. There is still planning for a bikeway in this location, with reduced land requirements for the cycleway. Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.	No change
509.1 556.1	Submitters have requested the inclusion of bike lanes on Park Rd, Yeronga.	The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time. Your request for new infrastructure project has been noted and will be considered in future amendments. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of pathway projects that Council is seeking to deliver in the future.	No change
372.1	Submitter has commented Yeerongpilly is close to two major tertiary institutions, however there are no existing bikeways along the streets.	The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time. Your request for new infrastructure project has been noted and will be considered in future amendments. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of pathway projects that Council is seeking to deliver in the future.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
004.1 008.1 142.1 242.1	<p>Submitters raised concerns regarding the inclusion of the Priestly Rd Bikeway (Tiverton PI to Camelot PI) secondary cycle route project (BRD-SP-004):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant environmental impact • conflict with BDNP NPP-004 • lack of demand • increase in crimes • negative impact on property value. <p>Some submitters suggested Beams Rd as alternative location for bikeway.</p>	<p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed. The bikeway project is proposed to be removed as it is not expected to be required within the current time frame of the LGIP.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time. This project may be considered in future amendments.</p>	Remove BRD-SP-004 from amendment package
106.1 193.1 432.1 454.1 476.1 478.1 496.1	<p>Submitters support the inclusion of the Kangaroo Point Riverwalk (Dockside Ferry Terminal to Mowbray Park) (KAN-RW-004), Toowong to West End Green Bridge (TOO-GB-001) and St Lucia to West End (SLU-GB-001) projects.</p> <p>One submitter raises concerns for the safety of the access and exit points of the Kangaroo Point Bridge.</p> <p>Submitters have requested the following changes in the LGIP amendment 1B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bring forward the delivery timeframe for Kangaroo Point Bikeway (Veloway 1 Cycleway to Thornton St) (KAN-SP-004) from 2026-2031 to 2021-2026 • bring forward the delivery timeframe for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge (TOO-GB-001) and St Lucia to West End Green Bridge (SLU-GB-001) from 2026-2031 to 2021-2026 	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about Kangaroo Point riverwalk (Dockside Ferry Terminal to Mowbray Park) (KAN-RW-004). However, the riverwalk project is to align with park acquisition shown in the LGIP and no change is proposed.</p> <p>The next phase of planning will consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as potential land resumption, safety, maintenance options, accessibility to the property, noise, and safety.</p> <p>Projects are selected based on the fulfilment of the criteria listed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material, and the deliverability and financial sustainability over the period to 2036.</p> <p>Project scheduling also considers the degree of planning and design which has occurred for a proposed project and the scale of construction.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inclusion of additional cycle route projects. <p>One Submitter raises concerns with the Bridges for Brisbane (Toowong to West End, and St Lucia to West End) project.</p> <p>One submitter request to accelerate the Kangaroo Point riverwalk project with a focus on completing the missing link between Dockside and Mowbray Park.</p> <p>One submitter also requested the inclusion of separated bike lanes on the Kangaroo Point Bridge (KAN-GB-001).</p>	<p>possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time. Requests for new infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.</p>	
091.1 604.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Kingfisher Creek bikeway (Withington St to Caswell St) secondary cycle route project (EAB-SP-001), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> potential land resumptions changes to security and safety property devaluation. <p>Alternative locations for the cycle route are suggested.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
023.1 047.1 172.1 192.1 202.1 247.1 272.1 278.1 311.1 357.1 368.1 408.1 411.1 630.1 652.1 654.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Kangaroo Point Riverwalk (Dockside Ferry Terminal to Mowbray Park) project (KAN- RW- 004), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential loss of privacy • impact to public amenities • increase in noise and crime • safety concerns • potential land resumption • decrease of property value. <p>Some submitters have raised concerns regarding ability to maintain regular dredging. Request Council provide proposed options for maintenance access.</p> <p>One submitter commented that the project is unnecessary due to alternative walkway from Shafston Ave to Lytton Rd in Norman Park, and housing crisis. Submitter also requested for a pedestrian crossing at Deakin St.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts. Pedestrian crossing is outside the scope of the LGIP however, this suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p> <p>Development of the riverwalk network supports Council's long-term planning for the inner city in the City Plan.</p>	No change
019.1 020.1 025.1 085.1 087.1 095.1 096.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Kedron Brook Bikeway (Cribb Ave to Lansvale St) primary cycle route project (MIT-SP-010), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • existing on-road cycle path • potential increase of existing crime 	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to adjust the alignment of the project to reduce impacts to private properties and utilise the existing shared path located along St Helens Rd.</p>	<p>Amend MIT-SP-010- Kedron Brook bikeway (Cribb Ave to Lansvale St).</p> <p>Remove section from St Helens Rd to</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
097.1 100.1 126.1 128.1 129.1 170.1 176.1 214.1 218.1 398.1 457.1 460.1 483.1 492.1 494.1 502.1 533.1 557.1 599.1 665.1 685.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of privacy unnecessary cost security and safety risks proposed location on flood affected land erosion and environmental impacts. 	<p>The new project will connect Cribb Ave to St Helens Rd, with the project description to be renamed Kedron Brook bikeway (Cribb Ave to St Helens Rd).</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	<p>Lansvale St from amendment package.</p> <p>Retain section from Cribb Ave to St Helens Rd (connecting to end of St Helens Rd), and update project description to reflect the project extent.</p>
015.1 076.1 162.1 497.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Morningside Riverwalk (Taylor St to Colmslie Recreation Reserve) project (MOR-RW-001) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impacts to boat ramp access existing marine operations conflicting with the current land use security. <p>Some submitters have commented that this project is inconsistent with the DA and Infrastructure agreement on the site.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>One submitter has requested an extended timeframe if the project proceeds, to allow for change of land use changes compatible with the proposed project.</p>	<p>site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p>	
<p>344.1 394.1</p>	<p>Submitters have concerns with the location of the Bulimba Creek bikeway (Cannon Hill to Runcorn) project and impacts to private property.</p>	<p>This item is an indicative alignment only, along Bulimba Creek. Matters dealing with the cycle route will be considered as part of any future development application on the site.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>373.1</p>	<p>Submitter requests a new path to avoid crossing Wardell St by improving gravel service road to connect the bikeway and Enchanted Forest Playground.</p>	<p>There is an existing staircase that provides this connection. It connects Stewart Rd to the Enoggera Creek bikeway underpass via Dorrington Park. While an additional bikeway path would be desirable, the steep slope makes achieving accessible path grades very difficult in this location. The existing stairs provide a direct connection.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>119.1 339.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the Bicentennial Bikeway - Stage 5 (Regatta Park</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>to Glen Rd) primary cycle route (TOO-SP-002) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encroachment of private property • impacts to traffic noise • potential pollution • impacts to property value. 	<p>to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
002.1 276.1	<p>Submitters raised concerns with the Bridgeman Downs Bikeway (Neville Rd to Bridgeman Rd) secondary cycle route project (BRD-SP-005), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • increased crime 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • privacy of their property • impacts to land value • increased noise • existing easement and • impacts to wildlife • access to properties. 	<p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
534.1 583.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the location of the Cedar Creek Bikeway (Keperra Picnic Ground Park to Nelson PI Park) secondary cycle route project (FGR-SP-006) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts to the private properties • safety and privacy of landowners • fair compensation for any land resumption. 	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback about the location of the LGIP project.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>One submitter raised concern with an Aerobic Sewage Treatment Plant that is located 8.07m from their back fence requesting that if the pathway goes ahead a fence and lockable gate is provided.</p>	<p>and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on private property.</p> <p>Land valuation rates were used for long term financial assumptions, calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. This considers the area needed and a valuation rate by square metre. The method considers how much land is needed and applies a valuation rate by square metre. All land valuations in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>The next phase of planning will consider site specific impacts and constraints such as: safety, accessibility to the property, noise, and potential injury on the property.</p>	
<p>132.1 423.1 626.1</p>	<p>Submitters raised concerns with location of Grafton St to Hudson Rd (QR railway overpass) secondary cycle route project (ALB-SB-001), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • safety concerns • reduce land value • conflict with the property access • practical barrier due to the railway line being elevated. <p>Submitters suggest an alternative location.</p>	<p>Submitter concerns and suggestions for alternative locations have been reviewed. This project is proposed to be retained in the LGIP to ensure that the Active and public transport network has sufficient connectivity across the city.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
297.1	<p>Submitter raised concerns regarding the Bridgeman Downs Bikeway (Bridgeman Rd to Retreat St) secondary cycle route project (BRD-SP-006), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased traffic • loss off parking availability • safety concerns for the additional traffic and the potential increase in crime • loss of trees and the size of the project seems excessive. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	No change
471.1	<p>Submitter raised concerns regarding the inclusion of Morningside Riverwalk (Apollo Rd to Taylor St), Bulimba) project (BUL-RW-004) including:</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the comments provided. It should be noted that Land for active and public transport in this instance is intended to be managed through the Development assessment process.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact to strategic defence assets and capabilities for military • major security concerns should the public walk through the facility • disrupt defence operations. 	<p>Therefore, no impacts occur to properties that do not redevelop.</p> <p>In relation to the ADF site, the provision of future pathways for pedestrian and active transport through the site in a riverside park location will be negotiated through the application process.</p>	
559.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the Downfall Creek Bikeway (Gympie Rd Underpass) primary cycle route project (CHE-SP-010).</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>
216.1	<p>Submitter requests reprioritisation of the following active and public transport projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAR-SP-002 - Carina Bikeway (Fursden Rd to Meadowlands Rd) • CDL-SP-010 - Bulimba Creek Bikeway (Scrub Rd to Eromanga St Park) • EAB-SP-001 - Kingfisher Creek Bikeway (Withington St to Caswell St) • FLK-SP-002 - Bullockhead Creek Bikeway (Lilydale Pl to Waterford Rd) • HER-SP-001 - Enoggera Creek Bikeway (Clyde Rd to Gould Rd Park) • MGE-SP-001 - Salvin Creek Bikeway (Creek Rd to Pine Mountain Rd) • MKA-SP-003 - Rocky Water Holes Creek Bikeway (Muriel Ave to John Bright St) • MKA-SP-005 - Rocky Water Holes Creek Bikeway (Gladstone St to Beaudesert Rd) • MOR-SP-001 - Perrin Creek Bikeway (Algoori St to Beelarong St) • MOR-SP-004 - Perrin Creek Bikeway (Algoori St to Baringa St) 	<p>The pathway network for off-road pathways is planned as part of the LGIP. Any cycle infrastructure provided in the road corridor would be considered as part of a road project. Road corridor projects are only required to be LGIP projects when acquisition of private land is required. Therefore, cycle infrastructure for the corridors requested can be retrofitted to the existing road corridor without acquisition of private land.</p> <p>The LGIP prioritises the sequence of delivery for infrastructure to meet the expected pace and location of future development and includes estimates of the costs of delivering the infrastructure needed.</p> <p>Projects identified in the LGIP were selected based on several criteria detailed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. The LGIP is to support Brisbane's growth to the LGIP planning horizon of 2036. Other projects will be assessed and may still be selected for future funding as the need arises to support Brisbane's transport network.</p> <p>Please note to better facilitate the pathway network development, MOR-SP-004 will be removed and replaced with an alternate shared bridge project (to be known as</p>	<p>Remove MOR-SP-004 from amendment package and replace with MOR-SB-001.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OXY-SP-001 - Oxley Bikeway (Englefield Rd to Douglas St - southern side of railway line) • OXY-SP-002 - Oxley Bikeway (Douglas St to Oxley Station Rd - southern side of railway line) • SAL-SP-002 - Rocky Water Holes Creek Bikeway (McCarthy Rd to Precision St) • SAL-SP-003 - Rocky Water Holes Creek Bikeway (Precision St to Assembly St) • SAL-SP-004 - Rocky Water Holes Creek Bikeway (Assembly St to Beaudesert Rd). <p>The submitter requests to align the State Government's Principal Cycle Network (PCN) and revise design schedule to encourage active transport.</p> <p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EAF-SP-003 - Kingsford Smith Dr Bikeway (Schneider Rd to Viola Pl) • TOO-GB-001 - Toowong to West End Bridge • SLU-GB-001 - St Lucia to West End Bridge. 	MOR-SB-001) over the waterway in the Algoori St road corridor, which is a Council road corridor.	
308.1	Submitter requests update of the size and costs of cycle routes that were calculated using the incorrect spatial data projection (WGS84 instead of GDA94 Zone 56).	Suggestion noted. Datasets will be amended to GDA94 Zone 56 and the land costing for affected projects will be recalculated to reflect the most accurate cost estimates as at the base date of 30 June 2021.	Amend land area and costings for impacted projects using correct spatial projection, and update values in the SOW.
324.1	Submitter requests the following additional high-priority bicycle routes for inclusion as Primary Cycle Routes in LGIP:	Items included in the LGIP have been selected based on a citywide planning exercise, which have been prioritised to respond to expected growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP. To remain financially sustainable, not all	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Freeway Bikeway to Indooroopilly Riverwalk Bikeway Indooroopilly Riverwalk to Fairley St via Lambert Rd Bikeway Sylvan Rd Bidirectional Bikeway. 	<p>potential items can be accommodated. Council has reviewed the infrastructure items requested. In this case, Council will not be proposing any additional changes to incorporate these projects. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of all future road projects and Council continually reviews the LGIP over time. Other projects may be assessed and selected for future amendments subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities as needed to support Brisbane's road network.</p>	
014.1 493.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Bullockhead Creek Bikeway (Waterford Rd to Roxwell St - along eastern side of creek) secondary cycle route project (ELG-SP-002) and Ellen Grove to Forest Lake Bikeway (Bagnall St to Considine St) (ELG-SP-005) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> environmental impacts changes to property access flooding loss of amenity resale property value. 	<p>The submitters' comments have been reviewed, and due to concerns about property impacts, potential effects on the waterway and vegetation, as well as the high cost, the project is proposed to be removed from the LGIP. It is the intention for Bagnall St and Waterford Rd corridors to be updated to deliver bicycle facilities within the road corridor as part of a future project.</p>	Remove ELG-SP-002 from amendment package
340.1 535.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the location of the Ellen Grove to Forest Lake Bikeway (Woogaroo St to Lovat St) secondary cycle route project (ELG-SP-003) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impacts to private property affecting future development of land property value cost of infrastructure. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>This item has been identified as part of citywide network planning to ensure the road can maintain efficiency as the city grows. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate the</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints, such as property impacts, topography, disruption to existing businesses, accessibility, noise, safety, and traffic management. Where required, community engagement will be undertaken throughout this process.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
