

Moranbah UDA Development Scheme

Submissions Report

Under section 29 of the *Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007*

April 2011



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Summary of Key Amendments to Proposed Moranbah UDA Development Scheme arising from submissions..... | 3 |
| 2. Summary of other Key Amendments to Proposed Moranbah UDA Development Scheme arising from operational and legal review | 4 |
| 3. Overview of submissions | 5 |
| 4. Brief summary of key areas of support and concern raised in the submissions | 5 |
| 5. Summary of submissions – Moranbah UDA Proposed Development Scheme..... | 8 |
| 6. List of amendments arising from submissions | 57 |
| 7. List of amendments arising from operational and legal review | 61 |

1. Summary of Key Amendments to Proposed Moranbah UDA Development Scheme arising from Submissions

Following is a summary of the key amendments to the Proposed Moranbah UDA Development Scheme which was gazetted on 30 July 2010. The public notification and submission period for the Proposed Development Scheme was held from 7 February to 22 March 2011.

LAND USE PLAN

Further explanation and detail as to where larger-scale mining camps could be located so as to provide more certainty for the community – map and wording – including sub-precincts.

Amendments made to both the Development Scheme content and maps.

The maps have been amended in line with from Isaac Regional Council to incorporate sub-precincts to help show and detail which areas are more appropriate than others for the locating of larger-scale mining camps.

There are now only three areas identified within Precincts 2 and 3 where it is considered larger-scale mining camps may be appropriate and have been shown via hatching on the precinct maps.

The inclusion of sub-precincts to provide further clarity that Government owned land (be that either State or Local Government land) is not intended to incorporate non-resident worker accommodation and prioritise more diverse and affordable housing options.

Inclusion of an administrative definition for a 'larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation' being of 100 rooms or greater or that includes private mess facilities, camp style accommodation or donga-style buildings.

LAND USE PLAN

In respect of dust concerns the inclusion of additional criteria, as requested by Qld Health, to further ensure the health and safety of future residents within Precinct 2

Amendment to the content of Precinct 2 to identify that any uses (including interim uses), greater than one storey in height, are to be appropriately set back from any anticipated air quality impacts (as shown on the Constraints Map in Appendix 1) to ensure upper levels are not adversely exposed. A footnote helps to further explain that these requirements are at the request of QLD Health and that the appropriate set back will be determined in consultation with DERM and Qld Health, in conjunction with the approval of any plan of development submitted as part of a development application within this area.

LAND USE PLAN

Amended location of the Mixed Use Zone contained within Precinct 2

The indicative location of the Mixed Use Zone within Precinct 2 has been slightly amended so as to better reflect the development aspirations for this site. Upon review of submissions it was considered that the request was reasonable and supported in that it neither changed the intent of the zone within this area nor did it threaten the viability of the Town Centre or the fulfilment of the retail and commercial aspirations for the town, in accordance with the Retail and Commercial Assessment, March 2011, prepared by Macroplan.

2. Summary of other Key Amendments to the Proposed Moranbah UDA Development Scheme arising from an operational and legal review

| |
|--|
| LAND USE PLAN Components of the Land Use Plan & Levels of Assessment Table |
| Consistent with the operational amendments made to the Blackwater Development Scheme. |
| LAND USE PLAN Removal of indicative densities from the Precinct maps and inclusion of hatching to more clearly show the areas where larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation may be appropriate |
| Amendments were made in this respect as only very few submissions were received in relation to densities however many more submission were received querying where larger style camps may be located. As a consequence the intended density ranges are now expressed more fully within the worded content of the sub-precincts and the Precinct Maps play a greater role in identifying where larger-scale mining camps may be considered. |
| LAND USE PLAN Relationship to the Belyando Shire Planning Scheme 2009 |
| How the Development Scheme relates to the Belyando Shire Planning Scheme 2009 has been more explicitly described and simplified. This has now been included within section 3.2.8 – UDA Wide Criteria instead of the previous repetition within each Precinct Criteria. |

3. Overview of Submissions

A total of thirty-six (36) submissions were received during the formal submission period. Nineteen (19) submissions were received from individuals within the local community. Six (6) were from Queensland state agencies and ten (10) from local business/industry groups. There were four (4) submissions received after the formal close of the submissions period and two (2) of these were addendums to originally lodged submissions. Each submission (regardless of whether it was received during the formal notification period or late) was considered and reviewed by the Moranbah project team.

Submissions were received from the following key stakeholders / groups:

For Moranbah UDA

- Arts Queensland (Department of the Premier and Cabinet)
- Department of Community Safety (DCS)
- Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM)
- Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR)
- Department of Communities (DoC)
- Department of Local Government and Planning (DLGP)
- Queensland Health (QLD Health)
- Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (DEEDI)
- Isaac Regional Council (IRC)
- Land owners and Local residents
- Moranbah Action Group (MAG)
- Moranbah Traders Association
- Resource companies & associated industries
- Queensland Resources Council (QRC)

4. Brief summary of key areas of support and concern raised in the submissions

The following key areas of support and concern have been identified.

| Key areas of support |
|---|
| Submitters support the provision of affordable housing and land for residential development. |
| Submitters support the need for a new retail shopping centre within the Town Centre, ideally to include a supermarket. |
| Isaac Regional Council (IRC) are supportive of providing more detailed guidelines and locational requirements pertaining to non-resident worker accommodation. |
| Isaac Regional Council (IRC) supports the conversion of surplus parklands into development sites to increase the supply of serviced residential land that will assist in the provision of affordable housing options. |
| The Queensland Resources Council (QRC) commend the work of the ULDA and acknowledge that the availability and affordability of housing is a key concern for the resources sector and local communities. |

| Key areas of concern | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Concern about mining camps (i.e. 'non-resident worker accommodation') being located within the town.</p> <p>a. Quality of accommodation being provided</p> <p>b. Social concerns</p> <p>c. BMAs possible upcoming request for 100% FIFO for the nearby Caval Ridge mine</p> <p>d. Percentage caps of non-residents to resident numbers within the town.</p> | <p>The Development Scheme does not prioritise the provision of non-resident worker accommodation ahead of other residential uses.</p> <p>The role of the ULDA is to provide housing within Moranbah that provides choice and diversity through a mix of densities, types, design, tenures and levels of affordability to cater for a range of lifestyles, incomes and life cycle needs.</p> <p>The ULDA is not the decision maker in respect of any future application by BMA to request 100% FIFO – this is the role of the Co-ordinator General through the EIS process.</p> |
| <p>2. Dust</p> <p>a. Securing a future growth area</p> | <p>Securing a future growth area</p> <p>A key Government Objective in the declaration of Moranbah was to “review and finalise the structure plan for the potential south west town expansion area”. In progressing this objective it was found that a key constraint to urban growth within this area was the newly approved Caval Ridge Mine project. The potential future dust impacts from this mine impact upon a third of the site. As this mine project is approved the ULDA have mapped the expected impacts on the constraints map contained in the Development Scheme. The urban development area proposed within Precinct 2 is located outside of the predicted risk area.</p> <p>A submission was lodged with the ULDA raising concern that the extent and location of urban development within Precinct 2 may inadvertently stifle plans for future mine projects close to town and in this respect that the Development Scheme process should be put on hold to consider this more fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In light of the following it is considered by the ULDA that the request to delay the Development Scheme process is unreasonable: No future mining projects potentially located near Precinct 2 have yet progressed to EIS phase and consequently have neither been considered nor approved by the Coordinator General on behalf of the Government. • The ULDA's plan identifying urban development on land within the southwest growth area have been in the public domain since last October • The ULDA's plans take into consideration all currently approved mining projects within the region. • The town footprint is heavily constrained by mining in all directions and a key role of the ULDA is to secure a growth area that can be protected from future adverse mining impacts so as to provide certainty for town growth, ensure health and safety of residents and to provide land to house future residents employed to service the expected future resource projects. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>2. Dust (cont'd)</p> <p>b. Health implications</p> | <p>Health Implications</p> <p>Given the towns proximity to numerous existing and potential future mines, is it understandable that concerns regarding the potential health implications have been raised, particularly in respect of dust pollution.</p> <p>The ULDA have undertaken ongoing consultation with both DERM and Qld Health in this respect.</p> <p>In summary, whilst DERM administers the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 1997 (EPP(Air)) they have stated that the Moranbah south-west growth area should proceed on a risk-based approach subject to confirmation from Queensland Health that human health issues are adequately addressed. The response from Qld Health is as follows and outlines conditional support – which can be (and has been) adequately addressed through the identified amendments to the Development Scheme and future development assessment processes:</p> <p><i>“Under the proposed Development Scheme, Queensland Health supports residential areas within Precinct 2 north of the predicted 24 hour average airborne particulate matter contour line denoting concentrations of 50µg/m³ for particulate matter less than 10µgm (PM₁₀). Any elevated residential dwellings (i.e. up to 3 storeys as described within Precinct 2 outcomes) should be appropriately set back from the 24 hour average PM₁₀ 50µg/m³ contour line to ensure upper levels are not adversely exposed. This criterion has been set by the Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) to ensure human health and wellbeing is not adversely affect and is also an air quality goal within the Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 2008 (EPP Air). “</i></p> |
| <p>3. Concern that the ULDA are not doing enough to increase the amount of affordable housing and rental options.</p> | <p>The Development Scheme supports the provision of permanent housing within Moranbah as a priority and provides choice and diversity through a mix of densities, types, design, tenures and levels of affordability to cater for a range of lifestyles, incomes and life cycle needs.</p> <p>The ULDA will be helping to increase the availability of affordable housing within the UDA by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilitating the development of State land for residential purposes • promoting greater diversity of housing by introducing more flexibility in regulations to encourage smaller forms of housing and lot sizes • undertaking development that demonstrates high quality of more diverse forms of housing • securing a future growth area for the town to enable industry and business confidence • working with Isaac Regional Council on mechanisms to retain affordable housing stock in the community and ensure that the target market is non-resource key workers. • committing \$1 million for affordable housing for Moranbah to be delivered in the 2011/12 year. |

