

Brisbane City Plan 2014

**Tailored amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014*:
Long term infrastructure plans 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 LTIP submissions.....	6
3.1 Roads network.....	6
3.2 Active and Public Transport network.....	7
3.3 Stormwater network	13
3.4 Parks network	14
3.5 General submissions.....	17
4.0 Conclusion.....	18

Abbreviations and acronyms

Term	Description
BNO	Bicycle network overlay
City Plan	<i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i>
Council	Brisbane City Council
LGIP	Local government infrastructure plan
LGIP amendment 1B	Proposed amendment to <i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i> : Local government infrastructure plan
LTIP	Long term infrastructure plan
LTIP amendment 1B	Proposed tailored amendment to <i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i> : Long term infrastructure plan
Planning Act	<i>Planning Act 2016</i>
SQID	Stormwater Quality Improvement Devices

1.0 Introduction

Statutory public consultation on the Tailored amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014*: Long term infrastructure plans amendment 1B (LTIP amendment 1B) was undertaken between 3 August and 14 September 2023. The LTIP amendment 1B is proposing changes to ensure the LTIP remains accurate, relevant and current for identifying and preserving Brisbane’s long term infrastructure needs.

Council received 54 submissions on the LTIP amendment 1B. Submissions received after the closing date were still given full consideration.

It is important to note that the proposed LTIP amendment 1B may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government during the Minister for Housing, Local Government, Planning and Public Works’ consideration.

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 providing details of the proposed amendment was 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 .

In alignment with the State Government’s Minister’s Guidelines and Rules (Chapter 5, Part 3, Section 11), and Council’s commitment to transparency, letters were sent to landowners whose properties are adjacent to sites included in a proposed draft amendment.

The LTIP is a strategic document which informs long-term financial and land use planning; it does not override established financial decision-making, budget-setting, project planning or approval processes. If new or upgraded infrastructure is ultimately determined to be required, the relevant project will progress to detailed planning, where specific requirements and direct landowner impacts will be identified and managed.

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

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

3.0 LTIP submissions

Council received 54 submissions on the LTIP amendment 1B. Information about the submissions and how Council has considered and responded to these 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 LTIP 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 Roads network

Submission Reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
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, however pedestrian crossings in isolation of a broader road or intersection upgrade are not considered trunk infrastructure and are outside the scope of the LGIP. This suggestion has been forwarded to TPO for consideration within other programs.	No change

3.2 Active and Public Transport network

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
002.1	Submitter objects to the proposed Bridgeman Downs secondary cycle route in the Bicycle Network Overlay (BNO), raising concerns around crime and lack of surveillance.	Submitter concerns have been reviewed however this item will be retained in the BNO to ensure that the Active and public transport network has sufficient connectivity across the city. The design and construction of pedestrian and cycle paths is completed in accordance with the infrastructure design planning scheme policy. Crime prevention through environmental design is applied to ensure pathways do not create unsafe environments.	No change
219.1	Submitter supports the removal of two secondary cycle routes through their property at Oxley.	Support noted.	No change
192.1	The submitter objects to the extension of the primary cycle route and Riverwalk along Cairns St, Kangaroo Point.	Submitter concerns and suggestions for alternation locations have been reviewed. This item will be retained in the BNO to ensure that the Active and public transport network has sufficient connectivity across the city.	No change
202.1	The submitter supports the location of the Kangaroo Point primary cycle route and Riverwalk in the BNO.	Support noted.	No change
203.1	Submitter requests the BNO 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 LTIP amendment 1B does not remove the cycle route, it proposes to change the category of 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.	No change
210.1	Submitter requests the inclusion of a bicycle route in the BNO following the alignment of the railway corridor from Beenleigh Rd to Compton Rd, Kuraby.	Submitter suggestion for an inclusion of an additional cycle route in the BNO following the alignment of the railway corridor from Beenleigh Rd to Compton Rd, Kuraby has been reviewed and is supported.	A new secondary route will be added in the Beenleigh rail line (Beenleigh Rd to Compton Rd).