381.1	<p>Submitter requests changes to delivery timeframes for the following cycle route projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKE-SP-007 – Cedar Creek Bikeway (Levitt Rd to Canvey Rd) • UKE-SP-008 – Cedar Creek Bikeway (Levitt Rd to Kirralee Cres). <p>Submitter supports removal of completed projects.</p>	<p>Support for removal of completed projects is noted.</p> <p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed and the proposed delivery timeframe of 2026-2031 for projects UKE-SP-007 and UKE-SP-008 is feasible. The delivery period will be amended to 2026-2031.</p>	Amend delivery timeframe for UKE-SP-007 and UKE-SP-008 to 2026-2031.
433.1	Submitter supports the inclusion of the Cedar Creek Bikeway (Keperra Picnic Ground Park to Nelson Place Park) secondary cycle route (FGR-SP-006).	Support noted.	No change
672.1	Submitter supports the Kangaroo Point Riverwalk (Dockside Ferry Terminal to	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>Mowbray Park) project (KAN-RW-004), however, raises concerns regarding the design and operation of the intersection of riverwalk with Mowbray Park ferry terminal including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the intersection is directly in front of the driveway. • concerns with the increase of noise and light pollution • potential increase of traffic • potential safety risk for residents and users. <p>Submitter request that the designs take into consideration issues above to minimise any impacts.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p>	
125.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Kedron Brook Bikeway (Cribb Avenue to Oxford Grove Park) secondary cycle route project (MIT-SP-003) suggesting it should require the acquisition of less private land and use existing Council land in the area.</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
375.1	<p>Submitter is open to resumption of property for the purposes of the Morningside Riverwalk (Taylor St to Colmslie Recreation Reserve) (MOR-RW-001).</p>	<p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur as part of a funded project, undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	No change
077.1 216.1	<p>Submitters support inclusion of the Morningside Riverwalk (Taylor St to Colmslie Recreation Reserve) (MOR-RW-001).</p> <p>One submitter requests review of the land valuation and project timing.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>Establishment costs are long term, financial planning estimates of the costs of delivering the required infrastructure. They are subject to change and calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	
216.1 379.1	<p>Submitters support inclusion of Morningside Riverwalk (Colmslie Recreation Reserve to Colmslie Beach Reserve) (MOR-RW-002).</p> <p>One submitter requests review of the alignment and establishment costs.</p>	<p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>Land valuation costs have been calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		Material. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.	
186.1 668.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the Perrin Creek Bikeway (Algoori St to Baringa St) (MOR-SP-004) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • privacy and safety • increased congestion • property access • impact on the environment. 	<p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed. To better facilitate the pathway network development, MOR- SP- 004 will be removed and replaced with a shared bridge project (to be known as MOR-SB-001) over the waterway in the Algoori St road corridor, which is a Council road corridor.</p>	<p>Remove MOR-SP-004 from amendment package and replace with MOR-SB-001.</p>
349.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Junction Rd Bikeway (Colmslie Rd to Metroplex Avenue) secondary cycle route project (MUR-SP-006) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detract from the intended industrial function of the area • create a public safety issue as cyclists mix with heavy vehicles. <p>Submitter request project be removed from the LGIP to a more suitable area for active transport.</p>	<p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed. The project has been partially delivered through previous development. The alignment will be reduced in length to reflect the delivered section.</p>	<p>Junction Rd bikeway (Colmslie Rd to Metroplex Avenue) secondary cycle route project (MUR-SP-006). Part removed from the amendment package (retain Colmslie Rd to property boundary of 47 Colmslie Rd/55 Metroplex Ave).</p>
444.1	<p>Submitter requests the inclusion of the following projects in the LGIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bikeway along Vulture St, South Brisbane • Bikeway along Dornoch Tce, Highgate Hill 	<p>The pathway network for off-road pathways are planned as part of the LGIP. Any cycle infrastructure provided in the road corridor would be considered as part of a road project. Cycle infrastructure for the corridors requested will be considered as part of the design for any future road upgrades within the existing corridor.</p> <p>Road projects identified in the LGIP were selected based on several criteria detailed in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. The LGIP is to support Brisbane's growth to the LGIP planning horizon of 2036.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of road projects that Council is seeking to deliver in the future. Other projects will be assessed and may still be selected for future funding as the need arises to support Brisbane's transport network.</p>	
<p>525.1 541.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the location of the Oxley Bikeway (Englefield Rd to Douglas St - southern side of railway line) secondary cycle route project (OXY-SP-001) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption. <p>One submitter raises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safety of private property • increase in noise • increase the probability of theft and vandalism • light pollution • impacts to the environment • decrease the market value of their property. 	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>Land valuation costs have been calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	
219.1	<p>Submitter supports the removal of Oxley Creek Bikeway (Lawson St Park to Ipswich Motorway) secondary cycle route project (OXY-SP-006).</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>
443.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the Oxley Bikeway (OXY-SP-001, OXY-SP-002, DAR-SP-004) in the LGIP. They also support the Oxley Greenway (ROK-SP-005, OXY-SP-009, ROK-SP-006) project but suggest an alternative location.</p> <p>Submitter requests the following inclusions in the LGIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxley Creek bikeway, Oxley Station/Cliveden Ave/Ipswich Motorway. • Oxley Creek bridge • Oxley Greenway in Rocklea • Bikeway path lighting Hyde Rd to Brisbane Corso. 	<p>Submitter concerns and suggestions for alternation locations have been reviewed. This project is proposed to be retained in the LGIP to ensure that the Active and public transport network has sufficient connectivity across the city.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, requests for changes to infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.</p> <p>Future planning and alignment of the Oxley Creek Greenway as part of the Oxley Creek Masterplan occurs outside of the scope of the LGIP process. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.</p>	<p>No change</p>
371.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the Richlands Bikeway (Natalie St to Eugenia St) secondary cycle route project (RIC-SP-003) being removed from the LGIP.</p>	<p>The project has been partially delivered as a shared path in Mario Close by previous development. Council will now include this project in the LGIP with a reduced alignment to ensure the existing bikeway asset does not become a stranded asset with no connection to Nursery PI or Eugenia St.</p>	<p>Retain in LGIP (2021-26 delivery) with a new LGIP ID (RIC-SP-013)</p>
401.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns with the Richlands Bikeway (Teraba St to Bendera St) secondary cycle route project (RIC-SP-012)</p>	<p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan,</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	including that it will impact their private property and business.	<p>the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p> <p>Land valuation costs have been calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	
495.1	Submitter raises concerns with the removal of the Rochedale Bikeway (Future Rd to	A review to the BNO (LTIP) identified that the key strategic routes are located on major roads. The	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>Rochedale Rd) secondary cycle route projects (ROC-SP-004 & ROC-SP-005) as they provide a linkage between multiple residential areas to schools, parks and centres.</p> <p>Submitter requests both ROC-SP-004 and ROC-SP-005 be reinstated in the LGIP and identified as a secondary cycle route within the BNO and be classified as trunk infrastructure.</p>	<p>alignments for ROC-SP-004 and ROC-SP-005 are being retained as local cycle links.</p> <p>Any agreements around land dedications or trunk works in finalised development applications will still be met.</p>	
595.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the proposed removal of the Rochedale Bikeway (future road to Priestdale Rd) secondary cycle route project (ROC-SP-012) from existing LGIP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development approval has conditioned the provision of this project as trunk • reinforced through design and operational works. 	<p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed. The project has been reinstated in LGIP amendment 1B to reflect partial delivery through previous development and conditioned into subsequent development which will be delivered within the first LGIP timeframe (2021 – 2026). Retaining this project will ensure consistency with the operational works in progress and ensure consistent outcomes as additional sites develop.</p>	<p>Retain ROC-SP-012 in the LGIP with a 2021-2026 timeframe.</p>
462.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the removal of the Rochedale Bikeway (Miles Platting Rd to future road) secondary cycle route project (ROC-SP-015) from existing LGIP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is needed to connect the wider Rochedale community to the town centre • land has been dedicated as a reserve to facilitate the bikeway • provides access to parkland and open space. 	<p>Submitter concerns have been reviewed. This project is proposed to be retained to ensure consistency with the existing alignment of the bikeway and development approvals.</p>	<p>Retain ROC-SP-015 in the LGIP.</p>
098.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the Prebble St extension (Priestdale Rd to Underwood Rd) secondary cycle route project (ROC-SP-017) given it aligns with the location of the future Council Park.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
447.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the Prebble St extension (Priestdale Rd to Underwood Rd) secondary cycle route project (ROC-SP-017) however, requests the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • alignment of Cycle Route to reflect the existing development applications to the east of the waterway corridor towards Rochedale Rd • amend the project description. 	<p>Any development approvals already submitted or approved under the current LGIP will not be affected by LGIP amendment 1B. The City Plan as is current at the time of the development application will apply.</p> <p>Assumptions made about items type and scale for the purposes of planning and costing the networks may also be refined through the development assessment process when an application is lodged with Council. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p>	No change
650.1	<p>Submitter supports Oxley Greenway Bikeway (Kendall St - Ipswich Motorway) secondary cycle route project (ROK-SP-006), however, raises concerns with the proposed location.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Council confirms that the subject site is not impacted by the proposed new LGIP project.</p>	No change
328.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the location of the Runcorn bikeway (Glenefer St to Beenleigh Rd) primary cycle route project (RUN-SP-002) regarding potential impacts to private property.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LGIP is a statutory planning instrument, which identifies anticipated infrastructure that may be required to support Brisbane as it develops. As part of City Plan, the LGIP is primarily used to determine where infrastructure upgrades may be needed alongside new development.</p> <p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs. It is important to note that in many cases, Council has made assumptions about the type and scale of infrastructure required in order to plan and cost the network. Should funding be provided to initiate a project, the next phase will involve detailed planning to consider site-specific impacts and constraints such as property impacts, topography, accessibility, noise, and traffic management. Project teams where required will</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		undertake community engagement throughout this process and minimise unnecessary impacts.	
507.1	Submitter raises concerns with the location of the Runcorn bikeway (Glenefer St to Beenleigh Rd) primary cycle route project (RUN-SP-002). Submitter suggests an alternative route for the bike path.	<p>The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impact on private properties.</p> <p>It should be noted that land for active and public transport is typically managed through the development assessment process.</p>	No change
046.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Jindalee Creek Bikeway (Jindalee Creek to Seventeen Mile Rocks Rd) secondary cycle route project (SIP-SP-003) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resumption of land • environmental impacts • changes to amenity • security issues. 	The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city. This project is likely to be delivered within the State road corridor which requires liaison with TMR. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impact on private properties.	No change
445.1	Submitter requests substantial amendment to the SOW for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge (TOO-GB-001) and Bicentennial Bikeway - Stage 5 (Regatta Park to Glen Rd) primary cycle route (TOO-SP-002) projects to update land valuation (increase land rates) to reflect latest negotiations with property owners.	<p>These pathways are required to manage travel demand and reduce congestion when future redevelopment occurs.</p> <p>Land valuation costs have been calculated using the method outlined in the Transport Network Extrinsic Material. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Active and public transport projects, acquisition may also be</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.	
397.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns with the removal of Mimosa Creek Bikeway (Hibiscus Sports Centre to Klumpp Rd/Mains Rd intersection) secondary cycle route project (UMG-SP-002).</p> <p>Submitter requests the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include more bikeway infrastructure for Old Cleveland Rd, and Logan Rd corridors to improve safety for cyclists, e-mobility users and pedestrians ensure alignment with the Queensland Government's Principal Cycling Network Plan (PCNP) and the LGIP. 	<p>A review to the BNO (LTIP) identified that the key strategic routes are located on major roads.</p> <p>As part of this review, the project has changed from secondary (trunk) to local (non-trunk) hierarchy therefore has been removed from the LGIP amendment 1B. A bikeway in this location is still desired however no longer considered trunk infrastructure. As this route remains in the BNO, it can still be delivered as a Council project in future subject to available funding.</p>	No change
208.1 315.1 397.1 514.1 519.1 526.1	<p>Submitters requested the inclusion of Bicycle lanes on Annerley Rd.</p> <p>Some submitters requested increased pedestrian and cycling safety on Annerley Rd and Fairfield Rd through additional LGIP projects. Also raises concerns about Ipswich Rd LGIP projects to prioritise motorists instead of Active and Public Transport.</p> <p>Some submitters requested funding allocated for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> several raised wombat crossings at dangerous slip lanes at Ipswich Rd/Ekibin Rd, Cornwall St/Ipswich Rd pedestrians and safety crossings on these existing roundabouts: Ekibin Rd/Lewisham St and Cracknell Rd/ Ekibin Rd E/Tarragindi 	<p>Any cycle infrastructure provided in the road corridor would be considered as part of a road project.</p> <p>Pedestrian and wombat crossings are not considered trunk infrastructure unless part of a larger road upgrade project and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration as part of a potential future project.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	Rd, Logical cycle lane extension to include Fairfield Rd, Waldheim St, Ekibin Rd E, Waterton St and Cracknell Rd.		
017.1	Submitter requests to include pedestrian and cycleways to create safe connections across Beatty Rd between Success St and Norman Croker Park.	The request for new crossing of Beatty Rd is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration for delivery as part of other projects, subject to available funding and citywide priorities.	No change
519.1	Submitter requests to update the BNO of Annerley Rd to a primary cycle route citing it links major locations, received more suggestions for safety improvement during the TMR Principal Cycle Network consultation in 2022.	<p>Submitter request has been reviewed and a change to the LTIP (BNO), changing Annerley Rd to Primary cycle route is not supported.</p> <p>The pathway network plans for off-road pathways as part of the LGIP. Any cycle infrastructure provided in the road corridor would be considered as part of a road project. Council cycle infrastructure for the corridors requested will be considered as part of the design for any future road upgrades within the existing corridor.</p>	No change
567.1	Submitter requests inclusions additional bikeway links along Stable Swamp Creek and Rocky Waterholes Creek to the BNO.	<p>Rocky Waterholes Creek is currently identified in the LGIP and LTIP and no change is proposed.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, requests for additional infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments, subject to an assessment of potential design considerations.</p>	No change
551.1	Submitter suggests inclusions of a bikeway upgrade and connection between the new Riverwalk at Radnor St and Centenary bikeway.	<p>This suggestion has been noted for consideration as part of a future amendment of LGIP and LTIP.</p> <p>Rationalisation of strategic cycle routes was required as part of the LGIP amendment 1B so that Council can focus on delivering highest priority corridor upgrades for cycling in an efficient and cost-effective manner.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
416.1	Submitter supports Toowong to West End Green Bridge project (TOO-GB-001), however, is disappointed it has not been valued, prioritised and implemented sooner.	Support noted. The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, requests for new infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.	No change