5. Summary of Submissions – Moranbah UDA Proposed Development Scheme

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| AREAS OF SUPPORT | | | |
| 1 | Interest in land availability and how lots can be purchased. | Noted. | N |
| 2 | <p>Suggest that a new retail shopping centre/mixed use precinct would greatly benefit the community on the Ted Rolfe Oval. This should ideally include a new supermarket (i.e. Woolworths, Aldi), a haberdashery store, a cafe or ten pin bowling alley. Suggests that bringing back the movie theatre would also aid in family entertainment.</p> <p>Believes that the Ted Rolfe Oval is an ideal location for a much needed second supermarket.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The ULDA procured a Retail and Commercial Assessment for Moranbah to support the preparation of the Development Scheme (<i>Moranbah Retail and Commercial Assessment prepared for the Urban Land Development Authority by Macroplan Australia Pty Ltd, March 2011, Final Report</i>). This report is called up with the Development Scheme to guide development and development assessment within the UDA, including the Ted Rolfe Oval site.</p> <p>This report identifies that a full-line supermarket of approximately 4000m² (with approximately 500m² of associated specialty retail) could be provided on the Ted Rolfe Oval site.</p> | N |
| 3 | <p>Agrees that there is a definite need for future growth as the town is growing rapidly and accommodation, especially affordable, is of huge demand.</p> <p>Supports the need for affordable housing to encourage families to live in Moranbah.</p> <p>Acknowledges that high density housing is needed and will help alleviate some of the housing shortage issues, giving contracting companies a choice to live in more suitable accommodation.</p> <p>Support for the provision of a range of housing options for residents and workers.</p> <p>(DLGP)</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The ULDA will be helping to increase the availability of affordable housing within Moranbah by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilitating the development of State and local government land for residential purposes • promoting greater diversity of housing by introducing more flexibility in regulations to encourage smaller forms of housing and lot sizes • undertaking development that demonstrates high quality and more diverse forms of housing. | N |
| 4 | Believes the open space area around Arkana Terrace, the Golf Club and down to the Hockey fields are excellent and ideal locations for a higher density residential zone. Strongly in favour of the redevelopment to cater for some of the accommodation demand. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Higher densities are provided for within Precinct 1 as it is in very close proximity to, and will work to extend, the Town Centre. The adjacent Golf Course will provide a pleasant open space setting and amenity for the future residents.</p> | N |
| 5 | <p>Supports the plan for Precinct 2.</p> <p>Support for future growth south of Grosvenor Creek.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Precinct 2 provides for substantial town expansion.</p> <p>The town footprint is heavily constrained by mining in all directions and a key role of the ULDA is to secure a</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | (IRC & DLGP Recommendation) | growth area that can be protected from future adverse mining impacts so as to provide certainty for town growth, ensure health and safety of residents and to provide land to house future residents employed to service the expected future resource projects. | |
| 6 | Supports the plan to expand housing options throughout Precinct 3. (IRC) | Noted. Precinct 3 provides for increased housing choice and diversity and encourages dwellings that range from individual houses through to multi-unit dwellings and accommodation for non-resident workers. | N |
| 7 | Supports the establishment of the Rural Zone in Precinct 2 between the existing rail corridor and the power line easement on the western boundary to address future sensitive receptors. | Noted. | N |
| 8 | Acknowledges that Precinct 2 is appropriate for development. | Noted. | N |
| 9 | Support in principle for Council's residential proposal to develop land south of Grosvenor Creek. | Noted Isaac Regional Council own a large portion of land south of Grosvenor Creek which they intend to develop to support future growth of the town. This site is identified within Precinct 2a. | N |
| 10 | Supports the identification of non-resident worker accommodation in the south west growth area and further supports the notion of addressing this in the Development Scheme. | Noted. The south west growth area provides opportunities for the provision of non-resident worker accommodation, located appropriately and designed in accordance with the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> . The guideline is intended to assist in delivering high-quality design outcomes for non-resident worker accommodation, encouraging innovative development outcomes to benefit both the occupants and the town. The detailed guideline establishes standards for the planning and design of worker accommodation. Areas where larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation may be considered appropriate are shown on Map 5: Precinct 2 Map (Sub-Precincts 2c & 3d) and Map 6: Precinct 3 Map (Sub-Precincts 3c & part of 3d). | N |
| 11 | Supports general intent of centre vitality and employment considerations. | Noted. The Development Scheme has been drafted to support economic growth within the town and reinforce the role of the Moranbah Town Centre as the retail and community focus. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 12 | Supports the inclusion of non-resident worker accommodation in the Residential Zone. | Noted. The residential zone is intended to cater for a range of residential types and densities to provide choice and variety in accommodation forms for both permanent residents and non-residents. Areas where larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation may be considered appropriate are shown on Map 5: Precinct 2 Map (Sub-Precincts 2c & 3d) and Map 6: Precinct 3 Map (Sub-Precincts 3c & part of 3d). | N |
| 13 | The Proposed Development Scheme is recognised as being a positive and proactive planning document for Moranbah that will facilitate the achievement of good development outcomes. | Noted. | N |
| 14 | DTMR supports the Proposed Development Scheme for Moranbah, particularly those aspects that protect and integrate roads and transport infrastructure to support the intent of the UDA. | Noted. | N |
| 15 | DTMR support for higher density and mixed use development proposed close to activity centres. | Noted. | N |
| 16 | Supportive of apartment style accommodation, town houses and houses for non-resident workers as they would create a sense of permanency, ownership and resemblance to a more normal home life, also allowing families to visit. | Noted. Both the Development Scheme and the associated ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> provide for and encourage this style of development within the town. | N |
| 17 | Supports the Proposed Development Scheme's identification of land adjacent to Goonyella Road for mixed use and residential purposes. | Noted. | N |
| 18 | Supports the proposed provisions that " <i>all aspects of development undertaken by the State, or statutory body representing the State, for the purposes of public housing</i> " is listed as exempt development under Schedule 1. | Noted. | N |
| 19 | The Moranbah UDA falls within the Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday (MIW), formerly Whitsunday, Hinterland and Mackay (WHAM), statutory planning region. The draft regional plan will recognise the Moranbah UDA through the <i>Queensland Housing Affordability Strategy</i> . The draft regional plan will also aim to promote a range of housing choices to cater for the | Noted. The Development Scheme aligns with the objectives of the draft regional plan for Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday (MIW) and particularly recognizes the importance of Moranbah in accommodating a thriving major regional activity centre which has a key role in supporting the expansion of the Bowen Basin mining | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|--|-----------|-------------------------|
| | diverse needs of the community through a mix of appropriate densities, types and designs. (DLGP) | industry. | |
| Guideline no. 03 Non-resident worker accommodation | | | |
| 20 | Supports design benchmark 1-3 whereby multiple levels maximise developable land and create living opportunities around activity nodes. | Noted. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| AREAS OF CONCERN | | | |
| General comments or concerns | | | |
| 21 | Believes that the ULDA is not following their duty of care to residents of the town to ensure that their decisions are not detrimental to residents. | <p>The ULDA is following due process under the Urban Land Development Authority Act 1997 (the Act) and has exceeded the Act requirements in respect of the amount and quality of public notification undertaken.</p> <p>All care is being taken by the ULDA to ensure that all relevant issues are adequately identified and addressed through the preparation of the Development Scheme.</p> | N |
| 22 | <p>Various concerns about the provision of affordable housing relating to the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals do not cater for long term, family friendly, sustainable developments but rather a short term fix to a much larger problem. • How will housing will be provided to various sections of the community? • Concerned about higher densities. • Proposed development will decrease the quality of life for residents and threaten the long term economic viability of the town. • Suggests there is a strategy to ensure equitable access to land within a reasonable timeframe and affordable price. • The combination of high prices and limited land supply create growth problems for Moranbah. Suggested that the ULDA provide solutions to existing growth problems. • Concern regarding property prices. Has a need to buy a family home but cannot afford to with the current house prices. • Concern regarding the balance of housing available and house prices disallowing people to live in Moranbah. • Concern surrounding the negative effect a lack of housing availability will have on company and production staff. • Some non-resident workers do wish it live | <p>The ULDA will be helping to increase the availability of affordable housing within the Development Scheme by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilitating the development of State and local government land for residential purposes • promoting greater diversity of housing by introducing more flexibility in regulations to encourage smaller forms of housing and lot sizes • undertaking development that demonstrates high quality and more diverse forms of housing • securing a future growth area for the town to enable industry, and business confidence in the towns future <p>The increase in densities proposed in the Development Scheme will be carefully controlled through design requirements. This will enable a greater variety of housing and increased housing yield which should improve housing affordability.</p> <p>The ULDA will be providing additional funds for the development of affordable housing options in Moranbah. The ULDA has committed \$1 million for affordable housing for Moranbah to be delivered in the 2011/12 year. Consultation with Isaac Regional Council has indicated that there is significant demand for affordable rental of smaller dwellings (2 bedroom stock). The ULDA is working with IRC to leverage other sources of funding to supplement the initial \$1 million.</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>in Moranbah but cannot afford to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding the provision of affordable housing to the community. • Concern regarding the urgent need for affordable family housing, affordable housing for staff members, affordable commercial opportunities and the choice and balance of housing overall. • the proposed development are not family and community friendly. • Request to allow families to move into traditional housing in the community. • A need to consider affordable family housing for staff of local business and families over multi-unit dwelling subdivisions for transient accommodation. • Permanent residents are waiting for the ULDA to make the educated decision to help supply and relieve the family accommodation problem. • Believes family housing in deficit by hundreds of houses. • Community is trying to conserve the friendly family community town reputation. • Concern about non-resident investors purchasing all available housing in Moranbah prior to the community. • The right for employees and their families to choose where they live must be acknowledged. • No specific ULDA plan or targets for Housing Affordability. Unable to establish affordability level and how it would be achieved, who it would apply to and measurable targets. • Requests that the ULDA recognise that housing affordability problems have been exacerbated by mining industry demand. | <p>The strategy for who can buy dwellings is still being developed however the ULDA is working with the Council on mechanisms to retain this affordable housing stock in the community to ensure it does not end up in the general market. One option being explored is the gifting of dwellings to a local not-for-profit housing provider who could then own and manage the dwellings, ensuring that they are targeted to non-resource key workers. The ULDA is exploring the option of quarantining a proportion of the housing available to purchase specifically for low to moderate income households who indicate a preference to be permanent residents of Moranbah. Similar approaches have been employed by government and private developers in other States and Territories including the ACT, Victoria and New South Wales using a balloting process. The only restriction placed on the purchase of these dwellings will be income based (in line with the ULDA's mandate of low to moderate income households) and it is unlikely that the purchasers will have restrictions placed on them in relation to future sale of the dwelling.</p> | |
| 23 | <p>Concerned that the proposed developments will only benefit mining company profits and not those of the community who own the resources.</p> | <p>The ULDA is involved in the planning for the Moranbah UDA to assist in accommodating a thriving major regional activity centre which has a key role in supporting the expansion of the Bowen Basin mining industry.</p> <p>In respect of non-resident worker accommodation the ULDA has developed the Non-Resident Worker</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | Accommodation Guideline to ensure that any new accommodation of this type is delivered to benefit both the occupants and town within which it is located. | |
| 24 | Would like to know whether expressions of interest for larger blocks of land (700sqm) will be available. | The sales and marketing strategy for the resultant ULDA development sites is still being determined. Interested persons can register to be updated on the Moranbah Urban Development Area through the ULDA's website. | N |
| 25 | Questions whether the ULDA has the power to override Council's land development. | Under the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007, the ULDA, and not Council, is responsible for the planning and assessment of development in declared Urban Development Areas (UDAs) across the State. | N |
| 26 | Responses to key questions were incomplete and inadequate in terms of detail and outcomes and delivered too late for appropriate community consideration. Necessary work to ensure community understands proposal was not undertaken. | <p>The ULDA consultation on the Development Scheme was above and beyond that required under the Act/ Consultation has included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two information newsletters delivered to all households; meetings with key land owners and ongoing consultation with Isaac Regional Council and State Agencies. - 2 week Structure Plan consultation. In relation to this there were three community information drop-in sessions held at the Moranbah Fair Shopping Centre – over 150 people consulted. During this time Draft Structure Plans and posters were available on the ULDA website. - 6 week Proposed Development Scheme consultation. In relation to this there were five community information drop-in sessions at the Moranbah Fair Shopping Centre – over 200 people consulted. During this time the Proposed Development Scheme and informational posters were available on the ULDA website. | N |
| 27 | Concern that the Nevtan Investments Pty Ltd. Development quashed by State Government would have had a dramatic and positive influence on the development of our town. | Noted, however this comment is not relevant to the ULDA's current preparation of the Development Scheme. | N |
| 28 | Concerns that releasing too much land will lower the value of existing land within the town. | The ULDA's principal role in Moranbah is to provide more land suitable for urban purposes and specifically address housing affordability. The Development Scheme achieves this by allocating additional land for urban purposes. It is a long term plan that responds to the impact of resource development in the region | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | and will assist in the provision of more affordability housing options | |
| 29 | Precinct Plans should address the integration of land use and transport planning provisions (DTMR). | Noted. Land uses and key transport routes (vehicular and pedestrian/cycle) are shown on the Precinct maps. | N |