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
306.1	<p>Submitter supports proposed primary cycle routes along Grey St, Vulture St, Clem Jones Promenade and Sidon St, South Brisbane.</p> <p>The submitter does not support secondary cycle route along Russell St due to impacts on traffic.</p>	<p>Submitter support for the proposed primary cycle routes is noted. Rationalisation of strategic cycle routes was required as part of the BNO review for the LTIP amendment 1B so that Council can focus on delivering highest priority corridor upgrades for cycling.</p> <p>The secondary cycle route is to be retained on Russell St (a Neighbourhood Road) to support active travel for the local population.</p>	No change

324.1	<p>Submitter is generally supportive, and has requested additional bicycle routes for inclusion and suggested routes to be upgraded in multiple locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig Tree Pocket • Darra to Seventeen Miles Rocks • Forest Lake - Doolandella • Paddington-Milton connection • Inner-City routes. 	<p>Submitter requests have been reviewed and a number of these requests are supported. These are identified in the change column.</p> <p>Where requests have not been supported as part of this amendment, the LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, requests for new infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.</p>	<p>Changes are summarised below:</p> <p>Add new primary route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turbot St Off Ramp (Roma St to Turbot St) <p>Upgrade route to Primary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blunder Rd/Stapylton Rd (Inala Ave/King Ave to Johnson Rd) • Roxwell St/Grand Ave (Centenary Mwy to Forest Lake Blvd) • Garden Rd/Forest Lake Blvd/Wadeville St (Progress Rd to Blunder Rd) • Spinkbrae St/Kenmore Rd/Fig Tree Pocket Rd • Fig Tree Pocket Rd (Kenmore Rd to Rosella St) • Rosella St/Jesmond Rd (Fig Tree Pocket Rd to Cubberla St) <p>Upgrade route to secondary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simpsons Rd, Bardon (Stuartholme Rd to Macgregor Tce)
-------	---	---	--

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given Tce/Fernberg Rd, Paddington (Barooka Rd to Latrobe Tce)
373.1	<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.</p> <p>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>	No change
380.1	<p>Submitter supports the removal of local cycle route at 751 Beams Rd, Carseldine.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	No change
391.1	<p>Submitter supports removal of the proposed primary cycle route along Beams Rd, Taigum and requests the removal of the bikeway on the subject property.</p>	<p>The item is being reclassified as secondary cycle route as part of this amendment, not removed altogether. The shared path will be constructed in the verge of the roadway and there are no land requirements for this item.</p>	No change
458.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns with the changes in the Fig Tree Pocket BNO, particularly the upgrade of the existing secondary cycle route to a primary cycle route along the site frontage, citing infrastructure constraints, land dedication issues, and adverse impacts on future development.</p>	<p>Submitter proposed changes have been reviewed and are unable to be supported. Rationalisation of strategic cycle routes was required as part of the BNO review for the LTIP amendment 1B so that Council can focus on delivering highest priority corridor upgrades for cycling. As a result, some routes have been upgraded whilst others were removed.</p> <p>The 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