3.3 Ferry terminal network

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
092.1 114.1 145.1 146.1 147.1 157.1 161.1 261.1 265.1 355.1 359.1 418.1 419.1 434.1 435.1 436.1 437.1 438.1 439.1 440.1 441.1 452.1 555.1 600.1	Submitters request inclusion of additional City Cat terminal in Tennyson.	Submitter request has been reviewed and environmental, safety and efficiency issues have been identified in providing a ferry terminal upstream of The University of Queensland. For these reasons a ferry terminal is not currently being considered beyond St Lucia within the LGIP planning horizon.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
622.1 688.1 701.1			
193.1 454.1 476.1 478.1	Submitters support the inclusion of the South Bank 1 and 2 Ferry Terminal project (SBR- FT- 002).	Support noted.	No change
193.1 454.1 476.1 478.1 496.1	<p>Submitters support the Dockside Ferry Terminal project (KAN-FT-003).</p> <p>One submitter suggests connecting City Hopper from Dockside to City Cat Mowbray and have riverfront access to the ferries to increase ridership.</p> <p>One submitter requests the Dockside Ferry terminal is prioritised before Mowbray Park terminal.</p>	<p>Support noted for the Dockside Ferry Terminal</p> <p>Regarding the request to connect City Hopper from Dockside to City Cat Mowbray, this suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration as part of a potential future project.</p> <p>The request to prioritise these projects have been noted, however the estimated timing of these projects is based on land use and demand modelling across the city. Council must ensure that the timeframes in the LGIP reflect citywide priorities and can be delivered in an efficient and cost effective way.</p>	No change
193.1 454.1 476.1 478.1 672.1	Submitters support the inclusion of the Mowbray Park Ferry Terminal project (EAB- FT- 001).	Support noted	No change
101.1 193.1 444.1 454.1 476.1 478.1	<p>Submitters support the inclusion of the Victoria St Ferry terminal project (WES-FT-002).</p> <p>One submitter requested relocating the proposed Victoria St ferry terminal from Victoria St to Davies Park.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The location of the Victoria St ferry terminal has been reviewed and will remain as proposed. However, more detailed planning for the future ferry terminal network will consider the feedback received and any changes may be incorporated in future amendments.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		The timing of the Victoria St ferry terminal has been reviewed and is to remain in the 2026-2031 estimated delivery period.	
684.1	<p>Submitters has commented on the inclusion of the ferry terminals cost in the LGIP raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • serve greater tourist purpose than immediate local transport • not referred to in the MGR. <p>Submitter suggests removing the cost on housing within the LGIP of ferry terminal.</p>	<p>The ferry terminals and the overall ferry network play a significant role in Brisbane's public transport system. They provide unique and valuable transportation options for both local residents and tourists alike. The ferry network contributes to the accessibility and connectivity of various parts of the city, offering an alternative mode of transport that can alleviate congestion on roads and provide sustainable travel options.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) provide an indicative but non-comprehensive list of trunk and non-trunk infrastructure. While the MGR helps guide the planning and development of infrastructure, it does not encompass every single component that is part of the LGIP. The inclusion of ferry terminals in the LGIP is aligned with the overall objective of creating a comprehensive infrastructure plan that meets the transport needs of the community.</p>	No change

3.4 Stormwater network

The purpose of the LGIP is to set out the infrastructure needs of a growing city. Part of this is increasing the capacity of our local stormwater network to accommodate future demand.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
002.1 049.1 180.1 240.1	Submitters raised concerns with Bridgeman Downs waterway corridor land acquisition project (BRD-LA-006) with the following reasons:	The intent of the project is to maintain and rehabilitate the natural waterway corridor to improve the biodiversity and create a suitable habitat for flora and fauna. The proposed land acquisition will be located within the	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
276.1 643.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> potential property acquisition potential property value inefficient use of public funds impact on flora and fauna and lack of information provided. <p>Some submitters have commented that there is no need of acquiring land for waterways as there is already an existing easement that Council has access to.</p> <p>One submitter has raised concerns regarding the intent to include property sizes to maximum of 800-1000m².</p>	<p>current waterway corridor and utilise the existing easements in some locations in the area.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners.</p> <p>By undertaking these amendments, Council is ensuring that its delivery program is clear and transparent for the community, and that Council's investment is prioritised on the delivery of citywide trunk infrastructure needs that will support the Bridgeman Downs Neighbourhood Plan and residents of Brisbane.</p> <p>Lot sizes in the Bridgeman Downs Neighbourhood Plan are outside the scope of the LGIP. The Neighbourhood Planning team can assist with further queries.</p>	
180.1	Submitter was concerned with the Bridgeman Downs Waterway corridor acquisition project (BRD-LA-007) impacting property location at 2097 Roghan Rd.	The proposed land acquisition boundary aligns with the property boundary at 2097 Roghan Rd. Therefore, there are no anticipated land acquisition impacts for this property.	No change
306.1	Submitter noted they understand that the long-term planning for the stormwater infrastructure has moved from the LTIP to the LGIP (SBR-PR-020 and SBR-PR-023 with an expected delivery from 2026 out to 2036).	Noted.	No change
464.1	Submitter has raised concerns with the proposed Bridgeman Downs stormwater water rehabilitation project (BRD-RH-001).	The proposed stormwater rehabilitation project is proposed to be located within the existing waterway corridor and will improve the existing infrastructure.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on private properties.</p>	
<p>113.1 598.1 612.1 640.1 670.1</p>	<p>Submitters raise concerns that the removed stormwater pipe project (CVE-PR-005) from the LGIP has not been delivered and request that additional infrastructure is provided.</p>	<p>The section of LGIP pipe CVE-PR-005 through Jaffa Crt and south to Riley St was removed from the LGIP amendment 1B as this section was constructed in 2015 in accordance with design plans which were prepared and certified by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland and approved by Council.</p> <p>The section of pipe that extends through the townhouse developments along Riley St was also removed because these developments delivered different drainage solutions as part of a development approval.</p> <p>The shortened length of the pipe identified as part of this amendment is the remaining section through properties along Beaudesert Rd to be constructed when development occurs.</p> <p>It should be noted that the pipe size and alignment are indicative only and may change when detailed overland flow investigations are carried out as part of the development assessment process. Any stormwater design must comply with City Plan requirements and any other requirements that are relevant.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>032.1</p>	<p>Submitter has commented on Doolandella stormwater land acquisition project (DOO-LA-001) raising concerns of impacts to an existing development application and requests information regarding proposed acquisition.</p>	<p>This project is proposed to be retained in the LGIP to ensure that the stormwater network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected demand within the LGIP horizon.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	
588.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the Doolandella stormwater pipe relief project (DOO-PR-018), requesting a review of the necessity of the project or reassessment of location.</p>	<p>The purpose of the LGIP is to set out the strategic intent and infrastructure needs of a growing city. Part of this is increasing the capacity of our stormwater network to accommodate future demand.</p> <p>There is an existing 3m wide drainage easement through the properties to the north of Rockfield Rd. There is also an existing 600mm diameter pipe in the easement.</p> <p>The amendment proposes to locate the 1650mm relief drainage pipe within the existing drainage easement. However, the exact location is determined as part of the detailed planning yet to be undertaken. Council will consider impacts on private properties as part of that detailed planning.</p>	No change
381.1	<p>Submitter supports stormwater projects in The Gap Ward and requests removal of completed stormwater projects.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The LGIP is a 15-year plan, with a base date of 30 June 2021. This project is to remain in LGIP as it was not an existing and certified as-constructed asset prior to June 2021 (the as-constructed plans are dated March 2022). It is important to maintain this infrastructure as future, as it represents the full picture of infrastructure required to service the development assumed within the LGIP. The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time. These projects will be included as existing (delivered) items in the next future LGIP amendment.</p>	No change
378.1 448.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns regarding the location of stormwater projects in Rochedale including potential impacts on their properties,</p>	<p>Concerns regarding the location of drainage system have been reviewed and noted.</p>	Amend the following project items ROC-PR-161 and

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>requesting confirmation of the status and location of Rochedale pipe relief (ROC-PR-162) and bioretention swale (ROC-BS-002) projects.</p> <p>One submitter requested to bring forward the delivery timeframe of several stormwater drainage projects and to remove projects already delivered from the LTIP.</p>	<p>Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the bioretention swale (ROC-BS-002) was delivered and is now proposed to be removed from LGIP amendment 1B the pipe – relief project (ROC-PR-162) was updated to amend delivery timeframe from 2016 – 2021 to 2021 – 2026. <p>The timing of these projects reflects the anticipated need within the planning horizon.</p> <p>Please note the intended delivery of projects (ROC- PR- 161, ROC-PR-162) is to be within the future road corridor. When these projects were originally identified, the immediate area was not yet developed.</p> <p>Spatial alignment is proposed to be adjusted to reflect the intended location.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	<p>ROC-PR-162 Spatial alignment changed to be located along the future road corridor project Ford Rd (Rochedale Rd to Wanless Way)</p>
029.1	<p>Submitter supports stormwater (HEM-CU-005) improvements, however, raises concerns over ineffective drainage systems, increasing flood levels and maintenance regime in existing Hemmant drain.</p> <p>Requests review of drainage system and additional pipe drainage across property.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding the existing drainage system have been reviewed and noted. The LGIP shows the strategic intent for infrastructure delivery for the city.</p> <p>Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on private properties.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
107.1 669.1	<p>Submitters request the following changes to the stormwater drainage projects (PAL-PN-001, PAL-PN-002, PAL-PN-003, PAL-PN-004, PAL-PN-008, PAL-PN-009):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include additional land reserve required to accommodate the proposed swale to align with the Pallara Drainage Master Plan drainage pipes be amended to align with Councils latest city design concept plans update the construction cost to reflect the actual trunk works to be delivered propose acquisition of easement over privately owned land to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure. 	<p>Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties.</p> <p>Establishment costs are estimates of the costs of delivering the infrastructure needed and are subject to change, they have been calculated using the method outlined in the Stormwater Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>A change in the size is proposed be made to match the latest Council design plans "Vied Rd, Pallara Drainage Design - Laxton Rd to 132 Sweets Rd (Nov 22)".</p>	<p>Remove PAL-PN-004 from amendment package.</p> <p>Amend the following projects:</p> <p>PAL-PN-001:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Box culvert Dimensions: 1800 x 900mm No. of Barrels/Cells: 1 Length: 229.7m <p>PAL-PN-002:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Box culvert Dimensions: 2100 x 900mm No. of Barrels/Cells: 1 Length: 178.1m <p>PAL-PN-003:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Box culvert Dimensions: 3000 x 1200mm No. of Barrels/Cells: 1 Length: 224.4m <p>PAL-PN-008:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Box culvert