| 29a | <p>In relation to Precinct 2 there is concern that the proposal threatens the future viability and development of very substantial volumes of metallurgical coal resources with investment, royalties and job consequences and that this warrants close scrutiny before any final decision is made.</p> <p>Recommends the scheme decision be deferred until this issue can be fully examined. (DEEDI)</p> | <p>A request to delay the Development Scheme process is unreasonable given that no future mining projects potentially located near Precinct 2 have yet progressed to EIS phase and consequently have neither been considered nor approved by the Coordinator General on behalf of the Government.</p> <p>The ULDA's plan identifying urban development on land within the southwest growth area have been in the public domain since last October and consequently there has been ample time for stakeholders to come forward with evidence to support these claims – which has not happened. The ULDA's plans take into consideration all currently approved mining projects within the region.</p> <p>The town footprint is heavily constrained by mining in all directions and a key role of the ULDA is to secure a growth area that can be protected from future adverse mining impacts so as to provide certainty for town growth, ensure health and safety of residents and to provide land to house future residents employed to service the expected future resource projects.</p> <p>If any submitter is an affected owner and does feel that their interests have been properly dealt with during the preparation of the Development Scheme they can ask the Minister to amend the submitted scheme to protect the interests as an owner.</p> | N |
| Drafting/Administrative/Editorial Comments | | | |
| 30 | Suggests that Section 1.0 of the Proposed Development Scheme requires commentary around transitional arrangements from the ILUP to the Development Scheme. Applications lodged under the ILUP would continue to be assessed under that document, and not defer to the Development Scheme, which if this was the case may result in the lodged application representing prohibited development. Explanation of these procedural transitional arrangements is considered warranted. | Within a UDA, whilst a Development Scheme is being prepared the Interim Land Use Plan regulates development. It is not necessary to include an explanation of transitional arrangements within the Development Scheme as s57 of the ULDA Act identifies the matters which must be taken into consideration when making a decision. | N |
| 31 | Reference to Map 2 in the body of the text in Section 3.4.2 should be amended to <i>Map 3</i> . | Agreed. All map references have been checked and | Y |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | This sentence also repeats the content of Section 3.4.1. | amended. The repetition from Section 3.4.1 has been removed. | No. 1 |
| 32 | The content under the heading <i>Industry Zone</i> in 3.4.2, paragraph 2, is incomplete. | Agreed. This content has been corrected. | Y No. 2 |
| 33 | <p>Suggests there is an inconsistency between the level of assessment within the ILUP and the Development Scheme for residential housing on allotments less than 450m². It is submitted that the level of assessment for the Residential Zone in Section 3.0 of the Proposed Development Scheme results in an unintended consequence, with housing on allotments less than 450m² requiring a UDA development application to be made to the ULDA.</p> <p>Recommends that the Proposed Development Scheme be amended to reflect the ILUP level of assessment for Precinct 1 to ensure consistency and equity in the delivery of housing in the transition from the ILUP to the Development Scheme.</p> | <p>The levels of assessment table have been amended to provide more clarity as to if and when an application for development needs to be made to the ULDA, particularly in respect of housing.</p> <p>It is now clearly stated that development for a House is 'exempt' development under the Development Scheme if all of the following apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. On a lot 450m² or more b. A frontage of 12.5m or more c. The House does not include a secondary dwelling d. The development complies with the acceptable solutions in Element 1 of the Queensland development code (QDC), MP1.2 – Design and siting standard for single detached housing – on lots 450m² and over*. <p>(* The development scheme identifies compliance with certain provisions of the QDC as a criterion for development for a House to be exempt development despite the statement in QCD MP1.2 that it does not apply to development in an urban development area.)</p> | Y No. 4 |
| 34 | <p>Concern regarding Footnote 19 which states that under Precinct 3 Provisions the ULDA Guidelines prevail over the Belyando Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Requests clarification as to how this reference will be interpreted with the new Isaac Regional Council Planning Scheme which will supersede the Belyando Planning Scheme.</p> | <p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>The references to the Planning Scheme have been rationalised and now contained within section 3.2.8 Table 1.</p> <p>When a new Planning Scheme is prepared for the Isaac Region the Development Scheme will need to be amended to reflect any relevant changes.</p> | Y No. 5 |
| 35 | Request to amend plans to correctly label Goonyella Road and Moranbah Access Road. (DTMR) | Noted and amended. | Y No. 11 |
| 36 | Request the further clarification in the Development Scheme regarding the level of assessment and the assessment manager for land identified on the Environmental | All land registered on the EMR or CLR will be managed in accordance with the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the Draft Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Contaminated Land | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>Management Register or Contaminated Land Register, particularly in the case of “public housing” developments.</p> <p>(DoC)</p> | <p>in Queensland. All land will be fit for its intended purpose.</p> <p>This is addressed in ULDA Guideline No. 14 <i>Environment and Natural Resources Sustainability</i>.</p> <p>The ULDA is responsible for assessment of development applications involving land included on the EMR or CLR. The ULDA’s practice is to seek advice from DERM on such applications before making a decision. Normal processes managed by DERM will still apply to remove land from a register.</p> | |
| 37 | <p>Page 9, Section 3.3.6. The issues raised in footnotes 2 and 3 are issues that should be addressed now, as part of master planning for the UDA. These are not issues that can easily be resolved if left to the development application stage.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Strategic issues in relation to these constraints have been taken into account in the preparation of the Development Scheme. The further detailed analysis of these constraints can adequately be considered and resolved through the development assessment process.</p> | N |
| 38 | <p>Administrative Definitions, Page 33 reference to the planning scheme for Isaac Regional Council should be to the Belyando Planning Scheme, given that there is not currently a planning scheme for ISAAC REGIONAL COUNCIL.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Not considered necessary to make this amendment as the Belyando Planning Scheme 2009 is the relevant Planning Scheme at the time of the creation of the Development Scheme.</p> | N |
| Lack of affordable and accessible housing and housing choice | | | |
| 39 | <p>Concern that housing will favour transient accommodation and affordable housing with high density bias.</p> | <p>The Development Scheme supports the provision of permanent housing within Moranbah that provides choice and diversity through a mix of densities, types, design, tenures and levels of affordability to cater for a range of lifestyles, incomes and life cycle needs.</p> <p>Also refer to issue # 22 response.</p> | N |
| 40 | <p>Concern that the ULDA will assume the feedback from Moranbah and the community in the Adaptive Communities promotion is what everybody wants for accommodation (high density townhouses and units, motel-style townhouses and units, however it is only the community thoughts to solve the unbalanced 70% transient workforce that the government has approved and forced upon the community</p> <p>Concern the Council’s Adaptive Communities project relates to future transient accommodation and not what is needed in Moranbah’s housing situation.</p> | <p>It is assumed that the Adaptive Communities consultation undertaken by Isaac Regional Council (IRC) has been used by IRC to guide their feedback and submission to the ULDA in respect of the Development Scheme. The ULDA has not been provided with the specific outcomes of IRC’s Adaptive Communities consultation.</p> | N |
| 41 | <p>Requests that the ULDA recognise that as a</p> | <p>The Adaptive Communities consultation undertaken</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | result of the lack in detail in the proposed plan regarding impacts of temporary accommodation, the IRC's 'Adaptive Communities' consultation process has been compromised. | by Isaac Regional Council (IRC) is separate to the ULDA Development Scheme preparation process. The Development Scheme preparation has not compromised the 'Adaptive Communities' consultation which will help to guide Council for the future of the region, not just Moranbah. The Development Scheme process provided IRC with an opportunity to use the findings and outcomes of their Adaptive Communities consultation to inform their submission and comments to the ULDA. | |
| 42 | Would like to know who decides who is given housing and the type of housing. | The ULDA is working with Isaac Regional Council on mechanisms to retain affordable housing stock in the community and ensure that the target market is non-resource key workers. Refer also to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 43 | Concern regarding BMA's connection to the housing market and the lack of affordable housing associated. | Where the ULDA is not the owner of land we can work to help facilitate development and encourage the implementation of the Development Scheme outcomes. In respect of the ULDA's plans for affordable housing within the UDA refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 44 | Concern that the initial town plan done by the Moranbah Growth Management Group is being done all over again. | The outcomes of the previous Moranbah Growth Management Group work was used to inform the preparation of the Development Scheme however could not be reinstated due to new land constraints. Namely future potential dust impacts from mining developments to the south. | N |
| 45 | Suggests non-resident worker accommodation be included in Section 3.3.1 <i>New housing in the ULDA</i> as the MAC model facilitates housing choice, affordability and accessibility. | The Development Scheme defines 'non-resident worker accommodation' within the 'Residential Uses' category. Accordingly it is considered that 'non-resident worker accommodation' is a type of housing to meet the needs of the community and consequently aligns with the statement in section 3.3.1 (i). Accordingly an amendment is not considered necessary. | N |
| 46 | Inappropriate definition of Affordability - Disadvantaging Service Workers. Without definition, how do ULDA seek to improve affordability and apply affordability to service and professional workers currently disadvantaged on rents and housing prices. | The ULDA's definition of 'affordability' and 'affordable housing' comes from the ULDA's Affordable Housing Strategy which can be found on our website. | N |
| 47 | There is a need to prioritise land and housing planning. | Noted. The Government declared a UDA within Moranbah so that the ULDA can work to provide more affordable housing through the improved supply of residential land and a greater range of housing types to suit the | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | needs of the Moranbah community. Refer also to issue # 22 response. | |
| 48 | Recently approved unbalanced percentages highlights that the Government misunderstands that affordable housing solves some mining company's employment and staffing problems. | Comments noted. No change required to the Development Scheme. | N |
| 49 | Requests the land be made available for the development of appropriate housing in the short term. | The Development Scheme does assist in bringing new residential land to the market more quickly to meet both short and long-term housing needs. Refer also to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 50 | Request that non-resident worker accommodation does not dominate the range of housing options available. (DLGP) | The Development Scheme does not prioritise the provision of non-resident worker accommodation ahead of other residential uses. The role of the ULDA is to provide housing within Moranbah that provides choice and diversity through a mix of densities, types, design, tenures and levels of affordability to cater for a range of lifestyles, incomes and life cycle needs. Also refer to issue # 22 response. | |
| 51 | Requests that the plan takes into account the relative incomes of the community. | The strategy for who can buy dwellings is still being developed however the ULDA is working with the Council on mechanisms to retain this affordable housing stock in the community to ensure it does not end up in the general market. In doing so the ULDA is taking into consideration the relative incomes of key workers within the community. The ULDA is exploring the option of quarantining a proportion of the housing available to purchase specifically for low to moderate income households who indicate a preference to be permanent residents of Moranbah. Also refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| Lack of family housing | | | |
| 52 | Concerned that if BMA receive approval for the 100% FIFO proposal, planned residential integration will shift to favour transient accommodation over family housing. | The ULDA is not the decision maker in respect of any future application by BMA to request 100% FIFO nor is it the ULDA's role to make policy decisions on whether camps are appropriate or not in a town, or whether they should be located on mine sites. It is the responsibility of the Co-ordinator General to make decisions on employment arrangements, such as FIFO, for individual mines. Regardless of the decision of the Co-ordinator General the Development Scheme requirements do | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | <p>not prioritise the provision of non-resident worker accommodation ahead of other residential uses. The role of the ULDA is to provide housing within Moranbah that provides choice and diversity through a mix of densities, types, design, tenures and levels of affordability to cater for a range of lifestyles, incomes and life cycle needs.</p> <p>Also refer to issue # 22 response.</p> | |
| 53 | <p>Concern raised that the ULDA believes many people do not consider Moranbah a permanent place to live so therefore they will not provide home with a big yard and space for children.</p> | <p>There are many different types of families and permanent residents, many who are single, that require housing within Moranbah, either for purchase or rental. The Development Scheme works to ensure that there will be a variety of housing types, sizes and forms on offer for residents to choose from. As there will be diversity in the housing provided traditional size homes and lot sizes will also be available.</p> | N |
| Future Retail and Commercial Development /Ted Rolfe Oval/Centre vitality and employment | | | |
| 54 | <p>Concern regarding a retail focus in the Town Square, as opposed to Moranbah Fair which is the current retail heart of town. Allowing redevelopment of the Ted Rolfe Oval will negatively impact current businesses.</p> | <p>The ULDA procured a Retail and Commercial Assessment for Moranbah to support the preparation of the Development Scheme (<i>Moranbah Retail and Commercial Assessment prepared for the Urban Land Development Authority by Macroplan Australia Pty Ltd, March 2011, Final Report</i>). This report is called up within the Development Scheme to further guide the intents for each commercial area and to provide further guidance to development assessment. This report identifies that additional retail and commercial activities, including a full-line supermarket of approximately 4000m² on the Ted Rolfe Oval site could be viable within Moranbah given the expected population growth. The report has been undertaken to ensure that any additional commercial and retail uses would not adversely impact on the continuation of the Town Centre being the focus for retail and community focus within the town.</p> | N |
| 55 | <p>Concern around availability of staff for new retail centres.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to issue # 22 response.</p> <p>In addition the provision of more affordable housing options will assist in the attraction and retention of key workers to staff new retail centres.</p> | N |
| 56 | <p>Questions whether the ULDA has to demonstrate how they will offset the loss of open space should redevelopment of Ted Rolfe Oval go ahead.</p> | <p>During the preparation of the Development Scheme the ULDA has considered previous work undertaken by the former Moranbah Growth Management Group and Isaac Regional Council in relation to surplus land and potential redevelopment opportunities. In brief the open space provision within the town is in excess of the requirements and given that there are many</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | constraints on town expansion the need to reconsider how land within the town is being used is a necessity. In addition the ULDA has also undertaken much consultation with IRC about their desires for the town and there is considerable support for the redevelopment of this space. Current uses on the Ted Rolfe Oval site are intermittent and can be accommodated on other sites within the town. | |