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
495.1	Submitter requests both Rochedale bikeway ("future Rd' to Rochedale Rd) (previously ROC-SP-004 and ROC-SP-005) be identified as a secondary cycle route within the BNO and be creditable trunk infrastructure.	<p>A review to the BNO identified that the higher strategic routes are located on major roads. The alignments for these routes are being retained as local cycle links.</p> <p>Conditions of any current development approval or infrastructure agreement over the site will prevail.</p>	No change
519.1	Submitter requests to update the BNO on Annerley Rd to a primary cycle route citing it links major locations, received more suggestions for safety improvement during the Transport and Main Roads Principal Cycle Network consultation in 2022.	The request to upgrade Annerley Rd and Fairfield Rd to primary cycle routes is not supported. Any cycle infrastructure provided in the road corridor would be considered as part of a road project. Council expects cycle infrastructure for the corridors requested can be retrofitted to the existing road corridor without acquisition of private land.	No change
523.1	Submitter has raised concerns over the removal of secondary cycle and local routes from the BNO and requests inclusions of multiple routes on the BNO in Acacia Ridge.	<p>Submitter suggestions for additional projects have been reviewed. Mortimer Rd, Acacia Ridge is included in the BNO as a secondary cycle route, the local cycle route along Mortimer Rd has been removed as part of this amendment.</p> <p>Rationalisation of strategic cycle routes was required as part of the BNO review for the LTIP amendment 1B so that Council can focus on delivering highest priority corridor upgrades for cycling.</p> <p>The 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
554.1	Submitter supports the removal of the proposed secondary cycle route in the BNO which is located over private property at Beams Rd, Bridgeman Downs.	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
315.1	<p>Submitter requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the upgrade of Annerley Rd between Noble St and Ipswich Rd to include bike lanes. Annerley Rd should be a primary route on the BNO. 	<p>Submitter suggestions for additional projects have been reviewed. The request to upgrade Annerley Rd to primary cycle route is not supported. Any cycle infrastructure provided in the road corridor would be considered as part of a road project. Council expects cycle infrastructure for the corridors requested can be retrofitted to the existing road corridor without acquisition of additional land.</p>	No change
567.1	<p>Submitter requests inclusions of bikeway links at Stable Swamp Creek and Rocky Waterholes Creek to the BNO.</p>	<p>Submitter suggestions for additional projects have been reviewed. Rocky Waterholes Creek, Moorooka is included in the BNO as a secondary cycle route. Submitter request for a new item for Stable Swamp Creek, Rocklea is not supported. Rationalisation of strategic cycle routes was required as part of the BNO review for the LTIP amendment 1B so that Council can focus on delivering highest priority corridor upgrades for cycling.</p> <p>The LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, other requests for changes to infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.</p>	No change.
526.1 550.1	<p>Submitters request inclusion of multiple routes on the BNO across Brisbane.</p>	<p>Submitter suggestions for additional projects have been reviewed and a request to reinstate a cycle route to the BNO is supported.</p> <p>The LTIP will continue to be reviewed over time, other requests for changes to infrastructure projects have been noted and will be considered in future amendments.</p>	Reinstate route to primary on Logan Rd (Stanley St Woolloongabba to Cortis St Mount Gravatt)

3.3 Stormwater network

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
447.1	Submitter requests the transfer of SQID projects in Rochedale from the LTIP to LGIP to support the construction of Farley Rd corridor (ROC-RC-046) anticipated to be delivered early 2024. Requests to amend the delivery timeframe to 2021 – 2026 to align with the road corridor project.	The request to transfer item to the LGIP is not supported as the identified infrastructure is not expected to be needed until after 30 June 2036.	No change
448.1	Submitter requests amendments to the draft LTIP to remove stormwater items in Rochedale that have already been delivered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROC-SW51 • ROC-SW1 • ROC-SW2 • ROC-SW10 	Submitter request has been reviewed and is supported. Items delivered and certified as constructed before 30 June 2021 will be removed from the LTIP amendment 1B and added to the existing assets.	Remove delivered items and add as existing assets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROC-SW51 • ROC-SW1 • ROC-SW2 • ROC-SW10
306.1	Submitter supports the transfer of the long-term stormwater items from the LTIP to the LGIP (SBR-PR-020 and SBR-PR-023) with an expected delivery from 2026 - 2031 and 2031- 2036 respectively.	Support noted.	No change
656.1	Submitter requests the 450 mm stormwater line proposed on the subject site (SHI-SW4) be included as an additional trunk infrastructure item under the LGIP.	The LTIP plans for an efficient stormwater network to ensure stormwater pipe and open drainage networks operate capacity is optimised to minimise flood impacts on people, property, and infrastructure. The identified infrastructure is not expected to be needed until after 30 June 2036 so will remain in the LTIP.	No change

3.4 Parks network

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
003.1 629.1	Submitters support the removal of the District general recreation park item at Mitchelton (MIT-P4) from the Community purposes network overlay map, as the item is proposed to be replaced by a Local general recreation park in the LGIP.	Support noted.	No change
024.1 027.1 030.1 031.1 034.1 036.1 055.1 057.1 117.1 118.1 167.1 188.1 190.1 564.1 623.1 631.1 644.1 649.1	<p>Submitters have commented on the proposed change, removing a District recreation park from the LTIP (MIT-P4) and replacing it with a Local general recreation park at Mitchelton (MIT-A1-001) in the LGIP, citing the following concerns:</p> <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 item having no limitations for future residential development, further increasing the need for the district recreation park.</p>	<p>Network planning undertaken for LGIP amendment 1B considers updated planning assumptions and desired standards of service for determining park requirements and addressing service gaps for an area.</p> <p>The outcome of the network planning is shown in Appendix E of the Parks and Land for Community Facilities Network Extrinsic Material, where there is no gap to address for district general recreation parks, however a local general recreation park 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 Desired Standards of Service for local general recreation parks is 0.8ha. Therefore, the land requirement for this park infrastructure item has been reduced from 4.5ha to 0.8ha to align with DSS specifications for a local general recreation park.</p>	No change