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dimensions: 2700 x 900mm • No. of Barrels/Cells: 1 • Length: 23.5m <p>PAL-PN-009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Box culvert • Dimensions: 2700 x 1200mm • No. of Barrels/Cells: 1 • Length: 178.2m
074.1	<p>Submitter requests to bring forward the delivery timeframe of Rochedale stormwater culvert and pipe relief projects (ROC-CU-021, ROC-PR-175) stating they will be required earlier to facilitate development in the area.</p>	<p>The <i>Planning Act</i> specifies the planning horizon for which Council needs to plan its trunk infrastructure. The timing of the project reflects the anticipated need as it falls within the planning horizon. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	No change
447.1 451.1 495.1	<p>Some submitters request the water corridor project in Rochedale (ROC-LA-002) to reflect larger land holdings and to bring forward the delivery timeframe. They also request Council to include land cost and review the construction costs.</p> <p>One submitter raises concerns that the stormwater drainage projects may not appropriately consider the constrained nature of overland flow along Rochedale Rd, and</p>	<p>Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties. Council's standard approach for providing stormwater projects is to typically construct within road corridors as part of subdivision or through an easement.</p> <p>Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions of current development approvals over the site prevail.</p> <p>Establishment costs are estimates of the costs of delivering the infrastructure needed and are subject to</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>request the stormwater strategy for the area be reviewed.</p> <p>Also requests alternative locations for two stormwater drainage projects.</p> <p>One submitter state there appears to be a misalignment in the mapping for the trunk infrastructure for land acquisition between the Draft LGIP Amendment 1B mapping and the current City Plan LTIP mapping/waterway corridor mapping in the Rochedale (d) catchment.</p> <p>One submitter requests the inclusion of SQID projects in the LGIP from the LTIP to support the construction of Farley Rd corridor (ROC- RC-046), Rochedale anticipated to be delivered early 2024. Requests to amend the delivery timeframe to 2021 – 2026 to align with the road corridor project. Also requests projects in the former LTIP and now part of the new LGIP road corridor project (ROC-RC-046) include costs associated with the waterway corridor crossing within the road works or be identified as separate projects in the LGIP.</p>	<p>change, they have been calculated using the method outlined in the Stormwater Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>The request to transfer project to the LGIP is not supported as the identified infrastructure is not expected to be needed until after 30 June 2036 so will remain in the LTIP.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	
462.1	<p>Submitter supports the retention of land acquisition for the waterway corridor (ROC-LA-004), requests fair compensation for the land, which allow for public access and the health of Brisbane's waterways.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i>.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners. For Stormwater projects, acquisition may also be managed through the development assessment process or Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market.</p>	
547.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns with the Rochedale stormwater pipe new infrastructure project (ROC-PN-013) and impacts to the property if landowners wish to redevelop the land.</p>	<p>This project is proposed to be retained in the LGIP to ensure that the stormwater network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected demand within the LGIP horizon.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	No change
262.1	<p>Submitter requests to maintain the original completion timeframe (2021-2026) for stormwater pipe relief project (WYN-PR-001) to ensure the timely delivery of suitable stormwater infrastructure. Concerns are raised that the size of the infrastructure may not handle the overland flow.</p>	<p>Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties.</p> <p>Please note individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Conditions of any current development approval over the site will prevail.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	No change
479.1	<p>Submitter supports Yeronga stormwater pipe relief projects.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	No change
092.1 114.1 145.1 146.1 147.1 148.1	<p>A range of submitters support the inclusion of the following stormwater projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stormwater upgrades in Oxley and Sherwood • multiple stormwater pipe relief projects from Devon St to Venner Rd, Yeronga 	<p>Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
149.1 150.1 157.1 161.1 187.1 205.1 215.1 222.1 243.1 248.1 252.1 260.1 261.1 265.1 305.1 315.1 319.1 325.1 335.1 336.1 338.1 345.1 346.1 348.1 355.1 359.1 361.1 372.1 374.1 376.1 386.1 387.1 388.1 389.1 399.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • open stormwater channel remediation Hyde Rd/Leyshon Park, Yeronga. <p>Some submitters have requested the following stormwater projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reinstate five stormwater pipe upgrades in Annerley • stormwater project upgrades Oxley Rd, Chelmer • stormwater upgrades/backflow valve Victoria Ave, Chelmer • stormwater pipe upgrades in Corinda • pennywort creek culvert along Pratten St • Graceville backflow valve at Girraween Park • backflow valves Brougham St along Mearns St, Victoria St and Sharp St • backflow valve for King Arthur Tce, Tennyson • Yeronga West stormwater pipe upgrades (Hyde Rd to Brisbane Corso) • request all backflow valves recommended by AECOM after the 2011 floods for Ormadale Rd, Ortive St and Stevens St, Yeronga • stormwater pipe upgrade from Ymp to Moolabin Creek. 	<p>Following the 2011 Brisbane River flood backflow devices were installed at high priority locations. Delivery of lower priority backflow devices is funded through Council's capital works program for stormwater relief infrastructure rather than the LGIP SOW.</p> <p>The priority of backflow devices is being reviewed as part of the recommendations of the Brisbane 2022 Flood Response Review. Should a higher priority be given to backflow locations that coincide with planned LGIP infrastructure, these backflow devices will be reflected in future LGIP updates.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
405.1 418.1 419.1 420.1 425.1 428.1 434.1 435.1 436.1 437.1 438.1 439.1 440.1 441.1 443.1 452.1 455.1 456.1 465.1 479.1 509.1 537.1 555.1 556.1 560.1 562.1 569.1 600.1 609.1 622.1 688.1 701.1			
656.1	Submitter requests that the 450mm stormwater line proposed to traverse the subject site (LTIP item SHI-SW4), to cater for external stormwater	Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and will consider impacts on properties.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	flows, be included as an additional trunk infrastructure project under the LGIP.	The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, and changes to the stormwater network may occur in future amendments.	
684.1	Submitter has commented on several stormwater projects were to be delivered between 2016 – 2021 period but have now been amended to be 2021 – 2026 delivery timeframe	<p>The delivery timeframes outlined within the LGIP are indicative only. The inclusion of these projects within the LGIP ensures funding can be allocated in future budgets to secure the infrastructure.</p> <p>The estimated timing of these projects has been based on land use and demand modelling across the city. Council must ensure that the timeframes in the LGIP reflect citywide priorities and can be delivered in an efficient and cost effective way.</p>	No change

3.5 Parks network

Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane’s park network is diverse, accessible, and meets the needs of the growing community.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
003.1 629.1	Submitters support the inclusion of a local general recreation park at Mitchelton (MIT- A1- 001), which is proposed to replace the district general recreation park (MIT-P4) shown in the current LTIP.	Support noted.	No change
024.1 027.1 030.1 031.1 034.1 036.1 055.1	Submitters have commented on the proposed change, removing a district general recreation park from the LTIP (MIT-P4) and replacing it with a local general recreation park at Mitchelton (MIT-A1-001) in the LGIP and raised the following concerns:	Network planning undertaken for LGIP amendment 1B considers updated planning assumptions and DSS for determining park requirements and addressing service gaps for an area. The outcome of the network planning is shown in Appendix E of the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
057.1 117.1 118.1 167.1 188.1 190.1 564.1 623.1 631.1 644.1 649.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> larger park is required for future growth in area – no justification for proposed park to be downsized conflicts with community expectations created during the previous neighbourhood planning process and LTIP, which should be implemented as part of development assessment. <p>One submitter has also commented on bushland areas surrounding the project having no limitations for future residential development, further increasing the need for the district recreation park.</p>	<p>This material identifies there is no gap to address for district general recreation parks, however a local general recreation park gap exists. Therefore, in transitioning the proposed park from the LTIP to the LGIP it has been updated to a local general recreation park classification.</p> <p>The desired minimum park size under the proposed DSS for local general recreation parks is 0.8ha. Therefore, the land requirement for this park infrastructure project has been reduced from 4.5ha to 0.8ha to align with DSS specifications for a local general recreation park.</p>	
049.1	Submitter has raised concerns with the acquisition of neighbouring property for a future district general recreation park at Bridgeman Downs (BRD-A2-001), including the lack of tree coverage on the subject property.	<p>The future delivery of this district general recreation park supports the outcomes and future growth identified in the Bridgeman Downs Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Council uses a range of methods to acquire land for park projects, however Council does not intend to compulsorily acquire land. For Park projects, Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market. Acquisition can also be managed through the development assessment process.</p>	No change
005.1 010.1	<p>Submitters commented on the proposed location of a local general recreation park at Upper Kedron (UKE-A1-005), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact on existing residential properties potential land resumption increased housing needs due to Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. 	<p>This project is proposed to be transferred from the LTIP (currently known as UKE-P1) and is intended to be delivered as part of the Ellendale Estate development.</p> <p>Section 5.1 of the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3 specifies the location of UKE-A1-005 as “Part take of 266 Ross Rd, Upper Kedron (to be located within 750m walking distance of residential development)”. At the time network planning was undertaken for LGIP</p>	Amend UKE-A1-005 mapped location to within the most recent boundary of 266 Ross Rd, Upper Kedron to reflect delivery intent of project.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>Submitters requested that parks acquisition be conditioned as part of the next development stage of Ellendale Masterplan.</p>	<p>amendment 1B, the area where the point was placed was part of 266 Ross Rd, Upper Kedron.</p> <p>The delivery of this project is proposed to be conditioned as part of a future stage of the Ellendale Estate and there will be no impacts to newly constructed dwellings.</p>	
381.1	<p>Submitter supports the following parks projects GAP-U2-001, KRR-E11-001, KRR-E12-001, and UKE-E5-001.</p> <p>Submitter raises concerns on the proposed location of a local general recreation park at Upper Kedron (UKE-A1-005).</p> <p>Submitter requests the acquisition of 47 and 53 Paten Rd, The Gap, to expand and support the growing use in the park.</p>	<p><u>GAP-U2-001, KRR-E11-001, KRR-E12-001, UKE-E5-001:</u> Support noted.</p> <p><u>UKE-A1-005:</u> This project is proposed to be transferred from the LTIP (currently known as UKE-P1) and is intended to be delivered as part of the Ellendale Estate development.</p> <p>Section 5.1 of the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material specifies the location of UKE-A1-005 as “Part take of 266 Ross Rd, Upper Kedron (to be located within 750m walking distance of residential development)”. At the time network planning was undertaken for LGIP amendment 1B, the area where the point was placed was part of 266 Ross Rd, Upper Kedron.</p> <p>The delivery of this project is proposed to be conditioned as part of a future stage of the Ellendale Estate and there will be no impacts to newly constructed dwellings.</p> <p><u>Requested acquisition of 47 and 53 Paten Rd, The Gap:</u> The expansion of Paten Park is not anticipated to be required within the LGIP amendment 1B planning horizon. There is no service gap identified in this area, and the size of Paten Park currently exceeds the desired minimum park size under the proposed DSS for district general recreation parks of 3ha.</p>	<p>Amend UKE-A1-005 mapped location to within the most recent boundary of 266 Ross Rd, Upper Kedron to reflect delivery intent of project.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Suggestions to consider specific properties for future expansion of the parks network have been noted and may be assessed against other citywide priorities and overall suitability for use as parkland as part of a future LGIP amendment.</p>	
<p>006.1 178.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Holland Park West (HPW-A1-002), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing parks such as Balis St Park and Glindemann Park are within walking distance of location • acquiring homes during a housing crisis • topography is not suitable for a park • negative impacts on the fauna and flora. 	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. While it is acknowledged there are several parks within Holland Park West, Council's parks network planning shows a long-standing gap in this area, meaning some residents do not have access to a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance.</p> <p>However, further site investigations have revealed the location has some topographic constraints which would limit Council's ability to deliver an accessible and functional local general recreation park in this location. Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to relocate this project to an indicative location at the intersection of Brodie St and Buckland St. Council will investigate alternate ways to deliver recreation outcomes for this area into the future.</p>	<p>Amend HPW-A1-002 to an indicative location project at the intersection of Brodie St and Buckland St.</p>
<p>007.1 183.1 467.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a district outdoor sports park at Stretton (STN-A5-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the existing residential property • acquiring homes during a housing crisis. <p>One submitter suggests an alternative to upgrade the existing park at 118-130 Lexton St, Stretton.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to shift the project to an indicative location at the intersection of Penson St and Frizzell St. This park is anticipated to be delivered in an alternative location given the recent development activity in the current location. Detailed planning is yet to be undertaken and Council will consider suggested alternate locations and impacts on private properties.</p>	<p>Amend STN-A5-001 to an indicative location at the intersection of Penson St and Frizzell St</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>One submitter has commented that the proposed project conflicts with the existing development application over the site, and potential land value degradation.</p>		
<p>012.1 018.1 021.1 022.1 138.1 143.1 390.1 498.1 637.1 679.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Mansfield (MFI-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on existing residential properties, including ability to sell • acquiring homes during a housing crisis • topography is not suitable for a park • increased traffic and noise • enough existing parks in area • loss of accessible homes near public transport and amenities. <p>One Submitter raises concerns with the displacement/impacts to accessibility and amenity for residents with disabilities. They support new parkland in the area but not this location.</p> <p>One submitter has stated that LGIP became effective on 2 June 2023.</p> <p>One submitter has requested what legislation gives Council authority to acquire private land. Also seek to know whether the cost for an independent advice to stop this proposal can be refunded by Council.</p>	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. While it is acknowledged there are several parks within Mansfield, Council's parks network planning identified a gap in this area, meaning some residents do not have access to a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance.</p> <p>However, further site investigations have revealed the location has some topographic constraints which may limit Council's ability to deliver an accessible and functional local general recreation park in this location. Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and combined with the low projected population growth proposes to remove this project from the LGIP amendment 1B.</p>	<p>Remove MFI-A1-001 from amendment package</p>
<p>052.1 053.1</p>	<p>Submitters raised concerns regarding a reduction in the establishment cost of the</p>	<p>Establishment costs are estimates of the costs for delivering the required infrastructure and have been calculated using the method outlined in the Parks and</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>proposed district access/recreation corridor park at Bulimba (BUL-A8-001) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduction in land values • removal of turfing costings. <p>Submitters requested values associated with land dedications and construction costs be revised to ensure they remain fair and reasonable.</p>	<p>Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material. Land valuation estimates have been undertaken for individual properties identified to be partially acquired for proposed park, current to the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021. Land which has already been acquired for this park has been removed as part of the LGIP amendment 1B.</p> <p>District access/recreation corridor parks are typically delivered along vegetated creek corridors where no or minimal turfing is required. As such, turfing has been included in stage C embellishment cost estimates for this park type. While it is understood this is not the case with BUL-A8-001, all LGIP embellishment costings are calculated based on standard assumptions for each park type.</p> <p>Council's long-standing intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the remaining required park area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the remaining identified properties. Conditions of any current development approval over the site will prevail.</p>	
077.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of a local general recreation park at Bulimba (BUL-A1-001); however, they request the project description be amended to reflect the local general recreation park and a recreation corridor identified in the Infrastructure Agreement for 153 Taylor St, Bulimba.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Council's long-standing intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the remaining required park area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the remaining identified properties. Conditions of any current development approval or infrastructure agreement over the site will prevail. The current LGIP project is still generally consistent with the park outcomes in the Infrastructure Agreement.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
098.1	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of the district outdoor sports park (ROC-A5-001) and a district general recreation park (ROC-A2-011) at Rochedale; however, they request a mapping update to reflect the trunk park's location in the Infrastructure Agreement for 323 Rochedale Rd, Rochedale.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Council's long-standing intention for this project is to seek for new development to contribute the required park area when appropriate development applications are decided for the identified properties. Conditions of any current development approval or infrastructure agreement over the site will prevail. While there may be an Infrastructure Agreement in place for partial delivery of the land requirement for these two LGIP projects, it is not appropriate for Council to assume successful delivery of this land/ infrastructure until it has been transferred into Council ownership.</p>	No change
127.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed local general recreation park at Banyo (BYO-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • already sufficient open space in local area • contaminated site • lack of public study public available to support the need for a park. 	<p>This proposed project is part of the current LGIP, with Council's park network planning identifying a servicing gap in local general recreation park provision in this area. This existing gap and projected population growth have not changed since this project item was first included in the LGIP in 2021, so the project has been carried forward into this amendment.</p> <p>Council's intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the required park area when an appropriate development application is submitted for the subject site. The future development of the subject site will also be required to provide appropriate public access to the park and ensure any site decontamination is completed.</p>	No change
131.1 197.1 233.1 303.1 312.1 316.1 333.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed local general recreation park at Everton Park (EVP-A1-003), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enough existing parks in area • acquiring homes during a housing crisis 	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. While it is acknowledged there are existing parks within Everton Park, Council's parks network planning shows a long-standing gap in this area, meaning some residents</p>	Remove EVP-A1-003 from amendment package