| 57 | Believes that by putting shops on Appleton Street will not reinforce the Town Square. | Isaac Regional Council are supportive of the retail and commercial growth of the Town Centre to include redevelopment of the Ted Rolfe Oval site and into Appleton Street. The Retail and Commercial Assessment for Moranbah (<i>Moranbah Retail and Commercial Assessment prepared for the Urban Land Development Authority by Macroplan Australia Pty Ltd, March 2011, Final Report</i>) will be used to guide the implementation of the Development Scheme and ensure the viability of the Town Centre. This report will be updated in the future to ensure relevancy and reflect any changes in population projections. | N |
| 58 | Questions what will be different in the redevelopment of the Ted Rolfe Oval from the previous proposal of Council's. | There is currently no development application being considered in respect of the Ted Rolfe Oval site. Any future development proposed on this site will need to be undertaken in accordance with the Development Scheme and in particular the requirements contained within Precinct 1. In addition the Retail and Commercial Report by Macroplan will be used to guide the size, type and nature of any uses proposed on the site. | N |
| 59 | Proposes the Development Scheme provide distinction between traditional town centre vitality and non-resident worker accommodation facility ancillary uses to avoid misinterpretation when assessing proposals that include central facilities. | It is not necessary to provide further distinction between the retail and commercial uses considered within the Mixed Use Zones and any Non-resident worker accommodation uses proposed. As amended within the Precinct and Sub-Precinct requirements Non-resident worker accommodation proposed to be located in close proximity to the retail activity centres are not to be 'larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation uses (i.e. of 100 rooms or greater or that include private mess facilities, camp style accommodation or donga-style buildings). The ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> provides further clarification about the nature and type of ancillary facilities considered appropriate in relation to non-resident worker accommodation. | N |
| Neighbourhood, block and lot design | | | |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 60 | Questions whether land will be delivered at 800sqm as has been previously. | The Development Scheme works to ensure that there will be a variety of housing types, sizes and forms on offer for residents to choose from. As there will be diversity in the housing provided traditional size homes and lot sizes will also be available. | N |
| 61 | Questions what controls the ULDA put on the land in the south west growth area and the size of blocks. | The requirements in respect of Precinct 2 are identified within the Precinct Map, the Precinct provisions and the sub-precinct provisions. | N |
| 62 | Suggested inclusion of the following in 3.3.3 to encourage high quality accommodation: <i>"Provides facilities for residents to access appropriate recreation uses and social interaction".</i> | It is not necessary to provide further criteria within s3.3.3 in respect of the design of non-resident accommodation villages given that the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> goes into detail about the design requirements and the appropriateness of ancillary uses. | N |
| 63 | Small lots exhibit a high degree of fragmented ownership making it difficult for other parties to acquire and develop land to meet their requirements especially given Moranbah's limited development footprint. | Noted, however the number of small lots with fragmented ownerships contained within the boundaries of the UDA is very small and is not considered to be a significant hindrance to redevelopment opportunities provided for under the Development Scheme. | N |
| 64 | Accommodation must incorporate a mix of units and houses to meet the different needs of community members, including resource industry employees. | Noted. The Development Scheme provides for this. | N |
| 65 | Suggests that the scheme should include the need to achieve the highest possible urban design outcomes. (IRC) | Noted. The Development Scheme already does this. As stated within Section 1.1 (iv) a key role of the ULDA is to facilitate the planning principles that give effect to ecological sustainability and best practice urban design. All Development Scheme criteria, and associated guidelines have been drafted on this basis. | N |
| Building heights and density | | | |
| 66 | Large amounts of high density living will change the family orientation of the town. There is a preference on stand-alone houses. Concerned that high density housing will override family housing. | The densities proposed within the Development Scheme are generally higher than those which have been developed to date within the town. At present the town is experiencing high growth due to the current expansion pressures of the local coal mining operations and lacks both affordable and diverse housing types to respond to the growth pressures. As such the town is under considerable housing stress and is not able to provide for the needs of key workers or those not able to access subsidized | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | <p>housing. In order to assist in the provision of more affordable and diverse housing stock given the land use constraints it is necessary to increase densities, for so long as they are adequately designed and located to ensure the amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents. The provisions of the Development Scheme and the associated guidelines provide the necessary criteria to ensure that the higher density developments are undertaken and assessed in accordance with best practice urban design principles. The increased housing diversity will provide more options for the various types of family units and residents that want to locate in Moranbah.</p> <p>Any expansion to the existing Moranbah township is highly constrained as evidenced within the constraints map included in Appendices. Accordingly in order to sustain the growing population and ensure that the town can support this growing population into the future it is to contemplate and cater for increased housing densities, albeit designed appropriately in association with best practice urban design criteria to ensure the amenity and wellbeing of all residents.</p> | |
| 67 | Does not support proposed densities and believes it should be limited to 3 storeys. Preference to rural-style housing that is mostly single dwellings on single blocks as opposed to rows of units. | <p>Within the residential zone the Development Scheme provides for heights that are up to around 3 storeys in height. Up to four storeys is considered appropriate within the mixed use zone and in very close proximity to the town centre. Due to the constraints on expansion opportunities, if the town wants to grow to meet expected population projections then it cannot to do so on the basis of only single dwellings on large allotments. A variety of housing types, styles and sizes need to be provided to assist in the provision of affordable housing and meeting population projection needs.</p> <p>Also refer to issue # 66 response.</p> | N |
| 68 | Concern regarding the proposed density of 60 dwellings per hectare at Arkana Terrace. | The scheme identifies that up to around 60 dwellings to the hectare may be considered. This is not a 'minimum' target and consequently the types of densities within this area will be market driven. The opportunities for higher density reflect those locations within close proximity to the town centre and have ready walking access to key facilities. | N |
| 69 | Proposes further clarification regarding building heights for non-resident accommodation opposed to standard residential housing to provide a degree of developer confidence. | The ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> identifies that heights are generally one to two storeys and only higher if it is considered that there will be no adverse impacts on amenity – if this is the case then the heights in the Residential Zone provide this further guidance. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 70 | <p>The scheme does not appropriately limit village/camp-style rooms and medium to high density unit development to promote a significant majority of detached residential housing development inline with Council's goal for a significant majority of permanent residential population in the community of 70%. (IRC)</p> | <p>The ULDA's role in Moranbah is not to make policy decisions on whether camps area appropriate or not in the town, or whether they should be located on mine sites. It is the responsibility of the Co-ordinator General to make decisions on employment arrangements, such as FIFO, for individual mines.</p> <p>The ULDA's role is to introduce a plan that will integrate any suitable camps that are proposed, by ensuring that they are appropriately located and by applying development standards that achieve a high level of amenity.</p> <p>The Development Scheme has been amended to identify areas where it may be considered suitable for larger-scale camp style accommodation, and the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> establishes design benchmarks to achieve high quality development.</p> <p>Given that the UDA does not incorporate the entirety of the town of Moranbah it is an impractical mechanism to implement through development regulation and assessment of individual applications within the Urban Development Area.</p> | N |
| 71 | <p>Opposes density restrictions on Council owned land. (IRC)</p> | <p>The location of zonings, heights and densities proposed within the Development Scheme have been based on planning principles such as location, development constraints and opportunities, amenity and proximity to the town centre and other retail and commercial areas not land ownership.</p> <p>There is no justification for changes to the densities allowable on Council owned land. The density provisions contained within the Development Scheme are not absolute maximums or minimums but provide guidance as to what can be reasonably expected within the relevant precinct. Absolute maximums and minimums are not detailed within the Development Scheme so as to allow proposed development to respond adequately to market needs and consideration will be given to this in respect of any development application.</p> | N |
| 72 | <p>Building heights up to 3 storeys are proposed on along Grosvenor Creek, Goonyella Road and the Village Centre; however taller buildings would be considered if supported by the ULDA.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Building heights are generally in the range of up to 3 storeys (11.5m). As stated within the Development Scheme greater heights may be considered if sufficient grounds are provided and considered appropriate for the location.</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 73 | <p>Seeks an amendment to the Development Scheme to remove specific density controls for residential development within the northern side of Grosvenor Creek in Precinct 2 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the land is a gently sloping, Greenfield site approved for subdivision for multiple dwelling development making it readily available for development at higher residential densities • the land is well separated from the existing urban area of Moranbah by the cemetery to the north and Goonyella Access Road to the east so it can be developed for higher residential densities without adversely impacting existing residential character or amenity. Stage 3 of Grosvenor Estate is to the west of the land in question and is a developing area without a well established sense of character or identity • the land is well separated from urban areas so it can be developed at higher residential densities without adversely impacting on future urban areas • Grosvenor Creek would provide natural boundary to define and contain the extent of the higher density residential area • The land will be within or surround a Mixed Use zone which is intended to provide a range of commercial, retail, dining, entertainment and community, therefore making it logical to maximise the density of residential development. Net residential densities of up to 60 dwellings per hectare are supported elsewhere by the Scheme on Residential zoned land adjoining Mixed Use zoned land elsewhere in Moranbah (Precinct 1) • The land adjoins an extensive areas of Civic and Open Space zone land to be dedicated as parkland making it logical to maximise the density of residential development closest to areas of public open space • The land slopes towards Grosvenor Creek • The Scheme places no limitation on the density of short term accommodation and non-resident worker accommodation within the residential Zone, relying on | <p>In response to this submission the location of the Mixed Use Zone has been slightly amended so as to better reflect the development aspirations for the site. Upon review of the submission it was considered that the request was reasonable and supported that it does not change the intent of the zone within this area, and did not change the intent that the Town Centre would still be reinforced as the retail and commercial heart of the town.</p> <p>As stated within the Development Scheme greater heights and densities may be considered during the assessment of a development application if sufficient grounds are provided and considered appropriate for the location.</p> | Y No. 7 |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>design criteria to indirectly control densities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development infrastructure has been designed to accommodate the demand generated by higher density residential development. <p>Alternatively if the ULDA is uncomfortable with the approach, a net residential density of 60 dwellings per hectare could be applied to all land in Precinct 2.</p> | | |
| 74 | <p>Amendment is suggested for the maximum building heights to confirm a building height of up to 4 storeys is supported in the Mixed Use Zone, to allow development up to 4 storeys in strategic locations within the Residential Zone and to allow for roof-top gardens in both the Mixed Use and Residential Zone.</p> | <p>It is not considered appropriate to change the scheme in this respect.</p> <p>As stated within the Development Scheme greater heights and densities may be considered during the assessment of a development application if sufficient grounds are provided and considered appropriate for the location.</p> | N |
| 75 | <p>Inconsistency in the provision of 4 storey development in the Mixed Use Zone while limiting development in Precinct 2 to 2-3 storeys.</p> | <p>It is not considered appropriate to change the scheme in this respect.</p> <p>As stated within the Development Scheme greater heights and densities may be considered during the assessment of a development application if sufficient grounds are provided and considered appropriate for the location.</p> | N |
| Infrastructure, street design and parking, including pedestrian and cycle | | | |
| 76 | <p>An additional constraint on future growth areas is the proposed future expansion for the Goonyella rail system, which has identified duplication of the rail line with associated infrastructure upgrades.</p> | <p>Whilst this is a constraint it is not considered to impact upon the proposed urban areas within Precinct 2 given that the rail line is a considerable distance away from the proposed Residential Zone.</p> | N |
| 77 | <p>Suggested inclusion of the following in 3.3.5 to encourage high quality accommodation: <i>“Provides adequate bus parking onsite to avoid on-street heavy vehicle parking”.</i></p> | <p>No justification to warrant this change to the Development Scheme. The ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> establishes design benchmarks to achieve high quality development for these uses.</p> | N |
| 78 | <p>The Scheme should allow new developments to accommodate public transport facilities and infrastructure, particularly in the development of non-resident accommodation.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to Section 3.3.5, Page 8: <i>“New use, works and lots are designed and infrastructure included accommodating public</i></p> | <p>The scheme does not disallow the consideration of these aspects. Moranbah currently does not have a public transport system and there have been no plans for this to happen in the near future by either Council or DTMR.</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <i>transport</i> . (DTMR) | | |
| 79 | Pedestrian and cycle paths to be identified with key routes on Precinct Maps – mesh grid pattern based on 500-700m spacing between paths (as per mark ups on Attachments 1 and 2 of submission). (DTMR) | Relevant inclusion of pedestrian and cycle paths have been incorporated into the Precinct maps. | Y No. 11 |
| 80 | Precinct intent statements should include requirements for high quality cycle paths to local services and key attractors with cycle facilities at key end destinations. Precinct Intents should include: <i>“promote and facilitate high quality walking and cycling facilities to local parks, services and key attractors including the provision of cycling parking facilities”</i> , with a footnote reference to Ausroads Part 6A. (DTMR) | Section 3.3.5 already covers cycle connections to key destinations. No amendment is proposed in this regard. | N |
| Transport and connectivity issues | | | |
| 81 | DTMR is interested in working with the ULDA to develop a transport impact study that considers planning work in relation to potential traffic yields to the state controlled road of Moranbah Access Road and Peak Downs Highway intersection to align with the Infrastructure plan and the Implementation Strategy to determine appropriate contributions and upgrades to infrastructure. (DTMR) | Noted. No amendment is necessary however as the Implementation Strategy already states that the ULDA will consult with DTMR in relation to upgrading/or contributions to upgrading of state controlled roads in the vicinity of the UDA. This would also involve Council given that the UDA does not extend to the entirety of the town. | N |