153.1 342.1 421.1	<p>Submitters commented on the inclusion of Greenslopes Park, Greenslopes, (GRE-P1) with the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on existing residential properties • conflict with site's character residential zoning • potential property value degradation • there are existing parks and parklands within 750m which indicates the DSS for the area has already been met. <p>One submitter raised concerns that the project will result in an increase in traffic, parking problems, safety of children. Submitter suggests a different location between Ridge St and Denman St, Greenslopes.</p>	<p>Submitter concerns have been noted and this proposed item (GRE-P1) will be removed from the amendment package.</p> <p>There is an existing LGIP item a short distance from Denman St, Greenslopes (GRE-A4-001) to deliver an Urban common on the corner of Headfort St and Newdegate St. The suggested location between Ridge St and Denman St would serve a similar catchment to this existing LGIP item and is therefore not an appropriate location to maximise network benefit.</p>	Remove from package
204.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns regarding the inclusion of Upper Mount Gravatt Long term park (UMG-P1), citing the land could be used for higher density dwellings to respond to the current housing crisis.</p>	<p>Submitter concerns are noted. The item identifies Council's intent to further investigate a potential future acquisition of land to connect this low and medium density residential pocket to the adjoining parkland network, which is currently inaccessible. The item will ensure future residents of this area have appropriate access to trunk parkland.</p>	No change
433.1	<p>Submitter supports the removal of FGR-P1(Long term corridor link park) in Ferny Grove</p>	Support noted	No change

458.1	<p>Submitter commented on proposed update to a long term corridor link park at Fig Tree Pocket (FTP-P1), citing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land has been identified for acquisition in LTIP since adoption in 2018 • proposed completion is a further 10 years from 2026 to 2036 • maintaining the land has ongoing ramifications for master planning of school • requests item be moved forward into the LGIP and considered trunk. 	<p>The existence of this item in the current LTIP means that it has been identified as a potential future land requirement.</p> <p>Council has determined that this potential future land requirement is most appropriately identified in the LTIP, as it is a post - 2036 requirement.</p> <p>Council may seek a land contribution generally in accordance with this item if the property is part of a future development application.</p>	No change
485.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns with removal of Upper Kedron Park Acquisition and Embellishment (UKE-P1) from the LTIP (item transferred to the LGIP) in that any changes may negatively impact their property.</p>	<p>This project has been transferred to the LGIP, as it is expected to be delivered as part of the Ellendale Estate development. The delivery of this item will be part of a future stage, and as a result there are no anticipated impacts to newly constructed dwellings.</p>	No change
010.1	<p>Submitter raised concerns with the proposed location of Upper Kedron Park Acquisition and Embellishment (UKE-P1) such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on existing residential properties • potential land resumption. 	<p>This project has been transferred to the LGIP, as is expected to be delivered as part of the Ellendale Estate development. The delivery of this item will be part of a future stage, and as a result there are no anticipated impacts to newly constructed dwellings.</p>	No change

3.5 General submissions

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required?
684.1	<p>Submitter has raised concerns that the Minister's Guidelines and Rules does not contemplate LTIP and question whether charges/costs from the LTIP are appropriate.</p>	<p>The LTIP provides information about long term infrastructure requirements (that Council has previously identified as necessary to support future development) to enable efficient decision making by Council, landowners and developers.</p> <p>The main function is 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, important to the continued liveability and financial sustainability of Brisbane.</p> <p>It maintains infrastructure commitments made with local communities through neighbourhood plans and clarify the implementation of the Planning Act for development to provide payment of additional trunk infrastructure costs.</p>	No change

4.0 Conclusion

The submissions received have been considered in the development of the final package of amendments.

It is important to note that the proposed amendment may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government during the Minister's consideration period.