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
341.1 351.1 354.1 363.1 367.1 370.1 377.1 382.1 383.1 385.1 400.1 406.1 410.1 517.1 536.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> potential land resumption excessive slope gradients impact on the value of land potential misuse of parks for criminal activities request to seek a new location that does not demolish buildings. 	<p>do not have access to a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance.</p> <p>However, further site investigations have revealed the location has some topographic constraints which may limit Council's ability to deliver an accessible and functional local general recreation park in this location. Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and combined with the low projected population growth has decided to remove this project from the package.</p>	
152.1 360.1 616.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed local general recreation park at Kedron (KED-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing parkland available in the area impact to parking access is difficult increase noise and traffic topography is not suitable safety concerns for patrons loss of homes. <p>One submitter suggests an alternate location at the intersection of Somerset Rd and Mitchell St, Kedron, with the following justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> centrally located within the catchment closer walking distance of the majority of residents 	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. Upon review and further investigation, it has been revealed that the local general recreation park provision gap in Kedron is smaller than what was identified during the network planning for LGIP amendment 1B. The initial gap area calculation did not account for walkable access to Bradbury Park through the Council-owned Lutwyche Cemetery. Recent Council investment in Bradbury Park ensures that it provides high quality recreation facilities that are relatively accessible to much of the gap area.</p> <p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to remove this project from the LGIP amendment 1B.</p>	Remove KED-A1-001 from amendment package

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> would not involve the removal of character houses increased road frontage and accessibility less perimeter of the park to residential boundaries. Avoiding adverse amenity impacts on neighbours. 		
362.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the changes to a proposed local general recreation park at Algester (AGR-A1-002), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reducing the size of the park from current LGIP will impact ability to provide adequate parks land in Algester DSS requirements will not be achieved in Algester request land size be reviewed, and land value increased to reflect market rates. <p>Submitter also commented on the reduction of park requirements for another two local general recreation parks proposed in Algester (AGR-A1-003 and AGR-A1-010).</p>	<p><u>AGR-A1-002:</u> Council has reviewed the existing Pardalote Park, which already contains standard embellishments for a local general recreation park. The park's current area is just under 6,000m², and in order to provide best value for the community and meet the DSS for this park type, only another 2,000m² of additional park land is required. The proposed changes to this project item reflect this. However, please note conditions of any current development approval over the site will prevail.</p> <p>Establishment costs are estimates of the costs for delivering the required infrastructure and have been calculated using the method outlined in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material. Land valuation estimates have been undertaken for individual properties identified to be partially acquired for proposed park, current to the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>In reviewing this park a typographical error was identified in that the location description lists the western end of the lot when the intention was to list the eastern end. This description will be amended in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material.</p> <p><u>AGR-A1-003:</u></p>	<p>Amend AGR-A1-002 to correct typographical error in location description.</p> <p>No change AGR-A1-003 and AGR-A1-010.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Council has reviewed the existing Busby St Park, which has started to be created through conditions on development approval for relevant sites.</p> <p>Detailed planning investigations have also revealed that the land identified for this project is significantly constrained by ecological values mapped in the City Plan Biodiversity areas overlay. As a result the available area for including a local general recreation park is reduced and it is proposed to reflect this in the LGIP amendment 1B.</p> <p><u>AGR-A1-010:</u> Detailed planning investigations have revealed that the land identified for this project is significantly constrained by ecological values mapped in the City Plan Biodiversity areas overlay. As a result, this project is no longer achievable and is proposed to be removed in this amendment. However, there is considered to be sufficient existing and proposed future local general recreation parks to meet the DSS in this area.</p>	
384.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns in relation to property acquisitions for the Ellen Grove local general recreation park (ELG-A1-001), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of quality environmental outcomes • not functional in terms of demand, convenience and accessibility. 	<p>Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane parks are diverse and accessible.</p> <p>Delivery of this park has commenced, with around 0.22ha being acquired by Council through a recent development.</p> <p>Council's long-standing intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the remaining required park area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the remaining identified properties. Any future development will also be required to provide appropriate public access to the park.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
686.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns regarding the proposed Ellen Grove local general recreation park (ELG-A1-002), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of detailed precinct or structure planning for area • park in this location does not meet the needs of existing and future residents. 	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. The future delivery of this local general recreation park will the development and growth of this part of Ellen Grove, and ensure residents are within 750m walking distance of a local general recreation park.</p> <p>Council's intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the required park area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the subject sites. The future development of the subject sites will also be required to provide appropriate public access to the park.</p>	No change
402.1 516.1 546.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Mount Gravatt (MGR-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased traffic • impacts to off street parking • loss of housing. <p>Some submitters suggest alternative locations for a park, while one submitter supports a future potential parkland in a more suitable location.</p>	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. Mount Gravatt has a large and long-standing gap in local general recreation park provision where this accessibility standard is not met. However, detailed site investigations in consideration of submissions have revealed that the identified site may not represent the best option to fill this large existing gap.</p> <p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to amend this project to an indicative location project somewhere in the vicinity – to be acquired as land becomes available on the open market in future. Council will continue to review and monitor population growth in the area and investigate alternate ways to deliver recreation outcomes in accordance with this project in the future.</p>	Amend MGR-A1-001 to an indicative location project at the intersection of Bentham St and Stanhope St
173.1 407.1 634.1	Submitters commented on the proposed location of a local general recreation park at	Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. The proposed	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>Everton Park (EVP-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resumption of property for park • existing alternate parks which are in walking distance • park would reduce developable size of block, which would provide relief to housing crisis • potential financial losses. <p>Submitters have also suggested alternative locations for a future park.</p>	<p>park has been included in City Plan since 2014, identifying the future intent on the emerging community zoned land. The project also addresses an existing service gap, where some residents do not have access to a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance. The park requirement will not preclude future development of most of these lots for more intensive residential uses than is currently present.</p> <p>Council's intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the required park area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the subject sites. The future development of the subject sites will also be required to provide appropriate public access to the park.</p> <p>Suggestions to consider specific properties for future investigations for the parks network have been noted and may be assessed against other citywide priorities and overall suitability for use as parkland as part of future City Plan amendments.</p>	
<p>422.1 544.1 676.1 663.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Carina (CAR-A1-002), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of need for a new park • land is unsuitable due to steep topography • increase in traffic • possible land resumption. <p>Some submitters suggest alternative locations for a park, while one submitter supports a future potential parkland in a more suitable location.</p>	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. Carina has a long-standing service gap in local general recreation park provision where this accessibility standard is not met. However, further site investigations have revealed the location has some topographic constraints which would limit Council's ability to deliver an accessible and functional local general recreation park in this location.</p> <p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to amend this project to an indicative location central to the existing service gap. Council will continue to review and monitor population</p>	<p>Amend CAR-A1-002 to an indicative location at intersection of D'Arcy Rd, Florence St and Burchell St</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		growth in the area and investigate alternate ways to deliver recreation outcomes in accordance with this project in the future.	
206.1 207.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed location of a Robertson local general recreation park (ROB-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recent development approval activity on properties any additional park infrastructure should connect to the existing John Henley Park. <p>Submitters also suggest alternative locations for the proposed park.</p>	<p>Since network planning for this amendment was undertaken a change in planning circumstances has occurred. Given the recent development activity in the proposed specific location it is anticipated this project be delivered in an alternative location.</p> <p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to revert this project back to the indicative location identified in the existing LGIP. This allows for further investigation into alternative locations and ways to deliver recreation outcomes for the area.</p>	Revert ROB-A1-001 back to an indicative project, as identified in current LGIP
329.1	<p>Submitter supports a proposed local general recreation park in Runcorn (RUN-A1-001) and the embellishment of Wally Tate Park (RUN-E5-001); however, submitter believes these projects have already been completed.</p> <p>Submitter also supports another proposed local general recreation park in Runcorn (RUN-A1-003), however believes this project is already in Council ownership.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p><u>RUN-A1-001 and RUN-E5-001:</u> These projects were not complete as of 30 June 2021, which is the base date for LGIP amendment 1B. Any projects completed after the base date of an LGIP are still considered a future project.</p> <p><u>RUN-A1-003:</u> The land identified for this project is still part of the privately owned Warrigal Farms. A recent development approval for the site has conditioned the future delivery of this project.</p>	No change
329.1 334.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Sunnybank (SUN-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is sufficient parkland existing in the area possible land resumptions. 	<p>Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane's park network is diverse, accessible, and meets the needs of the growing community.</p> <p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>distance of all residences in Brisbane. The project is identified on Emerging community zoned land and addresses an existing servicing gap, where some residents do not have access to a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance. The park requirement will not preclude future development of the majority of these lots for more intensive residential uses than is currently the case.</p>	
<p>192.1 202.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed Kangaroo Point metropolitan access/recreation corridor parks (KAN-A8-001, KAN-A8-002 and KAN-A8-003), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible land resumption of private properties • remove the connection between properties and the pontoons • establishment cost does not appear fair compensation for the land. 	<p>LGIP projects KAN-A8-001, KAN-A8-001 and KAN-A8-003 are proposed to be brought forward from the LTIP (replace KAN-P1 and KAN-P3 respectively) to meet Council's DSS for the parks network and establish public corridor access along the river in conjunction with planned riverwalk (active transport) infrastructure (identified as KAN-RW-004).</p> <p>Establishment costs are estimates used for long term financial planning and may not reflect the actual costs for delivering the required infrastructure. Valuations have been calculated using the method outlined in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. Land valuation estimates have been undertaken for individual properties identified to be partially acquired for proposed park, current to the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Council's intention for these projects is to condition development to either not prejudice the required land, or contribute the required park area, when appropriate development applications are submitted for the subject sites. This practice has seen the delivery of metropolitan access/recreation corridor parks such as Castlebar St Park, Wellington Rd Park West and Wellington Rd Park East – all of which will combine to eventually connect the riverwalk from Mowbray Park to Dockside. It is</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		anticipated that the necessary corridor can be achieved without impacting existing dwelling structures.	
313.1 521.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Salisbury (SAL-A1-001).</p> <p>One submitter cites the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • projected residential and population data does not warrant the need for a new park • existing parkland available in the area • cost of acquisition seems drastically low and why not utilise vacant land before demolishing houses in a housing crisis • offer to sell now above market value. <p>One submitter notes the land is a flood-free site that should be preserved for future housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • located on a no through road, meaning use will be low and a poor return on investment • traffic and parking issues. 	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. Salisbury has a long-standing servicing gap in local general recreation park provision where this accessibility standard is not met. The four properties identified will address the existing local general recreation park provision gap while minimising the number of impacted properties.</p> <p>Council uses a range of methods to acquire land for park projects, however Council does not intend to compulsorily acquire land. For Park projects, Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market. Acquisition can also be managed through the development assessment process.</p> <p>Since network planning was undertaken as part of LGIP amendment 1B, the draft Nathan, Salisbury, Moorooka Neighbourhood Plan has been developed. This plan is expected to facilitate additional population growth through to 2036, which will further increase demand for a local general recreation park in this area.</p>	No change
566.1 682.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Moorooka (MKA-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of housing • impacts to private property • existing parkland available in the area. <p>One submitter has requested Council to confirm why their property has been selected</p>	<p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. Moorooka has a long-standing servicing gap in local general recreation park provision where this accessibility standard is not met. This proposed park is optimally located to service the current and future needs of the Moorvale precinct and surrounding residences, without requiring the crossing of Ipswich or Beaudesert Rds.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	given their observation that Council usually utilises constrained land for parks.	<p>Council uses a range of methods to acquire land for park projects, however Council does not intend to compulsorily acquire land. For Park projects, Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open market. Acquisition can also be managed through the development assessment process.</p> <p>Since network planning was undertaken as part of LGIP amendment 1B, the draft Nathan, Salisbury, Moorooka Neighbourhood Plan has been developed. This plan is expected to facilitate additional population growth through to 2036, which will further increase demand for a local general recreation park in this area.</p>	
567.1	Submitter requests inclusion of additional parkland in Moorooka between Beaudesert Rd and Ipswich Rd.	<p>As part of LGIP amendment 1B Council has identified a new local general recreation park in Moorooka (MKA- A1- 001), which will address a long-standing servicing gap and provide residents with a park within 750m walking distance, without requiring the crossing of Ipswich Rd or Beaudesert Rd.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, requests for new infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.</p>	No change
575.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the location of a Clayfield local general recreation park (CLF-A1-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of housing • impacts to pedestrian safety • adequate existing parkland • proposed properties are unsuitable for parkland. 	<p>The park has been partially delivered on one of the four identified properties. Two of the remaining three properties are owned by Council, having been previously acquired on the open market.</p> <p>Council's standard practice when creating new parks is to purchase land when it becomes available on the open market.</p>	No change
225.1 226.1 227.1	Submitters have raised concerns with the location of a Clayfield local general recreation park (CLF-A1-002) for the following reasons:	In response to submitters concerns regarding a change in planning circumstances for the subject properties, namely that a recent development approval is in place,	Remove CLF-A1-002 from amendment package