| 82 | Request to identify bus stop to clearly identify public transport nodes in each precinct. (DTMR) | Moranbah currently does not have a public transport system and there have been no plans for this to happen in the near future by either Council or TMR. The Development Scheme does not hinder this from occurring in the future as necessary. | N |
| 83 | Request that the Vision plan graphically depict connectivity across Goonyella/Moranbah Access Road to connect commercial, employment and residential nodes. (DTMR) | The implementation strategy has been amended to identify this as an ongoing issue to resolve with IRC and TMR. There is already safe pedestrian connectivity provided across Goonyella/Moranbah Access Road via the underpass | Y No. 15 |
| Flooding and bushfire issues | | | |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| 84 | <p>Flooding of Grosvenor Creek needs to be considered as additional development has and will continue to have impact on possible flooding.</p> <p>Low lying area around Grosvenor Creek has the potential to flood Goonyella Road, affecting the proposed Precinct 2.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The constraints map included within the Appendices shows the Q100 flood affected land. Development is not proposed to be located within any land subject to flooding.</p> <p>Land that is known to flood, in accordance with Q100 is zoned either Rural or Civic and Open Space.</p> <p>The constraints map has been amended to reflect the operational works approval granted by Council on the land directly to the north of Grosvenor Creek and adjacent to Goonyella Road.</p> <p>An additional footnote has been included to identify that subject to the outcomes of the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry the provisions of the development scheme with respect to flooding and flood risk may be subject to change.</p> | Y No. 17 |
| 85 | <p>The Moranbah UDA Development Scheme includes a constraints map which includes the 1% AEP for flooding and the scheme requires that development applications demonstrate that the development will not be impacted by the constraints included on that map.</p> <p>(DCS)</p> | Noted. | N |
| 86 | <p>The planning scheme requires that Q100 flood free access is provided to Precinct 2.</p> <p>(DCS)</p> | Noted. | N |
| 87 | <p>The planning scheme commits to development responding to the constraints of the land including bushfire risk but does not identify bushfire hazard areas on the constraints map. DCS requests that any areas of medium and high bushfire hazard be included in the planning scheme constraints mapping.</p> <p>(DCS)</p> | <p>The constraints map has been updated to identify bushfire hazard areas. There are no areas of high bushfire hazard identified within the UDA however the Appendices now contains a map provided by DCS to indicate areas of possible medium bushfire hazard.</p> | Y No. 18 |
| Environmental Concerns including air quality, dust and noise impacts and contaminated land | | | |
| 88 | <p>Concerns regarding potential health impacts on future development in proximity to the Caval Ridge open cut coal mine in Precinct 2.</p> <p>(DLGP)</p> | <p>Given the towns proximity to numerous existing and potential future mine, is it understandable that concerns regarding the potential health implications have been raised, particularly in respect of dust pollution.</p> <p>The Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) administers the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the Environmental Protection (Air) Policy</p> | Y No. 6 |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | <p>1997 (EPP(Air)).</p> <p>As stated on the DERM website "...inhalable particles (those with diameter less than 10µm) are commonly understood to pose the greatest risk to human health. There have been extensive studies into the health effects of different levels of particles and pollution mixes. However, no studies have yet determined a threshold value for long-term or short-term exposure below which no adverse health effects are observed". The EPP(Air) goal for annual average PM₁₀ concentrations is 50µg/m³ (not to be exceeded more than five days per year) and although DERM monitors PM₁₀ in south-east Queensland, Gladstone, Rockhampton, Mackay and Townsville there is currently no monitoring being undertaken by the department in relation to Moranbah.</p> <p>The Caval Ridge Mine (CRM) project is the most recently approved mine project in close proximity to Precinct 2. This project was assessed by the Coordinator General who, upon review of the project material which included air quality reports and referrals to both DERM and Qld Health, approved the project subject to conditions. The conditions in relation to air quality are provided as a choice of either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adhering strictly to the 50µg/m³ PM₁₀ limit, or - adopting 'high management control measures' on days where meteorological conditions indicate that the 50µg/m³ PM₁₀ limit is likely to be exceeded if additional changes to mine management practices are not implemented. <p>As the second option is being used for the first time in Queensland, the Coordinator General also imposed a condition which requires a review of that approach after 24 months operation of the CRM. The Coordinator General's Report can be viewed at: http://www.dlqp.qld.gov.au/resources/project/bma-bowen/caval-ridge/cg-report-caval-ridge.pdf</p> <p>The constraints map included within the Development Scheme reflects the anticipated air quality impacts (for 50µg/m³ PM₁₀) from the approved Caval Ridge mine project, as it relates to the EPP(Air) goal for annual average PM₁₀ concentrations..</p> <p>As evidenced from the constraints map the Development Scheme does not propose to site any urban development where it is considered that the air quality would not meet the EPP (Air) objective for</p> | |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | <p>PM₁₀.</p> <p>Qld Health have identified that they support the residential areas within Precinct 2 as proposed within the Development Scheme as they have been proposed outside of the predicted dust impact areas (in particular the predicted 24 hour average airborne particulate matter contour line denoting concentrations of 50µg/m³ for particulate matter less than 10µm (PM₁₀)) modelled as part of the BMA Caval Ridge Mine project. Queensland Health have however raised concern that the dust modelling results represent ground level concentrations of particulate matter and that the concentration of air pollutants can increase slightly with an elevated receptor depending on the source location/source type, pollutant being considered, topography etc. Given Qld Health's request the Development Scheme has been amended to ensure that the DA phase can adequately address any buffering issues (such as increased setbacks for uses over 1 storey) in relation to the urban development and that both QLD Health and DERM are further consulted at this stage</p> <p>Further information regarding airborne particulates, and in particular PM₁₀, can be accessed on the DERM website: http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/environmental_management/air/air_quality_monitoring/air_pollutants/airborne_particulates.html</p> | |
| 89 | <p>Concern that the scheme is inconsistent with previous State Resource Declarations and does not address coal resource areas.</p> <p>Concern raised that the scheme is inconsistent with existing legislation; overlapping Restricted Area 352 proclaimed under <i>Mineral Resources Regulation 2003</i> and does not address the prior rights conferred to resource companies operating within the area.</p> | <p>The Development Scheme is consistent with the Government's intent and objective for securing a future south west growth area for the town.</p> | N |
| 90 | <p>Precinct 2 should not be redeveloped into a sports and recreation area due to potential dust and health issues.</p> | <p>The ULDA has been consulting with DERM and Qld Health in respect of dust impacts on Precinct 2. The urban uses are proposed to be located outside of the predicted dust impact area.</p> | N |
| 91 | <p>Concern that the removal of trees on land adjacent to Archer Drive will create extra noise and dust from the mining lease in the vicinity of the area.</p> | <p>The removal of vegetation near Archer Drive is not considered to substantially increase noise or dust from mining activities to the south. The impacts of the Caval Ridge mine project were taken into consideration by the Coordinator General as part of the Caval Ridge Mine Project EIS.</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 92 | <p>Residential precincts within the proposed designated area should not be sited in areas where the air quality may be prejudicial to human health. This would include air emissions from existing and future commercial and industrial facilities. Particular attention should be paid to the predicted air emissions from the Caval Ridge Mine expansion and the effects on the proposed Precinct 2. Under the proposed Development Scheme, Queensland Health supports residential areas within Precinct 2 north of the predicted 24 hours average airborne particulate matter contour line denoting concentrations of 50µg/m³ for particulate matter less than 10µm (PM₁₀). Any elevated residential dwellings (ie up to 3 storeys as described within Precinct 2 outcomes) should be appropriately set back from the 24 hours average PM₁₀ 50µg/m³ contour line to ensure upper levels are not adversely exposed. This criterion has been set by the Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) to ensure human health and wellbeing is not adversely affected and is also an air quality goal within the <i>Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 2008 (EPP Air)</i>.</p> <p>(QLD Health)</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Specific criteria has been included within Precinct 2 to ensure that QLD Health's requirements can be met and that ongoing consultation occurs with QLD Health and DERM in respect of future development applications on this site.</p> | <p>Y No. 6</p> |
| 93 | <p>Request to amend the scheme to ensure land is removed from the CLR/EMR prior to works (other than for decontamination) or a sensitive use commencing. Furthermore, land must be remediated to remove it from the CLR/EMR prior to works (other than for decontamination) or a sensitive use commencing.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>All land registered on the EMR or CLR will be managed in accordance with the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the Draft Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Contaminated Land in Queensland. All land will be fit for its intended purpose.</p> <p>This is addressed in ULDA Guideline No. 14 <i>Environment and Natural Resources Sustainability</i>.</p> <p>The ULDA is responsible for assessment of development applications involving land included on the EMR or CLR. The ULDA's practice is to seek advice from DERM on such applications before making a decision. Normal processes managed by DERM will still apply to remove land from a register.</p> | <p>N</p> |
| 94 | <p>SPP 5/10: <i>Air, Noise and Hazardous Materials</i> is anticipated to take effect in the near future.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>N</p> |
| 95 | <p>The scheme should demonstrate how industrial activities will be effectively separated and/or buffered from incompatible or sensitive land</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>The scheme has been amended to include a 50m</p> | <p>Y No. 10</p> |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| | uses and how the industrial uses will not be prejudiced by the intrusion of incompatible developments. (DERM) | buffer between existing industrial uses and future residential uses. | |
| 96 | Recommendation that a comprehensive cumulative impact study to address air quality issues be conducted. Until this is undertaken it is difficult to determine how future planning can proceed with any certainty. DERM reiterates that the ULDA seek information from QLD Health on potential health impacts, particularly in the south-west growth area. (DERM) | The ULDA is not the appropriate body to conduct the requested assessment as the UDA boundary only takes in land that was already identified for urban purposes under the Belyando Planning Scheme 2009. QLD Health have been consulted and are supportive of urban development in Precinct 2 subject to further development application details being reviewed at the development assessment stage. Amendments have been made to the Development Scheme in line with Qld Health's recommendations. | Y No. 6 |
| 97 | Request that the scheme ensure any proposed development that has the potential to be impacted by, or impact on, the refuse tip is referenced in the document and assessment criteria applied in order to assess potential impacts. (DERM) | The refuse tip is not located within the UDA nor is it within close proximity to any urban areas proposed within the UDA boundaries. | N |
| 98 | Request that any proposed development that has the potential to impact on Petroleum Lease, Mining Lease and/or MDLs is referenced in the document and assessment criteria applied, where applicable, to assess potential impacts. (Qld Health) | Noted and agreed. Precinct 2 has been amended to ensure that QLD Health's requirements can be met and that ongoing consultation occurs with QLD Health and DERM in respect of future development applications on this site. | Y No. 6 |
| Concern regarding Wildlife Management, vegetation and native title | | | |
| 99 | Concern that the land behind Archer Drive is home to many species of wildlife and development will remove this. | ULDA engaged a third party consultant to undertake an ecological assessment of the subject site, including mapping and database reviews and field surveys. Field surveys recorded no threatened flora or fauna species on site and no significant populations of migratory fauna species. The assessment concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impact on threatened fauna or flora species, migratory bird species, corridor values, Referable Wetlands or vegetation communities. | N |
| 100 | With regard to section 2.0 Strategic Context, page 3, the principles of the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i> (NCA) and its subordinate regulatory instruments are not | The Nature Conservation Act 1992 (NCA) sits outside of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and as such it is applicable to development occurring within the UDA. The ULDA have referenced the NCA in ULDA | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>addressed.</p> <p>It is suggested that the following words be inserted under 'Manage environmental values by:</p> <p><i>“ Identify and manage threatening processes that are capable of impacting the viability of protected plants and animals in the local area.”</i></p> <p>Recommendation that an amendment to the Development Scheme include guidelines and/or criteria for assessment to ensure development application comply with the provisions of the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i> as follows:</p> <p>Section 3.3.6, pages 9-10</p> <p>1. Where there is a requirement for clearing of plants protected under the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i>:</p> <p>clearing of protected plants must only occur in accordance with a clearing permit or an exemption under the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i>;</p> <p>offsets must be provided for the permanent loss (take) of near threatened, rare, vulnerable and endangered plants to achieve an equivalent or better overall outcome at a regional scale in accordance with the Queensland Government Environmental Offsets Policy 2008 and generally in accordance with the Queensland Government Policy for Biodiversity Offsets (Consultation Draft).</p> <p>2. Where the activities of the proponent may cause disturbance to animal breeding places the prior approval from DERM of a Species Management Plan must be obtained.</p> <p>Where there is a need to take fauna, the prior approval from DERM must be obtained.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Guideline no. 14 Environment and Natural Resources Sustainability and stated that it applies. No amendments to the Development Scheme are considered necessary.</p> <p>http://www.ulda.qld.gov.au/_dbase_upl/ULDA_Guideline_14_Environment_and_Natural_Resources_Sustainability.pdf</p> | |
| 101 | <p>Request to amend the scheme to incorporate mechanisms that describe potential impacts to existing native fauna species (including changes to suites of species and ecological processes) which may be affected by the proposal. Describe the management of fauna species during and after construction phases. This section should address animal safety and welfare during construction phase. This section needs to specify requirements regarding</p> | <p>Aspects of rehabilitation and management are dealt with in the ULDA Guideline no. 14 Environment and Natural Resources Sustainability.</p> <p>The Development Scheme provides appropriate offsets for the removal of vegetation.</p> <p>The constraints maps have been updated to include Endangered Regional Ecosystem (which are located outside of the UDA urban development footprint).</p> | <p>Y No. 20</p> |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>recording and notification of death or injury of wildlife caused by operations to DERM. Describe mitigation or offset options that may be required as a result of the proposal (i.e. artificial boxes); mitigation and offsets should be consistent with the <i>Queensland Environmental Offsets Policy</i> and <i>Draft Biodiversity Offsets Strategy</i>.</p> <p>Request to amend the Constraints Map to include areas of remnant vegetation in addition to the areas of high value growth.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>The constraints map reflects potentially impacted vegetation types that are required to be offset and as such only reflect High Value regrowth containing Endangered Regional Ecosystems (sub dominant). All of DERMs Remnant, High Value regrowth vegetation and essential habitat mapping was taken into account in preparation of the Development Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to rehabilitation, the specific requirements will be determined at the Development Assessment stage. Endangered RE is not planned to be disturbed, and as such has not been included in the rehabilitation requirements. Rehabilitation will likely include planting, but will also differ with each Development Application. The minimum requirement for rehabilitation will be determined at the DA stage.</p> <p>In this UDA the level of vegetation protection achieved is the same as that achieved under the Vegetation Management Act in an Urban area.</p> | |
| 102 | <p>Reference is made to the definition of 'Significant Vegetation'. Suggestion to amend the definition to"</p> <p><i>"Means all vegetation, except those listed as pest vegetation by State or local government, that is significant in one or more of the following..."</i></p> <p>Further request to amend the definition to include remnant vegetation and high value regrowth.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Appropriate corrections to the typographical errors will be made.</p> | Y No. 16 |
| 103 | <p>Request that there is mention the Duty of Care referenced in the scheme in relation to environmental management</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Noted however no amendment to the Development Scheme as this is dealt with through the ULDA Guideline no. 14 Environment and Natural Resources Sustainability.</p> <p>An amendment has been included to update the name of this Guideline within the Development Scheme.</p> | Y No. G |
| Community open space and facilities issues | | | |
| 104 | <p>Concern regarding the ULDA's, Council's or other large company's power to purchase the cinema for alternate use as a meeting facility or accommodation.</p> | <p>The cinema is located outside the boundaries of the UDA.</p> <p>The Development Scheme only applies to land located within the Moranbah UDA.</p> | N |
| 105 | <p>Requests that development is not built on the town open areas as they are utilised by</p> | <p>A careful assessment of open space has been undertaken as part of the preparation of the Development Scheme. Many areas are in excess of</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | families. | need and can be developed. Appropriate levels of open space will be provided as part of the development process. Refer to issue # 56 response. | |
| 106 | Believes there is a shortage of parks for children to play in and suggests that vegetated parks and parkland be considered in all Precincts. | Section 3.3.3 Neighbourhood, block and lot design criteria states that parks are to be provided "...that cater for a variety of functions and experiences and that are safe and accessible for users". Further details about where these parks could be located are shown on the Precinct plans. | N |
| 107 | Does not support the open space of the Golf Club as a significant trade off for high density accommodation. | The entire golf course is not part of the UDA. The UDA boundary only takes in that part of the course that is currently unused and ongoing consultation is occurring with the club to understand their expansion needs and desires. | N |
| 108 | Believes the skate park should be retained and enlarged in a location close to the centre of town. | Should redevelopment of the Ted Rolfe Oval occur the skate park would be a consideration in the masterplanning process. Should the skate park not be able to be retained on the site it would be relocated, however noting the desire for it to be kept in close proximity to the town centre. This has been now detailed within the Implementation Strategy of the Development Scheme. | Y No. 12 |
| Arts and culture | | | |
| 109 | Arts and culture can be used to build stronger regional communities - socially, culturally, economically and environmentally. In times of change, such as this proposed development, arts-led approaches can help maintain a strong sense of community. By celebrating, preserving and engaging with local heritage, stories and traditions communities develop a shared sense of identity and belonging - this is missing in the Moranbah UDA. Artistic design themes that celebrate local heritage, stories or traditions of Moranbah ought to be incorporated into an open space strategy for the UDA. (Arts Qld) | The ULDA acknowledges the important role that public art can play in celebrating and further developing a sense of community identity and belonging. Therefore, the scope of the <i>Social, Cultural and Community Infrastructure Strategy</i> has been broadened to include the: "investigation and facilitation of opportunities to incorporate public art in conjunction with the development of key activity nodes and entry statements for the town within the UDA". Additionally, Precinct 2 outcomes have been amended to include the incorporation of "public art" on the corner of Goonyella Road and Moranbah Railway Station Road in order to enhance and compliment the existing entry to the town. | Y No. 14 & 6 |
| Family Entertainment | | | |
| 110 | Family entertainment in the town is needed. The town does not revolve around the men and workers. | Noted. The retail and commercial assessment undertaken to support the preparation of the Development Scheme identifies that there is scope to increase the amount of retail and commercial uses/activities within the | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | town, given the predicted ongoing population growth. The Development Scheme does not preclude family entertainment uses occurring within the UDA, particularly within the Mixed Use Zone or Civic and Open Space Zones. | |
| Residential Zone | | | |
| 111 | Concern regarding the removal of the 'Red Zone' from the initial draft mapping. | The Draft Structure Plan maps released for public consultation in October and November 2010 were draft and provided a guide as to how the Development Scheme preparation was progressing at that stage. Taking into account the feedback from the structure plan consultation and ongoing consultation with Council and State Agencies the Proposed Development Scheme was completed and released for a further 6 weeks of consultation. | N |
| 112 | There is no detail provided on the number of dwellings or population targets that the density targets are intended to deliver. | <p>In order for Macroplan to undertake a retail and commercial assessment of the town an analysis of the predicted population growth was undertaken and informed by, amongst other things, the release population figures released by the Office of Economic and Statistical Research (OESR) for the Bowen Basin. Given that population predictions are continually evolving they are not stated within the Development Scheme document but rather used in the background planning to guide the requirements of the Development Scheme.</p> <p>The Implementation Plan identifies that upon receipt of further updated projections by IRC or OESR the retail and commercial assessment report, and other associated reports, can be updated as necessary to provide additional guidance towards the implementation of the Development Scheme.</p> | Y No. 14 |
| Mixed Use Zone | | | |
| 113 | <p>Requests that the Mixed Use Zone be extended onto the northern block of the proposed 'Village Centre':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As land fronting Moranbah Access Road and Cunningham Road is most opportune for commercial/retail purposes due to high exposure to passing trade and accessibility. • To reinforce the 'active frontage' and 'indicative park location' designations on the northern side of Cunningham Road and reflect previous outcomes which supported the development of a specific commercial type use and short term | <p>Agree.</p> <p>This request is considered reasonable and supported in that it neither changes the intent of the zone within this area nor does it threaten the viability of the Town Centre or the fulfilment of the retail and commercial aspirations for the town, in accordance with the Retail and Commercial Assessment Report.</p> <p>The Precinct map for Precinct 2 has been amended.</p> | Y No. 7 |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-----------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>accommodation fronting Moranbah Access Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure integration of the commercial/retail uses with the residential and short term accommodation both vertically and horizontally to take advantage of cross utilisation of facilities such as car parking, waste disposal areas and infrastructure • To better centralise the 'activity node' within Grosvenor Estate improving walkability • To increase the extent of land within Precinct 2 where higher net residential densities are supported • As much of the Mixed Use zoned land is highly suited for the integration of non-resident workers accommodation due to walking distance within the facilities and services provided within the commercial centre and the Grosvenor Creek parkland area. <p>If the ULDA is uncomfortable zoning the recommend land in the Mixed Use, it could be limited to the critical land fronting Goonyella Road and both sides of Cunningham Road.</p> <p>Recommended that the ULDA amend the Development Scheme accordingly if concerned that the land use intents do not fully support the range of land uses proposed within the 'Village Centre'.</p> | | |
| Activity Node Intent | | | |
| 114 | The Development Scheme does not include any provisions about the intent or purpose of the Activity Nodes identified. | These intents are expressed in the Precinct provisions and through guidance by the Retail and Commercial Assessment report. | N |
| Industry Zone | | | |
| 115 | <p>Does not support the reintroduction of the Industry Zone under the Scheme. The change at the ILUP stage suggests there was a need to maximise residential and non-resident worker accommodation opportunities in lieu of Industry.</p> <p>Question regarding the demand for low impact industries that are identified in the Proposed Development Scheme for Industry Zone. Is not considered to be the highest and best use for</p> | The ULDA has been considering the appropriate land uses for these sites during the preparation of the Development Scheme. Upon consultation with other Government agencies and communities it is not considered that there is enough justification to change the intent of this area given that the majority of it is presently being used for industrial purposes. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>that part of Precinct 3.</p> <p>Recommends the Industry Zone be removed and the residential Zone extended over this zone to be consistent with the ILUP.</p> | | |
| 116 | Concern regarding the impact of the Industry Zone and the prohibition of residential uses over residual land that is not approved, or currently before the ULDA for non-resident worker accommodation. | <p>The current development application for non-resident worker accommodation will continue to be assessed by the ULDA in accordance with s57 of the ULDA Act which identifies the matters which must be taken into consideration when making a decision.</p> <p>See also issue # 115 response.</p> | N |
| 117 | Does not make sufficient consideration for the ongoing industrial land requirement of the community both present and future. | <p>The Development Scheme allows for the continued ongoing industrial operations within the UDA and support this by further zoning this land for industrial purposes. The Development Scheme does not remove any industrial land use zonings. The ongoing industrial land requirements for the town will need to be considered by Isaac Regional Council and incorporated into their future planning scheme processes.</p> <p>The Government objectives for ULDA involvement in Moranbah was not directed towards the provision of industry but rather the provision of housing choice and diversity to assist in the provision of affordable housing for key workers not involved in the resource industry.</p> | N |
| 118 | The scheme only provides for a small area of industrial zoned land within Precinct 3, most of which has been developed. | Refer to issue # 115 and # 117 responses. | N |
| 119 | There has not been any apparent consideration towards Moranbah's ongoing industrial land requirements and where this land will be accommodated. | Refer to issue # 115 and # 117 responses. | N |
| 120 | While the resource sector is an important element of the local economy, it is equally important that sufficient provision is made for other economic activities to be accommodated to provide complementary goods and services for both the resources sector and community. | <p>Refer to issue # 115 and # 117 responses.</p> <p>In respect of retail and commercial uses a retail and commercial assessment was undertaken to support the preparation of the Development Scheme and identifies that there is scope to increase the amount of retail and commercial uses/activities within the town, given the predicted ongoing population growth. The Development Scheme reflects these outcomes.</p> | N |
| Civic and Open Space Zone | | | |
| 121 | The scheme does not differentiate between Green Space (for environmental protection) and Open Space (more residential uses). It is not | The intent for the Civic and Open Space Zone has been identified within the Development Scheme along | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>always appropriate to have recreational activities conducted in areas of ecological significance or sensitivity.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | with appropriate uses. | |
| Precinct 1 | | | |
| 122 | <p>Concerns regarding the location of high density mixed-use areas in close proximity to local schools.</p> <p>Suggestion that land in the immediate vicinity of neighbouring the schools would be better developed as Civic Zones or built as family homes.</p> | There is no evidence to suggest that this type of development would impact adversely on schools. | N |
| 123 | Concerns that half of Precinct 1 is already developed land, dominated by ownership by a limited number of entities, with the potential that the land available for development will not be sufficient to achieve the planning objectives. | <p>Within Precinct 1 there is approximately 19 ha of State land which may have development potential and there is a further 11 ha of existing residential land that also has future redevelopment potential.</p> <p>This is a significant amount of land to achieve the planning objectives of the Development Scheme in regard to Precinct 1</p> | N |
| 124 | Suggests the ULDA exercises its powers to acquire, hold, dispose of and deal with property to enable the precinct to develop within a reasonable timeframe and that sufficient access to land is provided for. | The ULDA does not have compulsory acquisition powers but will work with landowners and Isaac Regional Council to achieve planned outcomes. | N |
| 125 | <p>Attachment 1 mark ups to Map 4 provides a more consolidated urban form with greater opportunities for sustainable transport systems.</p> <p>Suggested path additions for Map 4.</p> <p>(DTMR)</p> | Noted and amended as appropriate. | Y No. 11 |
| 126 | <p>Sewerage treatment plant buffer should be maintained within the UDA.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | Noted and accounted for within Precinct 1. | N |
| Precinct 2 | | | |
| 127 | Concern regarding the amount of available land for accommodation as most appears to be zoned rural or open space. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The land suitable for residential use in Precinct 2 has been determined using the constraints map contained within the Appendices. The south west growth area is constrained by flooding to the north, west and parts of the east (crossing Goonyella Road), a two kilometre fall-out zone from the Pistol club in the north-west portion and dust constraints from approved mining</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | south of the site. Through a compilation of these existing constraints, the amount of land suitable for residential development has been determined. | |
| 128 | Questions raised about whether the ULDA will deliver affordable units on land adjacent to Archer Drive and if they will be displayed prior to the project starting. | <p>The site adjacent to Archer Drive and the Boxing Club is the first site that the ULDA intent to develop for residential purposes. The application has been recently lodged for assessment and can be viewed on the ULDA website at: http://www.ulda.qld.gov.au/dad/devappdetails.aspx?ACTION=&x=TwYPuReAdxE%3d&tabId=tab1&Action=PREAPP</p> <p>This application will undergo public notification.</p> | N |
| 129 | Questions regarding the south west growth area and why it is not identified as high priority for development. | This site is considered as a priority to house the expected population projections for Moranbah and is reflected as such within Precinct 2 in the Development Scheme. | N |
| 130 | <p>Development should exclude the areas covered by EPC552 and MDL337, instead including alternate areas within Moranbah township and surrounds (west of Moranbah, current speedway and race course).</p> <p>Without excluding the areas referred to in issue #(ABOVE) (EPC552 and MDL377), the Scheme would lead to the effective sterilisation of the Moranbah South coal deposit - generating an estimated \$1.3b revenues. Inability to develop this part of the deposit would directly impact on viability of entire Moranbah South Coal Resource Areas project, restricting resource developments within the region and limit growth potential.</p> | <p>MDL 337 and EPC 552 do not correlate with the need for a zoning change on these areas. By declaring the south west growth area to be contained within the UDA boundary the Government has set a clear intent to support urban development on this site.</p> <p>This issue raised by the submitted is in itself inconsistent given that EPC552 incorporates the land that includes the race course and speedway and as a result. The race course and adjacent land may still be appropriate for future urban development but by itself does not provide enough land to meet the capacity demand predicted for the future. In addition this land is outside of the UDA boundary and would need to be progressed by the Council.</p> <p>The Anglo Coal Moranbah South Mine project EIS has not yet been submitted for consideration to the Government. The ULDA has taken into account all currently approved mining projects that may impact on the UDA.</p> | N |