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
442.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of housing • recent development approval activity on properties • adequate existing parkland • potential parking issues for use of park. <p>One submitter suggests an alternate location around Milman St to the north of proposed site.</p>	<p>Council proposes to remove this project from the LGIP amendment 1B.</p> <p>The suggestion of land at Milman St is noted, however this land is much further north and close to Kalinga Park and therefore does not address the servicing gap further south.</p>	
508.1	<p>Submitter has commented about a proposed park upgrade to Idonia St Park (BRD-U3-001), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fair compensation if proposed plans impact their land • fencing is constructed to protect privacy and prevent strangers from accessing the property. 	<p>The intent of this project is to upgrade the existing Idonia St Park, all planned works will remain within the park boundary. No compensation is applicable as no property acquisition is proposed.</p>	No change
464.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the creation of a district access/recreation corridor park at Bridgeman Downs (BRD-A8-001), including impacts to their property, when it could be delivered on land adjacent to the waterway corridor.</p>	<p>The district access/recreation corridor park known as BRD-A8-001 is already proposed to be removed from the LGIP amendment 1B.</p>	No change
475.1 512.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed district urban common park at Toowong (TOO-A4-002), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of housing during a housing crisis • existing parkland available in the area. 	<p>This new project has been proposed as a replacement for the current indicative location project (known as TOO-A4-001) to deliver a district urban common for the Toowong centre, similar to an urban common at Railway Tce, Milton.</p> <p>Council acknowledges the feedback received about this project and proposes to remove this project (TOO-A4-002), and retain the indicative project TOO-A4-001 in the LGIP. Council will continue to review and monitor population growth in the area and investigate options to</p>	Remove TOO-A4-002 from amendment package, and retain current indicative project TOO-A4-001 in LGIP

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		deliver a district urban common outcome for Toowong into the future.	
457.1	Submitter has commented on maintenance of bushland surrounding the existing Chesson St Park and Kedron Brook Creek at Mitchelton.	Maintenance of bushland is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to NEWS for consideration.	No change
451.1	<p>Submitter supports a proposed local general recreation park at Rochedale (ROC-A1-018), but has commented on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • required park size should be reduced to 0.6ha based on estimated park demand within 750m radius of anticipated park location • land cost of park is undervalued • delivery timeframe should be brought forward to 2021-2026 • total park costs should include landscape embellishments, suitable allowances for site preparation and servicing, electrical reticulation and infrastructure, consultant costs, contingency and escalation. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Network planning undertaken for LGIP amendment 1B considers updated planning assumptions and DSS for determining park requirements and addressing service gaps for an area. This has resulted in minor amendments proposed in this amendment to ROC-A1-018, reducing the required size from 1ha to 0.8ha, and adjusting the estimated delivery timeframe to meet the expected pace and location of future development in the area.</p> <p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance (as opposed to radius) of all residences in Brisbane. This has been considered when determining park size requirements.</p> <p>Establishment costs are estimates of the costs for delivering the required infrastructure and have been calculated using the method outlined in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. Land valuation estimates have been undertaken for individual properties identified to be partially acquired for proposed park, current to the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p> <p>Council's long-standing intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the required park</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the identified site.	
505.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the proposed inclusion of a local general recreation park at Rochedale (ROC-A1-023), including the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> project was removed from a previous LGIP version land has previously been resumed for the Gardner Rd and School Rd corridor upgrade existing waterway and also a caravan park that can be used for recreational purpose. <p>Submitter has suggested an alternate location.</p>	<p>The intent for the park was previously expressed in the LTIP. The park has been brought forward into the LGIP on the basis that development is expected to be well advanced throughout Rochedale by 2036. Future development of this and adjoining properties will create additional local demand for a recreation park to justify this project being transferred from the LTIP to the LGIP.</p>	No change
595.1	<p>Submitter supports a proposed district general recreation park at Rochedale (ROC-A2-010), but has commented on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proposed size is inadequate for a district general recreation park, and should be reclassified to a local general recreation park required park size should be reduced to 1.46ha, as this is sufficient to support local general recreation park needs in area. <p>Submitter also comments on the changes to the DSS in LGIP amendment 1B, raising concern it reduces clarity on requirements for specific park types.</p>	<p>Network planning undertaken for LGIP amendment 1B considers updated planning assumptions and DSS for determining park requirements and addressing service gaps for an area.</p> <p>ROC-A2-101 is an existing LGIP project with no change to size, estimated timing, intent or functional location in LGIP amendment 1B. The DSS for the park network details the intended functional differences between different park types and hierarchies.</p> <p>The changes proposed in LGIP amendment 1B are generally intended to improve clarity of the overall DSS through increasing the focus on accessibility, simplifying provision rates and adjusting the embellishment table to remove duplication, among other minor changes.</p>	No change
462.1	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed local general recreation park ROC-A1-030 should be amended to be classified as an 'Urban</p>	<p>Council has proposed to reduce the overall size requirement of this project from 0.8 to 0.6 ha to reflect that approximately 2000m² of parkland has been</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	Common' with an area of 0.5ha consistent with the DSS size standard for this park classification.	delivered on the corner of West St and Farmers St, Rochdale. The intent for this project has not changed, which is to condition development to deliver and additional 6000m ² of local general recreation parkland.	
092.1 114.1 145.1 146.1 147.1 148.1 149.1 150.1 157.1 161.1 187.1 199.1 205.1 215.1 221.1 222.1 243.1 248.1 252.1 260.1 261.1 265.1 305.1 315.1 319.1 323.1 325.1 335.1 336.1 338.1 345.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed local general recreation park (GRA-A1-001) at the corner of Honour Ave and Long St West, Graceville raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graceville has existing above-average recreational space lack of thorough research and community engagement project size increased traffic noise pedestrian safety loss of housing in a housing crisis impact to parking funding should be spent on upgrading existing parkland. <p>One submitter has requested Graceville Memorial Park needs upgrading on the western side, on either side of the Croquet Club.</p> <p>One submitter also suggests fund redirected to the purchase of homes in areas subject to flood or other required infrastructure</p> <p>Some submitters suggest funding be used to upgrade and embellish the following existing parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graceville Memorial Park, Graceville 	<p>Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane's park network is diverse, accessible, and meets the needs of the growing community; however, Council has no intention of resuming homes for new parks.</p> <p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. However, Graceville is expected to experience very low population growth, and detailed site investigations have revealed the existing park accessibility gap that this project has been proposed to address is relatively small most residents only marginally further than the desired 750m walk from their closest park.</p> <p>Given the strong community sentiment that a new park was not required or justified in this location, Council has determined that identifying the future acquisition of residential land for a future park is not justified in this instance, based on the unique local circumstances.</p> <p>Council proposes to remove this proposed project from the LGIP amendment 1B and will investigate alternative ways to deliver recreation outcomes for this low growth area in the future.</p> <p>Identifying land acquisition to deliver future trunk parkland is an entirely separate process with a separate funding source from 'flood buy-back' programs. It would</p>	Remove GRA-A1-001 from amendment package