| 131 | Area proposed for residential development is unsupported as it is far larger than the Council area in the south west growth area. | The area proposed as residential within Precinct 2 incorporates both privately owned land and an allotment owned by Council. | N |
| 132 | <p>Proposes that land to the south of Grosvenor Creek be considered suitable for non-resident accommodation and inclusion of rural portion of Lot 25 in the Residential Zone because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-permanent nature of accommodation villages • Villages are easily relocated and re-oriented with buffering to address | <p>Land within Precinct 2 can be considered for the provision of Non-resident worker accommodation in accordance with the Precinct and Sub-precinct requirements.</p> <p>There is no justification to change part of the rural zone to the residential zone.</p> <p>The Development Scheme has been amended to provide more clarity on the consideration of interim</p> | Y No. 3 |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>noise, dust and odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports scheme's interim land uses over short to medium term to maximise current available land. <p>Suggests this area would be more suitable to accommodate the expected non-resident workers.</p> | <p>land uses within the Rural Zone.</p> <p>The Rural Zone may accommodate unanticipated interim land uses that do not compromise the outcomes of Precinct 2, the amenity of the area, adjacent land uses or the long term use of the land for its intended purpose. Any interim land uses must be located outside of any areas identified as being subject to impacts from the approved Caval Ridge mine project.</p> <p>In particular any air quality impacts identified within the "Caval Ridge Air Quality Assessment – Supplementary Report, 30 October 2009, Prepared for BMA by URS Australia". This report by URS Australia was reviewed as part of the EIS process for the mine and it was considered that any adverse air quality impacts could be mitigated through the conditions recommended by the Coordinator-General.</p> | |
| 133 | <p>A potential growth problem is that the scheme has identified a large extension to Moranbah's existing development footprint through the designation of Precinct 2 as the single large development outcome within the township. Land ownership here is effectively under two ownerships, Isaac Regional Council and private individuals, having the capacity to impact on Moranbah's sequencing of development and land supply. Delay in development of this precinct will continue to place pressure on price and supply further reducing housing affordability.</p> | <p>This issue is understood and the ULDA have been in ongoing consultation with Council about the future development of this land. However it is not considered that any delay on the development of this land would significantly affect land supply in the short term given that the ULDA will be increasing the amount of land for residential uses within the existing town footprint and allowing for redevelopment opportunities.</p> | N |
| 134 | <p>Suggested amendment to Precinct Outcomes, Page 18, dot point 12 to include reference to crossing being conveniently located. (DTMR)</p> | <p>Noted and amendment included.</p> | Y No. 11 |
| 135 | <p>Recommendation that local shops including small grocery stores, be within walking distance to the majority of residents within the residential zone. (DTMR)</p> | <p>Noted and amendment included.</p> | Y No. 11 |
| 136 | <p>The mapping for Precinct 2 incorrectly shows an electricity easement over land fronting Goonyella Road. This land is burdened by a BMA Water Supply easement not an electricity easement.</p> | <p>Noted and corrected within the Development Scheme.</p> | Y No. 11 |
| 137 | <p>Consideration should also be given to restricting Environmentally Relevant Activities</p> | <p>The level of assessment table has been amended to clarify this.</p> | Y |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | (ERAs) within any ULDA plan. This is particularly a concern for development which may occur within the proposed rural area within Precinct 2. The plan allows ERAs (Permissible Development – Column 3A) within the Rural Zone, however the enforceability of any conditions placed on lands approved as ERAs is unclear under the proposed Development Scheme, as development on ULDA declared lands are exempt from the <i>Environment Protection Act 1994</i> . It is important that the cumulative environmental impact (air, noise etc) from any operation approved within the rural zone, or the surrounding mining areas, do not adversely affect human health. (QLD Health) | Placement of provisions about certain environmentally relevant activities in the exempt rather than self-assessable column, recognising that the development scheme does not impose any additional criteria for self-assessable development. | No. 4 |
| 138 | Consideration should be given to ensuring the potential impacts of any existing or future rural, mining or rail activities are adequately mitigated through the design, orientation, location and buffering of new development. (DERM) | Noted. This has been done through the preparation of the Development Scheme | N |
| Precinct 3 | | | |
| 139 | Concern raised that the proposed development behind Archer Drive will impede on the bushland that will act as a buffer zone for the town when the Moranbah South Mine is operational. | The bushland is not a buffer to the mining activities to the south of the town. The Moranbah South Mine has not yet been submitted to Government for consideration. | N |
| 140 | Access to the Grosvenor horse paddocks rented by many families will be cut off. Concerns raised regarding development behind Archer Drive as it will remove back access to properties and sheds. | The land adjacent to the Boxing Club and Archer drive is state land and no easements exist on the land for vehicular or stock access to any adjacent paddocks or backyards. | N |
| 141 | Concerns that development will decrease current house and land values. | There is no evidence to suggest that this will be the case. | N |
| 142 | Concerns that density up to 30 dwellings per hectare with single and multi-unit dwellings will create extra noise and no privacy. | The amenity of proposed residents and existing neighbouring communities is of utmost importance. The design criteria contained within the Development Scheme and the associated ULDA guidelines work to ensure that best practice urban design is incorporated into all development to protect the wellbeing and amenity of the community. | N |
| 143 | Does the Development Scheme allow for potential future expansion of the Residential | No. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | Zone onto the current Industrial Zone. | | |
| 144 | Believes Archer Drive development should be limited to 15 dwellings per hectare. | Refer to issue #66 response. | N |
| 145 | Concern regarding Map 6 and the extension of Belyando Avenue towards the Residential and Industry Zones. Requested that any such extension should not provide access to the Industrial Zone, but access be granted via the service road parallel to Goonyella Road instead. | Noted and agreed. Map 6 has been amended so that it does not indicate an extension of Belyando Ave. | Y No. 9 |
| 146 | Requested that the Industry Zone description in the Development Scheme Maps be amended to remove reference to 'Light' to be consistent with text. | Amendment has been made to the Development Scheme. | Y No. 10 |
| 147 | Concerns raised regarding children's safety and well-being should development adjacent to Archer Drive be approved. | Amenity and safety of all residents and the adjacent community will be taken into consideration in the future development application on this site. | N |
| 148 | The majority of Precinct 3 is already committed to development. | Noted. | N |
| 149 | Precinct 3 should include a choice of housing options for non-resident workers but should not include donga-style accommodation. Apartment style accommodation is much more suitable. | The majority of Precinct 3 is already committed to development of camp style non-resident worker accommodation through applications which have already been lodged with and approved by Isaac Regional Council. Should any further extensions or redevelopments occur in respect of non-resident worker accommodation within this area such would have to comply with the Precinct criteria and the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> . Further detail has been included within each Precinct about the types of non-resident worker accommodation that may be appropriate. | N |
| 150 | Concern regarding the establishment of residential uses in close proximity to industrial areas. Request for adequate buffer distances, especially from established businesses. Suggests that sufficient areas should be set aside for use as open space and recreation when in proximity to incompatible uses. (DLGP) | The Development Scheme will be amended to ensure that a 50m buffer is in place between future residential uses and existing industrial uses. | Y No. 10 |
| Level of Assessment Tables | | | |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| 151 | The Level of Assessment Table for the Residential Zone is unduly complicated and will have the effect of increasing the burden upon development within the UDA. | The Level of Assessment Table for each zone has now been amended to provide further clarity and remove ambiguity for all readers. | Y No. 4 |
| 152 | <p>New houses are not identified as Self Assessable Development but are instead identified as Permissible Development, thus the requirement to obtain development approvals for individual houses requires additional cost and constraint on affordability.</p> <p>Appears to be an error in that houses on lots with an exact area of 450m² and a frontage of 12.5m are identified as Exempt, irrespective of whether or not Building Work is proposed. Suggests this should be Self Assessable, while also making provision for alternative lot sizes or frontages to be Self Assessable.</p> | These aspects have now been clarified through the amendments to the Level of Assessment Table for each zone. | Y No. 4 |
| 153 | Scheme does not simplify the delivery of residential development of forms other than detached dwellings. This appears to be disconnected between the ability to have a plan of development approved and the structure of the level of assessment tables. This would mean that multiple dwellings could require more complex approvals than appear necessary. | <p>This has been clarified through the amendments to the Level of Assessment Table for each zone.</p> <p>If a development has an approval, and an associated approved Plan of Development, then it becomes exempt from any further assessment under the Development Scheme.</p> | Y No. 4 |
| 154 | <p>The level of assessment tables, Column 1 UDA Exempt Development (pages 13-15) lists development as exempt if the land is not on the EMR or CLR. There is a lack of information contained in the scheme with regards to accessing an application if a site is found to be listed on the CLR/EMR.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>All land registered on the EMR or CLR will be managed in accordance with the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the Draft Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Contaminated Land in Queensland. All land will be fit for its intended purpose.</p> <p>This is addressed in ULDA Guideline No. 14 <i>Environment and Natural Resources Sustainability</i>.</p> | N |
| 155 | <p>Reference is made to Column 3A, which lists development for Rural Uses and for ERA's as permissible uses. Given that the Civic and Open Space Zone is designed to cater for recreation uses (as well as environmental protection), it is difficult to understand how and Environmentally Relevant Activity or a Rural Use would be considered appropriate in this zone.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Amendment undertaken.</p> | Y No. 4 |
| Non-resident workers accommodation demands and concerns | | | |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 156 | The majority of residents in town want permanent workers moving to Moranbah with their families, not fly-in-fly-out workers living in the centre of town. | Noted. | |
| 157 | Concern that demand for single person accommodation will override the provision of family housing. | The Development Scheme does not prioritise the provision of non-resident worker accommodation ahead of other residential uses. The role of the ULDA is to provide housing within Moranbah that provides choice and diversity through a mix of densities, types, design, tenures and levels of affordability to cater for a range of lifestyles, incomes and life cycle needs. Also refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 158 | Concerns that current transient workers will eventually want to reside in the town and will be given preferential treatment housing over residents. | Refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 159 | People who do not work for mining companies, although eligible for some assistance from the mining companies under existing housing agreements, are unable to afford a house at current prices. Houses cannot be built when builders are asking upwards of \$500,000 to build, over and above the price of land. Young families with children who want to reside together because dad has landed a new job with a mining company are unable to get on their feet, and a townhouse of unit will not suffice. They want a house with a yard where the kids can run around and there is sufficient space. Neighbours in townhouses or units will not want to spend 10-15 years of their family life listening to the families next door through thin walls. Retain the fresh air, green grass and the community lifestyle in Moranbah. | Refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 160 | Concerned that mining companies will develop all available land for workers, not leaving any available for the community. | Refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 161 | Further concern that the mining companies will retain ownership of the accommodation, disallowing people to own their own home. | Refer to issue # 22 response. | N |
| 162 | Request to keep single person accommodation out of Moranbah. Requests that all mining camps or single person quarters are relocated out of town onto | The Development Scheme recognises non-resident worker accommodation as a component for meeting housing needs within Moranbah. The ULDA's role in Moranbah is not to make policy | Y No. 8 |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>mining leases so that it is the mining companies' responsibility to police them.</p> <p>Does not support the inclusion of Non-resident worker accommodation in town.</p> | <p>decisions on whether camps area appropriate or not in a town, or whether they should be located on mine sites.</p> <p>The ULDA's role is to introduce a plan that will integrate any suitable camps that are proposed, by ensuring that they are appropriately located and by applying development standards that achieve a high level of amenity.</p> <p>The Development Scheme has been amended to identify areas where it may be considered suitable for larger-scale camp style accommodation, and the ULDA Guideline no. 3 for Non-resident Worker Accommodation establishes design benchmarks to achieve high quality development.</p> <p>Also refer to issue # 70 response.</p> | |
| 163 | <p>Understands that there is a requirement/need for single person accommodation in remote areas where services and infrastructure do not exist; however Moranbah is not such a place. The services and infrastructure are available, therefore the town should be a thriving community of families and not camp-style accommodation.</p> | <p>The Development Scheme recognises non-resident worker accommodation as a component for meeting housing needs within Moranbah.</p> <p>Also refer to issue # 70 response.</p> | N |
| 164 | <p>Concern raised that mining companies need to provide permanent housing in relation to any mining projects that they do.</p> | <p>This is not an issue relevant for the ULDA. The Coordinator General would need to consider this as part of an EIS for the relevant mining company.</p> | N |
| 165 | <p>Concern regarding underutilised worker accommodation.</p> | <p>The ULDA are not aware of any underutilised worker accommodation within the town.</p> | N |
| 166 | <p>Concern raised with regard to BMA's Buffel Park development.</p> | <p>The decision making related to the Buffel Park Development Application lies with Council not the ULDA. Council are currently undertaking assessment of this application in accordance with the requirements of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (SPA).</p> | N |
| 167 | <p>The problems Moranbah faces will not be solved by turning the town into a giant mining camp.</p> <p>Suggests locating high density non-resident accommodation on the mine sites or along Sarchedon Drive.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>In the Proposed Moranbah UDA Development Scheme, the identification of where larger scale non-resident worker accommodation may be considered is on the hatched areas of Precincts 2 & 3 is only in specific locations on privately owned land.</p> | N |