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
346.1 348.1 355.1 359.1 361.1 372.1 374.1 386.1 387.1 388.1 389.1 399.1 405.1 418.1 419.1 420.1 425.1 428.1 434.1 435.1 436.1 437.1 438.1 439.1 440.1 441.1 452.1 453.1 455.1 456.1 465.1 466.1 480.1 482.1 509.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graceville Riverside Park, Graceville • Faulkner Park and/or acquisition of new parkland in flood prone areas of Chelmer/Graceville. <p>Some submitters requested the upgrade and embellishment of existing parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunlop Park, Corinda, to include new carpark and sport facilities • Fairfield Park, Fairfield, to include toilets and playgrounds • Nixon Park, Nixon Park • Strickland Tce Park, Sherwood • Yeronga Memorial Park, Yeronga • John Walker Place Park, Yeronga. <p>Some submitters requested land acquisition for parks at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58 Myla Tce, adjoining the Myla Tce RSL Memorial Park for a new park in Tennyson. • 133-143 Hyde Rd, Yeronga for park/sport/recreation purposes • Yeronga Bowls Club site for a new park in Yeronga for park/sport/recreation purposes • 2 Rosebery Tce, Chelmer. 	<p>not be appropriate for Council to prioritise expenditure of infrastructure charges revenue towards flood buy-back outcomes over trunk park outcomes.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
555.1 556.1 560.1 562.1 569.1 600.1 609.1 622.1 688.1 701.1			
179.1 230.1 584.1 585.1 628.1	<p>Submitters commented on the proposed Gloucester St local general recreation park (SBR-A1-002), raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential land resumption • loss of character building during the housing crisis • noise from the railway corridor • disruption to the long-term residents • steep terrain requiring costly modifications. • lack of needs for parks in the area • does not meet the DSS due to the size, topography and location. <p>Submitters suggest alternative locations.</p>	<p>Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane’s park network is diverse, accessible, and meets the needs of the growing community.</p> <p>Council’s desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane, which is not currently the case in this part of South Brisbane. However, further investigation has revealed that the specific location identified in the LGIP amendment 1B faces significant topographic constraints, limiting Council’s ability to deliver an accessible and functional recreation park in this location.</p> <p>In response to these constraints, Council proposes to remove this proposed project from the LGIP amendment 1B.</p> <p>Suggestions to consider specific properties for future expansion of the parks network have been noted and may be assessed against for their overall suitability for use as parkland in the future.</p>	Remove SBR-A1-002 from amendment package
213.1	Submitter is supportive of the inclusion of Davies Park upgrade to district general	Support noted. Council has delivered significant upgrades to Davies Park since the LGIP 1b base date of	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>recreation and outdoor sport (WES-U1-010), providing that sports clubs are priorities.</p> <p>Submitter also supports the West End Riverside Lands Park upgrade to metropolitan access/recreation corridor (SBR-U1-010), recommending extending the pedestrian and cycle way. Request the acquisition of 281-299 Montague Rd to extend Davies Park.</p>	<p>30 June 2021, which were designed and constructed in consultation with sporting club lessees.</p> <p>Suggestions to consider specific properties for future expansion of the parks network have been noted and may be assessed against for their overall suitability for use as parkland in the future.</p>	
343.1	<p>Submitter raises concerns regarding the size of the proposed Rochedale local general recreation park (ROC-A1-012) and that the park needs assessment does not show a need for larger park. A smaller park is better financially.</p>	<p>This is an existing project with only minor changes proposed in LGIP amendment 1B to reduce the required size from 1ha to 0.8ha and adjust the estimated delivery timing. The intent of the project has not changed, which is to condition development to contribute the required 0.8ha park area when an appropriate development application is submitted.</p> <p>Establishment costs are estimates of the costs of delivering the infrastructure needed and are subject to change, they have been calculated using the method outlined in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3. All costs in the report are in dollars as at the LGIP base date of 30 June 2021.</p>	No change
134.1 416.1	<p>Submitter supports the Kurilpa park project as it will provide much needed amenity to the residents.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	No change
193.1 444.1 454.1 476.1 478.1	<p>Submitters have commented regarding the following park upgrades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Musgrave Park (SBR-U2-001): supported the project but suggest including a future aboriginal cultural centre 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>A cultural centre is unlikely to be able to be considered as a trunk park project and therefore may not be relevant to the parks LGIP, however Council understands the Queensland Government may be investigating a project</p>	<p>Remove WES-A1-002 from amendment package, and retain current indicative project WES-A1-001 in LGIP</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Davies Park (WES-U1-010): request future upgrade to prioritise West End football club, touch rugby teams and any other locally based sports West End riverside lands park: request closure of road to prioritise cycleway and open a wide pedestrian thoroughfare, to Forbes St and Riverside -Dr. <p>Some submitters support the following parks upgrade and request extensive community consultation and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orleigh Park (WES-U1-012) Dutton Park (DUP-U2-001) Raymond Park (KAN-U2-001) Kangaroo Point Cliffs Park (KAN-U1-001) <p>Some submitters also commented on the following park acquisition and embellishment – specific location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBR-A2-001: support the project however request the removal of the industrial use to connect the park to Montague Rd to improve the safety of the park users SBR-A1-001: support the project however request Council to explore opportunities to acquire more land to meet the needs. <p>Some submitters raised concerns regarding the inclusion of WES-A1-002 and SBR-A1-002, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> potential land resumption of character homes 	<p>to deliver an Aboriginal Cultural Centre within the South Brisbane/ West End peninsula.</p> <p>The LGIP focusses on the provision of appropriate park infrastructure – the allocation of this infrastructure for the use of specific sporting and community clubs is outside of the scope of LGIP.</p> <p>Road closures are generally outside of the scope of park LGIP items but may be considered by Council where appropriate as part of broader enhancement projects.</p> <p>It is standard Council practice when delivering major park projects, including significant upgrades to parks such as those listed, to include appropriate community consultation as part of project planning and design.</p> <p>The removal of existing lawful land uses, including industrial uses from private property is outside the scope of the LGIP. However, it is Council’s intention that the LGIP identified parkland requirements will be delivered as part of the future redevelopment of the site, which is likely to be associated with cessation of industrial land uses on this site.</p> <p>LGIP amendment 1B includes the increase of the area of land required for this project from 0.3 ha to 1 ha. Additional parkland requirements have also since been identified in the Kurilpa Sustainable Growth Precinct Temporary Local Planning Instrument (TLPI).</p> <p>Submitter suggestions to consider specific properties for future expansion of the parks network have been noted and may be assessed against other citywide priorities</p>	<p>Remove SBR-A1-002 from amendment package</p> <p>No change to DUP-U2-001, KAN-U1-001, KAN-U2-001, SBR-A1-001, SBR-A1-002, SBR-U1-010, SBR-U2-001, WES-U1-010, WES-U1-012, SBR-A2-001</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> challenges to access the sites due to steep topography inconsistency with DSS parks size. <p>Some submitters have requested additional parkland at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 127-129 Hardgrave Rd, West End 16-24 Duncan St, West End 281-299 Montague Rd, West End 24-26 Archibald St, West End. <p>Some submitters have also suggested Council consider pocket parks at the Gabba Cross River Rail Station.</p>	<p>and overall suitability for use as parkland as part of a future LGIP amendment.</p> <p>'Pocket Parks' are not consistent with the current or proposed DSS for trunk park infrastructure and are therefore not currently considered for inclusion in LGIP. Council has been working closely with the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority to lobby for appropriate, high quality public realm outcomes as part of delivery of Cross River Rail.</p>	
617.1	<p>Submitter has raised the following concerns regarding the land acquisition to provide a local access/recreational corridor park (MNW-A7-002):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed location intersects with a family memorial area on site establishment cost is undervalued compared to the sales of the neighbouring block. <p>Submitter also suggests an alternative outcome to utilise the existing Council's corridor on the eastern side of Wynnum Creek to connect to the existing Stannard Rd Park.</p>	<p>This is an existing LGIP project (MNW-A7-002) which has only been amended to reflect partial delivery. Council's park network planning has previously identified a network benefit from the delivery of this project to consolidate the existing parks network and align with other infrastructure networks. This intent has not changed, and the project has therefore been carried forward in the LGIP 1b amendment.</p> <p>Council's intention for this project is to require new development to contribute the required 0.2ha park area from the south-east corner of the site when an appropriate development application is submitted.</p> <p>The methodology used to calculate land valuation rates is outlined in the Parks and land for community facilities network Extrinsic material. The portion of the lot required to achieve the intended outcome is the most flood-constrained part of the site and therefore has limited redevelopment value.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
013.1 037.1 038.1 039.1 041.1 042.1 043.1 044.1 058.1 059.1 060.1 061.1 062.1 063.1 064.1 065.1 066.1 067.1 068.1 069.1 070.1 071.1 072.1 078.1 079.1 080.1 081.1 082.1 083.1 088.1 089.1 090.1 093.1 101.1 110.1	<p>Many submitters have raised concerns with the location of the proposed West End Park acquisition and embellishment (WES-A1-002), for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of housing and character homes • poor topography and access to the sites • already sufficient existing parkland in the area • flawed planning rationale • no benefit to the community • increase in traffic • financial implications • does not conform to DSS (below minimum park size) • does not conform to DSS (gradient and accessibility for people with mobility requirements). • unnecessary to service low density area with ample private backyards • retain housing diversity in West End • potential conflict with parks planning and design code • economic, social and environmental impacts • development should/will provide parks. <p>Some submitters state the increase in population will be west of Montague Rd so they such parkland should be provided there.</p> <p>Some submitters have suggested alternative locations and suggested Council should alternatively acquire flood prone land.</p> <p>A number of submitters have suggested Council remove the 'specific location' project</p>	<p>Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane's Park network is diverse, accessible, and meets the needs of the growing community; however, Council has no intention of resuming homes for new parks.</p> <p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. This area of West End has a long-standing accessibility gap in local general recreation park provision, meaning there are many residents whose closest general recreation park is further than a 750m walk.</p> <p>In response to a range of community concerns, Council proposes to remove this project from the LGIP amendment 1b, and instead revert to the indicative location shown in the current LGIP which is relatively central to the gap area.</p> <p>This allows for further investigation into alternative ways to address the local general recreation park gap in this area and for the possibility of Council seeking opportunities to purchase land on the open market when they arise.</p>	<p>Remove WES-A1-002 from amendment package, and retain current indicatively located project WES-A1-001 in LGIP</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
111.1 112.1 115.1 123.1 133.1 134.1 135.1 140.1 141.1 151.1 154.1 155.1 156.1 158.1 159.1 160.1 164.1 165.1 166.1 168.1 181.1 194.1 195.1 196.1 198.1 200.1 201.1 212.1 217.1 220.1 223.1 224.1 231.1 232.1 234.1	and return to 'indicative park location' in West End, along with a call for enhanced collaboration and transparent planning with the local community.		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
235.1			
237.1			
238.1			
241.1			
244.1			
246.1			
249.1			
250.1			
251.1			
253.1			
254.1			
256.1			
257.1			
258.1			
264.1			
266.1			
267.1			
271.1			
273.1			
274.1			
275.1			
277.1			
279.1			
280.1			
281.1			
282.1			
283.1			
284.1			
287.1			
285.1			
286.1			
288.1			
289.1			
290.1			
294.1			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
295.1			
296.1			
298.1			
299.1			
300.1			
301.1			
302.1			
321.1			
331.1			
337.1			
358.1			
366.1			
369.1			
404.1			
415.1			
424.1			
427.1			
431.1			
450.1			
463.1			
487.1			
501.1			
513.1			
515.1			
529.1			
531.1			
545.1			
558.1			
565.1			
572.1			
574.1			
576.1			
577.1			
578.1			
579.1			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
580.1			
581.1			
582.1			
586.1			
587.1			
589.1			
590.1			
591.1			
592.1			
597.1			
601.1			
606.1			
610.1			
611.1			
613.1			
615.1			
625.1			
627.1			
635.1			
636.1			
641.1			
642.1			
661.1			
662.1			
666.1			
671.1			
675.1			
678.1			
683.1			
687.1			
689.1			
690.1			
691.1			
692.1			
693.1			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
694.1 695.1 696.1 697.1 698.1 703.1 704.1 705.1			
656.1	<p>Submitter supports the Park acquisition and embellishment for a district urban common (SHI-A4-001) in Spring Hill, however request to meet with Council to discuss an earlier delivery timeframe given the site has been purchased for development.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Network planning undertaken for LGIP amendment 1B considers updated planning assumptions and DSS for determining park requirements and addressing service gaps for an area. The estimated delivery timeframe is expected to meet the expected pace and location of future development in the area.</p> <p>Council's long-standing intention for this project is to condition development to contribute the required park area when appropriate development applications are submitted for the identified site.</p>	No change
680.1	<p>Submitter has commented on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is an existing unidentified park located between Hardgrave Rd and Montague Rd • the lots identified for Gloucester St Park are located outside the Kurilpa precincts. <p>Submitter seeks confirmation regarding Council's parks provision policy outlined below:</p>	<p>The land at 33 Thomas St and 68 Vulture St (now known as Bunyapa Park) was resumed (compulsorily acquired) by Council via the Notice of Intent to Resume (NIR) process in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. Council was comfortable to exercise its right to use this process in this case, as these properties were vacant urban land being used as an unsealed carpark, which had been the case for many years.</p> <p>Council uses a range of various methods to acquire land but seeks to avoid compulsory acquisition whenever possible. Any land acquisition that takes place will be in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1967.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a policy convention or document that governs the practice of council not resuming land for parks • the policy and process for delivering parks when identified owners are not willing to sell the land • the policy that allows council to resume land for transport and not parks confirmation whether Bunyapa Park was delivered via compulsory acquisition or private purchase. 	<p>However, this will only occur after undertaking a comprehensive process that involves detailed design and consultation with affected property owners.</p>	
699.1	<p>Petitioners raised concerns regarding the inclusion of the proposed local general recreation park (WES-A1-002) on Ida, Rogers, and Raven St in West End, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sufficient existing park land within walking distance • loss of established character homes • failure to reserve adequate green space in the development along Montague Rd. <p>Petitioners request the removal of confirmed park status from specific location to indicative without further intention to demolish established character homes.</p>	<p>Council is committed to acquiring and developing new parks and improving existing parks to ensure that Brisbane's park network is diverse, accessible, and meets the needs of the growing community; however, Council has no intention of resuming homes for new parks.</p> <p>Council's desired accessibility standards seek to provide a local general recreation park within a 750m walking distance of all residences in Brisbane. This area of West End has a long-standing accessibility gap in local general recreation park provision, meaning there are many residents whose closest general recreation park is further than a 750m walk.</p> <p>In response to a range of community concerns, Council has decided to remove the project from the proposed LGIP amendment 1B, and instead revert to the existing indicative location shown nearby in the current LGIP.</p> <p>This allows for further investigation into alternative ways to deliver recreation outcomes to address the local general recreation park gap in this area and allows for the possibility of Council seeking opportunities to</p>	<p>Remove WES-A1-002 from amendment package, and retain current indicative project WES-A1-001 in LGIP</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		purchase land on the open market when the opportunity arises.	
621.1	Submitter requests the green space/parks which are surrounded by Richie Rd, Sweets Rd, Vied Rd and Gooderham Rd needs some attention to transform from country style bush to a city green space/park.	<p>Submitters request has been reviewed. The parkland in question is classified as District Nature Conservation which is a non-trunk park type and therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the LGIP – it is managed to preserve and protect ecological and biodiversity values.</p> <p>There are a number of other existing parks nearby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sweets Rd Park • Pallara Park, Pallara • Linear Park • Armisfield Street Park <p>There are also two proposed LGIP projects which will deliver trunk recreation and sporting parkland and embellishments to meet community needs in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAL-A1-002 - Acquire and embellish land to provide Local General Recreation • PAL-U3-010 - Upgrade of Pallara Park 	No change
551.1	Submitter states a new sign has been erected on their property indicating it is a Council park that they are unaware of and seek clarification.	Signage is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to the Council's transport planning section for consideration.	No change
432.1	Submitter suggests that bikes and scooters be banned from using this narrow circular pathway and the bike and scooter traffic be instead redirected along Holman St and stay out of the park altogether unless wheeled and not ridden.	Regulation of the use of bikes and scooters is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to Council's transport planning section for consideration.	No change
596.1	Submitter raises concerns regarding Council obtaining land for park acquisitions across the city as raised in the media.	Council uses a range of methods to acquire land for park projects, however Council does not intend to compulsorily acquire land. For Park projects, Council may purchase land that becomes available on the open	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>market. Acquisition can also be managed through the development assessment process.</p> <p>Suggestions to consider specific properties for future expansion of the parks network have been noted and may be assessed against other citywide priorities and overall suitability for use as parkland as part of a future LGIP amendment.</p>	
443.1	Submitter supports the upgrade existing park infrastructure to the value of \$1-2m (DISTRICT BOTANIC GARDEN/ ARBORETUM) projects (SWD-U2-001)	Support noted	No change

3.6 Land for community facilities network

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
193.1 444.1 454.1 478.1	<p>Submitters support for the facility West End Local Community Centre and Library Extension (WES-CF-001), however request the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> delivery should be brought forward to 2021-2026, based on rapid population growth and current undersized and inaccessible library the existing West End library and adjacent Kurilpa hall at 174 Boundary St, West End, should be identified as a specific location for this facility requests that 174 Boundary St be incorporated with the West End library (178 Boundary St) to deliver a four-storey 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Local Community Centre and Library Extension (WES-CF-001) is shown at an indicative location as a specific site has not yet been identified.</p> <p>The LGIP is a strategic document, and projects are indicative and subject to funding through Council's Annual Plan and Budget processes. Their inclusion in the LGIP ensures funding can be allocated in future budgets to secure the required land. Further feasibility and design investigations are required to determine delivery options for the proposed community facility that will best serve the community.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	community facility extending onto the heritage-listed library.	The additional suggestions have been noted for future community facilities, subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities.	
443.1	Submitter requests the extension and upgrade of Annerley and Corinda Libraries.	<p>The LGIP is a strategic document, and projects are indicative and subject to funding through Council's Annual Plan and Budget processes. Their inclusion in the LGIP ensures funding can be allocated in future budgets to secure the required land. Further feasibility and design investigations are required to determine delivery options for the proposed community facility that will best serve the community.</p> <p>The additional suggestions have been noted for future community facilities, subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities.</p>	No change
193.1 444.1 454.1 478.1	<p>Submitters suggest inclusion of a Woolloongabba Library and Community Centre.</p> <p>LGIP population figures are underestimated for Woolloongabba and Kangaroo Point and were already exceeded in 2022.</p> <p>With rapid population growth for this area, the Cross River Rail station area is a possible location for a new library and community centre.</p>	<p>Council is committed to providing a well-linked and readily accessible network of high quality, flexible and well-utilised community facilities that provides opportunities for a diverse range of community activities, fosters community development and enhances the overall health and wellbeing of the Brisbane community. Council continually monitors changes in demand to meet the city's future needs and regularly reviews its infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The LGIP/LTIP represents Council's existing and planned trunk infrastructure network, however it is acknowledged that both trunk and non-trunk infrastructure may be delivered through multiple means such as through Council's capital works program and in some cases as part of a development.</p> <p>The Cross River Rail station is within the Woolloongabba Priority Development Area (PDA), under the planning authority of Economic Development Queensland. Council</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>advocates for the delivery of appropriate community facilities within PDAs across Brisbane.</p> <p>At the time of preparing the LGIP amendment 1B during 2021 and 2022, the estimated future supply of private residential dwellings was based on the 2018 edition of population growth projections published by the Queensland Government Statistician Office (QGSO) and National Institute of Economic and Industry Research (NIEIR). During the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, the QGSO did not release population data due to low migration.</p>	
<p>193.1 454.1 478.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the South Brisbane Principal Indoor Sports Centre (SBR-CF-001) and have strong support for an indoor sports centre in the Gabba Ward.</p> <p>Submitters state there is currently strong demand for this facility, and requests it be brought forward to 2021-2026. The community should be consulted on the future sports to be included.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The City Plan LGIP and LTIP are strategic documents, and projects are indicative. Further feasibility and design investigations are required to determine delivery options for the proposed community facility that will best serve the community.</p> <p>The timeframe for the delivery of this community facility is subject to development. Their inclusion in the LGIP ensures funding can be allocated in future budgets to secure the required land.</p> <p>The additional suggestions have been noted for future community facilities, subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>448.1</p>	<p>Submitters have commented on the Rochedale Local Community Centre (ROC-CF-002) – 267A Gardner Rd, Rochedale. They state the land is in Council ownership; therefore, this project should be removed from the LGIP and Council cannot include building costs in the LGIP, only land.</p>	<p>The establishment costs for the Land for Community Facilities Network include estimated costs for land and/or works to prepare the site for construction, including connection to services. The methodology and inclusions are detailed in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		The Rochedale Community Centre has not yet been delivered and site preparation works will need to be undertaken, therefore the project is still identified in the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). Council does not include community facility construction costs in the LGIP.	
454.1 478.1	Submitters generally support LGIP projects in ward, however multiple community facility projects need a 2021-26 timeframe.	The timeframe for the delivery of these community facilities is subject to development. Their inclusion in the LGIP ensures funding can be allocated in future budgets to secure the required land. The additional suggestions have been noted for future community facilities, subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities.	No change
684.1	<p>Submitters support infrastructure planning amendment and compliance with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. Requests additional consultation arrangements to allow further examination of the amendment and further investigation of LGIP projects and costs.</p> <p>Submitter requests explanation on technical matters such as the Weighted Average Cost of Capital, charges revenue forecast, and project costs for land for community facilities network.</p>	<p>Council does not include community facility construction costs in the LGIP. The LGIP establishment costs for the Land for Community Facilities Network include estimated costs for land and/or works to prepare the site for construction, including connection to services. The methodology and inclusions are detailed in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3.</p> <p>For details on rates and methodologies used within the SOW Models, information is contained in the Schedule of Works Model Extrinsic Material.</p>	No change
444.1	Submitter supports the inclusion of land acquisition to provide the West End local community centre and library extension.	Support noted	No change
567.1	<p>Submitter requests inclusions of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new library for Moorooka • upgrade Annerley library. 	Council is committed to providing a well-linked and readily accessible network of high quality, flexible and well-utilised community facilities that provides opportunities for a diverse range of community activities, fosters community development and enhances the overall health and wellbeing of the Brisbane community. Council	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>continually monitors changes in demand to meet the city's future needs and regularly reviews its infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The additional suggestions have been noted for future community facilities, subject to approvals, budget and citywide priorities.</p>	
416.1	Submitter suggests Council could provide community entertainment through the arts such as a performance space for music and other performance art, collaborative art space.	<p>This is outside the scope of the LGIP.</p> <p>The suggestion has been forwarded to the Community Services Planning and Governance team for consideration.</p>	No change

3.7 General

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
259.1	Submitter supports the LGIP assumptions, including density ranges, overlay assumptions, population projections, and growth summaries.	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Council's goal is to ensure that as growth occurs across the city and as land use planning is updated, the planning assumptions and infrastructure planning in the LGIP is amended to respond accordingly.</p> <p>Council agrees that regular review of the growth rates is necessary to ensure alignment with broader planning policy. It is noted that, at the time of developing the planning assumptions, the Queensland Government Statistician postponed the release of the 2021 population and dwelling projections until 2023.</p>	No change
146.1	Submitter has requested more opportunities for riverside pubs and e-scooter parking at ferry terminals.	Riverside pubs and e-scooter parking is outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion will be forwarded to the relevant Council team for consideration within other	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		programs.	
187.1	Submitter has commented on the details of a development application at Hyde Rd, Yeronga.	Individual development applications and approvals are outside the scope of the LGIP. Matters related to an individual application can be directed to Development Services.	No change
259.1	Submitter supports the proposed extensions of the Priority Infrastructure Areas (PIA) boundary, seeing them as logical extensions following approved development or recent neighbourhood planning work.	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Brisbane is evolving within one of the fastest growing regions in Australia. Council's goal is to ensure that as the city grows, it amends the Priority Infrastructure Area in accordance with updated land use planning.</p> <p>Council supports Urban Utilities intention to review the connection area for the Water Netserv Plan in accordance with the proposed PIA extension. The successful alignment of the Netserv and Council infrastructure planning will help to maintain high standards of infrastructure, delivered where and when it is needed and for the best value for money.</p>	No change
307.1	<p>Submitter supports the planning horizon to be increased to 15 years.</p> <p>Submitter suggests Council use a more nuanced and localised method of communicating specifically mapping.</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council aligns with timing of the Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program (QTRIP) and South East Queensland Infrastructure Supplement (SEQIS).</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>As growth occurs across the city and as land use planning is updated, Council agrees that extending the planning horizon to accommodate 15 years of growth which align with the industry feedback. Extending the horizon to 15 years will provide the industry more visibility of infrastructure needed to support the growth.</p> <p>Suggestions to use a more nuanced and localised method to show the planned infrastructure during public consultation have been noted. The adopted LGIP and LTIP amendment are communicated to the community through our existing City Plan Online.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>Council will continue to work with the State government to ensure that there is linkage between QTRIP and SEQIS.</p> <p>The LGIP and LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time. The LGIP is not an exhaustive list of road projects that Council is seeking to deliver in the future. Other projects will be assessed and may still be selected for future funding as the need arises to support Brisbane's growth in alignment with the State plans.</p>	
684.1	<p>Submitter raises following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry terminals are not referred to in the MGR, and also, the inclusion in the LGIP plays minimum role for local public transport as it is meant for tourist purpose. Recommends the cost on ferry terminals within the LGIP be removed or only consider the non-development purpose of the terminals MGR does not contemplate LTIPs and question whether charges and costs from the LTIP are appropriate Weighted average costs of capital (WACC) is not strictly defined, broadly agree that WACC can include both costs and operating expenditure of the organisation. However, request this be clarified and recommend the WACC to actual Council borrowing costs only there is a significant increase of infrastructure charges revenues that does not indicate the source of the funding the LGIP includes the construction cost for the land for community facilities network, whereas only the value of land is permitted. 	<p>Council's costing of the Land for Community Facilities is compliant with the MGR. While the MGR excludes the costs for the construction of the actual community centre building, feasibility studies will need to be undertaken to ensure the suitability of the site to accommodate a community centre. Upon completion of the investigations, basic site preparation will still need to be carried out prior to commencement of any construction works onsite.</p> <p>Further information on what costs is included as part of the site preparation for land for community facilities network projects can be found in the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, Brisbane City Plan 2014 4.5.3.</p> <p>Agree that more clarity could be included within the legislative framework under as it relates to the WACC. In accordance with the Draft LGIP Schedule of Works Model Extrinsic Material, the WACC rate used for the purposes of the LGIP is considered the most appropriate.</p> <p>The SOW Model – Revenue and Cash Flows has been updated to reflect the correct Anticipated Non-Residential Growth – Annualised from 2032 to 2036. These figures impacted the total Anticipated Revenue - Applied Charge and LGIP cash flow analysis.</p>	<p>SOW Model – Revenue and Cash Flows has been updated to reflect the correct Anticipated Non-Residential Growth – Annualised from 2032 to 2036.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>The LTIP is a strategic document that is designed to help preserve Council's ability to deliver long term infrastructure beyond the life of the LGIP such as roads, pathways, parks, land for community facilities and drainage. This is important to the continued livability and financial sustainability of Brisbane.</p> <p>The projects identified within the LTIP are not costed as they are set beyond the planning horizon.</p>	
447.1 448.1	<p>Submitter requests review of the planning assumptions to ensure they are reflective of current development trends for both residential and non-residential development.</p>	<p>Council's goal is to ensure that as growth occurs across the city and as land use planning is updated, the planning assumptions and infrastructure planning in the LGIP is amended to respond accordingly.</p> <p>Before commencing the LGIP, Council updated the planning assumptions to align with current development trends and data. This ensures the planning framework reflects the dynamic nature of both residential and non-residential development. During the development of LGIP 1B, Australia was in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, with population growth in Queensland driven by births and inter-state migration due to limited international migration. As a result, the 2021 population and dwelling projections by QGSO were postponed until 2023 to incorporate the 2021 census data, and infrastructure planning in the LGIP did not include the 2023 figures. Future LGIP's will update both residential and non-residential development in the review of the planning assumptions to align with new figures from the QGSO.</p>	No change
674.1	<p>Submitter has requested more cross river connectivity outlining the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> bring back the trams/light rail 	<p>Suggestions have been reviewed and items are not considered trunk infrastructure under the Queensland Government LGIP framework, therefore are outside the scope of the LGIP.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bring back affordable public transport • make CBD parking for those that must drive affordable • make plans to alleviate the traffic gridlock in the entire region • build the Adelaide St bus bridge • remove the toll from the go between bridge • reinstate Victoria Bridge to general traffic. <p>The submitter has also requested Council to investigate what further facilities and sites for crossing the Brisbane River are necessary.</p>	<p>Further, the LGIP is not an exhaustive list of projects that Council is seeking to deliver in the future. Other projects will be assessed and may still be selected for future funding as the need arises to support Brisbane's transport.</p> <p>You can view Council's Traffic and Transport projects by visiting Council's website.</p>	
567.1	<p>Submitter requests inclusions of pathway/park lighting for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poinciana Park through to Pegg's Park, Moorooka • Kookaburra Park, Rocklea • Russ Hall Park, Salisbury • Mortimer Rd Park and C.A. O'Sullivan Park, Acacia Ridge. 	<p>Suggestions have been reviewed are not considered trunk infrastructure under the Queensland Government LGIP framework, therefore are outside the scope of the LGIP.</p>	No change
479.1	<p>Submitter requests to improve surfacing of the Anzac Trail from School Rd to Honour Ave constructed by US troops in WW2 who used it as a route to Moorooka and West Yeronga.</p>	<p>This project is considered to be outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to NEWS for consideration.</p>	No change