| 168 | <p>Concerns raised around the future of housing proposed for transient workers.</p> | <p>The ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> provides criteria for the type of housing considered appropriate within these uses.</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 169 | Opposed to non-resident accommodation being proposed on land adjacent to Archer Drive. | This is not being proposed through the Development Scheme or any resultant ULDA development applications. | N |
| 170 | Question regarding non-resident ratio within the town. | Noted. OESR have just recently released Bowen Basin report updates and within this it states that the current ratio for the town is 26 percent. | N |
| 171 | Concern that no appropriate balance or ratio of resident to non-resident worker populations is articulated. Requests that the ratio be based on the level to which temporary workers can be sustainably supported without having a negative impact on the social and cultural composition of the community. | Refer to issue # 70 response. | N |
| 172 | <p>Believes the Development Scheme should prohibit camp-style development (i.e. including mess facility and relocatable donga style buildings) in Precinct 1, 2A (Council-owned portion of land in Precinct 2), 2C (south-east corner of land in Precinct 2) and 3A (eastern parcel of Precinct 3 and southern half of Precinct 3 to the west).</p> <p>Suggests that development in area 2B (north-east parcel of land in Precinct 2) should be permanent residential development ranging in density from 30-60 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Camp-style non-resident worker accommodation should be capped at 100 rooms per hectare in areas 2D (western-most portion of residential zone in Precinct 2) and 3C (north-west portion of Precinct 3).</p> <p>(IRC)</p> | <p>The maps have been amended to incorporate sub-precincts to help show and detail which areas are more appropriate than others for the locating of larger-scale mining camps.</p> <p>There are now only three areas identified where it is considered larger-scale mining camps may be appropriate and have been shown via hatching on the precinct maps.</p> <p>The inclusion of sub-precincts to provide further clarity that government owned land is not intended to incorporate non-resident worker accommodation and with prioritise more affordable housing options.</p> <p>Inclusion of an administrative definition for a 'larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation' being of 100 rooms or greater or that includes private mess facilities, camp style accommodation or donga-style buildings.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to cap the density of non-resident worker accommodation as the design, amenity, nature and scale of these uses can be mitigated through the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i>.</p> | Y No. 8 |
| 173 | <p>Urban residential dwelling uses for service industry worker housing with a guarantee of future affordability is desirous in Precinct 3B (Precinct 3 land parcel adjacent to Archer Drive).</p> <p>(IRC)</p> | Noted. | N |
| 174 | Non-resident accommodation should be located and designed to offer residents a high level of accessibility to the activity centres by | Noted. The ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker</i> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|
| | passenger and active transport modes with less emphasis placed on the motor vehicle. (DTMR) | <i>Accommodation</i> will help to facilitate this intent. | |
| 175 | Request that articulation be provided to indicate the preferred location of non-resident worker accommodation. Ideally these should be illustrated on the Precinct Maps. (DTMR) | Noted and the Development Scheme has been amended to reflect this within the Precinct Maps. | Y No. 8 |
| 176 | Areas designated for non-resident accommodation purposes should be supported by a precinct plan to ensure that the various elements of the urban form including transport provision are appropriately located. (DTMR) | The density of non-resident worker accommodation as the design, amenity, nature and scale of these uses can be mitigated through the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> . | N |
| 178 | Concern regarding the responsibility of paying for high-quality non-resident worker accommodation. | The proponent pays for the non-resident worker accommodation use. | N |
| 179 | Concern regarding the location and operation of non-resident worker accommodation within and surrounding Moranbah. (DLGP) | Noted. The ULDA can regulate development lodged through development applications after the introduction of the UDA on the 29 th July 2010. The compliance of existing non-resident worker accommodation is not the responsibility of the ULDA. | N |
| Non-resident worker population concerns | | | |
| 180 | Concerns regarding the absence of a cap on the number of non-resident accommodation that will be permitted to be constructed in town. | Refer to issue # 70 response. | N |
| Concerns regarding non-resident worker contributions | | | |
| 181 | Requests that mining camps should not be in or near town as non-resident workers utilise emergency services, roads, doctor's etc. and do not contribute to the town. | Refer to issue # 70 response. | N |
| 182 | Workers who live in camps have all food provided for them and use community facilities but do not contribute to the community in any way. | Refer to issue # 70 response. | N |
| 183 | Concerns that despite certain company's funding towards the town, it does not cover the need for more necessary services needed by the town. Non-resident workers are not included in the number of town residents for | Refer to issue # 213 in this respect. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y=yes/N=no |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| | which the emergency services are funded and resourced by Government. | | |
| Population concerns regarding non-resident workers | | | |
| 184 | Police numbers are based upon enrolled residents. Camps or single person quarters will nearly double the town population, but with the same number of police. | Refer to issue # 213 in this respect. Qld Police did not provide a response and therefore it is taken that they have no concerns with the plan. | N |
| 185 | Mining companies underestimate the population 'pull' to Moranbah. | Noted. | N |
| Social and safety concerns regarding non-resident workers | | | |
| 186 | Concerned that the balance of transient workers will detract from the home-town community feeling. | Refer to issue # 70 & #162 responses. | N |
| 187 | Concern raised about anti-social and lewd behaviour from transient workers within the town. | Refer to issue # 70 & #162 responses. | N |
| 188 | The Scheme fails to outline a mitigation strategy against social problems experienced in mining communities when resident and non-resident populations become imbalanced. Without research how can ULDA provide design, accommodation and amenity solutions without learning from other communities? QUT study reveals social problems can escalate if an imbalance develops. | Refer to issue # 70 & #162 responses. | N |
| 189 | Concerns regarding the location of non-resident accommodation in close proximity to sporting fields Scheme. | Refer to issue # 70 & #162 responses. | N |
| Constraints | | | |
| 190 | Mining lease constraints around the town limit population growth and should be rezoned in appropriate areas to cater for this. | The town is constrained from expansion by Mineral Development Licence no.s 273 & 377. The location of MDL's do not relate directly to zonings that may apply on the land. | N |
| 191 | There is no scale attached to the Constraints Map, therefore it is difficult to determine distances, particularly for buffering purposes. (DERM) | The constraints map is for guidance purposes only and does not require a scale. | N |
| 192 | Request to amend the legend of the Constraints Map to indicate the dark green | Map has been amended to only show relevant constraints for development applications. The green | Y |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|----------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | north of Grosvenor Creek and what it represents. (DERM) | spaces have been removed. | No. 17 |
| Infrastructure Plan | | | |
| 193 | An infrastructure funding commitment and/or an indication of the apportionment of costs to developers has not been detailed in the proposed Development Scheme. This is a risk if an approval is subject to unanticipated infrastructure contributions. | Infrastructure charges and funding have been adequately addressed within the Infrastructure Plan. | N |
| 194 | Request for an upfront and transparent approach to achieve an acceptable level of developer confidence and certainty to invest in the Moranbah UDA. | Infrastructure charges and funding have been adequately addressed within the Infrastructure Plan. | N |
| 195 | Requests more detailed provisions regarding infrastructure provision to ensure that proponents have clarity around extent, location and infrastructure costs. (DTMR) | Infrastructure charges and funding have been adequately addressed within the Infrastructure Plan. | N |
| 196 | Suggested amendment to Section 4.0, Page 23. Third paragraph should recognise that another infrastructure funding mechanism may be available by: <i>“As part of implementing this Development Scheme, the ULDA under section 97 (2), Part 6 of the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007, will also work with Isaac Regional Council, infrastructure provider agencies and state agencies regarding an appropriate infrastructure charging schedule”.</i> (DTMR) | Noted and accepted. | Y No. 13 |
| 197 | Suggested amendment to Section 4.0, Page 23. Fifth paragraph should reflect the importance of obtaining state infrastructure funding to enable developments to proceed. Suggested wording: <i>“State infrastructure funding to enable the development to proceed will be sought under the normal budgetary processes and will be part of an approved State agency capital program”.</i> (DTMR) | The intent of this section is the same as that recommended and it is not necessary to amend the wording. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 198 | Council water and sewerage services are concerned about the assumptions of the ultimate yield and timing expected from development. (IRC) | Noted. The ULDA will be undertaking ongoing consultation and cooperation with IRC to determine the existing and anticipated yield from the ultimate development of the urban areas. The Implementation Strategy has been amended to reflect this. | Y No. 14 |
| 199 | An easement for a new trunk pipeline through Precinct 3 adjacent to Archer Drive, however this has been refused by the ULDA with an alternative route suggested. There is concern regarding the capacity of this pipeline as upstream development is yet to be confirmed. Requests to work with ULDA to establish an alternate route along a neighbouring boundary, and to also negotiate with the landowner. (IRC) | Noted. The ULDA is happy to undertake ongoing consultation with IRC in this regard and this has been reflected within the Implementation Strategy. | Y No. 14 |
| 200 | Requests the ULDA recommend to the State Government that they provide guarantees that infrastructure funding arrangements are matched to resident/non-resident worker ratios. | Infrastructure charges and funding have been adequately addressed within the Infrastructure Plan. No amendments necessary to the Development Scheme. | N |
| Implementation Strategy | | | |
| 201 | The Development Scheme does not contain details on how the ULDA will facilitate development within the UDA. Request that the Implementation Strategy be expanded to provide for more direct involvement by the ULDA in the provision of land suitable for urban purposes. | The implementation strategy does adequately indicate the ULDA's role and involvement in implementing the Development Scheme goals. | N |
| 202 | Suggested amendment to read: <i>"Ongoing discussions are to be held with the Department of Transport and Main Roads Scheme to undertake a transport impact study that assesses the potential traffic yields Scheme from the proposed Development Scheme to determine the appropriate upgrades and contributions to the state controlled road Peak Downs Highway and Moranbah Access Road intersection".</i> (DTMR) | Noted and accepted. | Y No. 14 |
| 203 | Suggested amendment to read: <i>"Ongoing discussions are to be held with the Department of Transport and Main Roads Scheme on the principal cycle network links throughout Moranbah to achieve agreement on</i> | Noted and accepted. | Y No. 14 |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y=yes/N=no |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p><i>these links and determination of implementation priority".</i></p> <p>(DTMR)</p> | | |
| 204 | <p>Request that under Riverbank Management the word 'marine' be replaced with the word 'riparian'.</p> <p>(DERM)</p> | Noted and accepted. | Y No. 14 |
| Concerns regarding community consultation | | | |
| 205 | <p>Believes that the ULDA has not allowed a fair and proper amount of time for the consultation period.</p> | <p>A comprehensive consultation process has been used to assist with understanding community views. All members of the community and other stakeholders were given opportunities to have an input in preparing the Proposed Development Scheme. Many views were expressed during this process, including support for improving the supply of residential land and for higher standard of camp accommodation.</p> <p>The consultation period provided for the Structure Plan and Proposed Development Scheme exceeded that required by the ULDA Act.</p> <p>However, as the Deputy Premier has stated following representations from the Moranbah Action Group, the ULDA's role in Moranbah is not to make policy decisions on whether camps are appropriate or not in a town. The ULDA's role is to introduce a plan that will integrate any suitable camps that are proposed, by ensuring that are appropriately located and by applying development standards that achieve a high level of amenity.</p> | N |
| 206 | <p>Unacceptable that the community has been treated with contempt when it is obvious there is unhappiness regarding the proposed development.</p> | <p>The community has been well informed and well represented in response to the community consultation undertaken. This included many discussions with community members during the community engagement sessions. The ULDA has received submissions and comments objecting to the Development Scheme (or aspects of it) but also submissions and comments very much in favour of the Development Scheme. This submissions report has been prepared so that all submitters are aware of all issues that have been raised and how they have been addressed within the Development Scheme.</p> | N |
| 207 | <p>Request for a Whole of Community meeting with the intention of ULDA attending for a genuine debate.</p> | <p>The ULDA have met with many members of the community during the information sessions at the Moranbah Fair Shopping Centre. The ULDA have also met separately with other interested groups and parties to answer specific questions, concerns and explain the Development Scheme.</p> | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| 208 | Suggests that the ULDA consider extending the consultation period. | The consultation period provided for the Structure Plan and Proposed Development Scheme has exceeded that required by the ULDA Act. This request is not supported by either the ULDA or the Deputy Premier. | N |
| 209 | The ULDA should engage with the community in managing and enhancing biodiversity awareness post-construction. (DERM) | The ULDA may consider undertaking such if considered necessary and warranted. | N |
| 210 | Requests an immediate halt to the ULDA planning and consultation process in recognition of the community's backlash against the proposed Moranbah UDA and Proposed Non Resident Worker Accommodation Guideline. | The consultation period provided for the Structure Plan and Proposed Development Scheme has exceeded that required by the ULDA Act. This request is not supported by either the ULDA or the Deputy Premier. | N |
| 211 | Future consultation with Queensland Fire and Rescue Service, Queensland Ambulance Service and Emergency Management Queensland during detailed design and construction phases of major development should be undertaken regarding the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permeability including traffic calming impacts; • Site access and egress; • Road dimensions; • Construction staging; • Road closures and traffic hazards; • Storage and location of hazardous goods on-site; and • Other concerns as identified. (DCS) | Where considered necessary the ULDA will seek input from the Department of Community Safety in relation to the assessment of development applications. | N |
| Concerns regarding additional data | | | |
| 212 | Concerned that a biased opinion of the community has been assumed based on those who voted for the Adaptive Community options. | The Adaptive Communities consultation undertaken by Isaac Regional Council (IRC) has been used by IRC to guide their feedback and submission to the ULDA in respect of the Development Scheme. The ULDA has not been provided with the specific outcomes of IRC's Adaptive Communities consultation. | N |
| 213 | Concern raised that the ULDA has not undertaken the necessary social impact studies | Assessment of social impacts of mining camps is outside the scope of the ULDA and the matters | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|-----------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>required to evaluate the effects of the proposed developments.</p> <p>Concern that the Plan C and MacroPlan Australia research and data not ideal to guide the plan.</p> <p>Requests that unanswered social and economic questions to be answered before determining appropriate 30 year development plan.</p> | <p>directly addressed in Development Schemes. However, to assist the local Council, and those agencies and community organisations with the responsibility for providing social, community and cultural services and facilities, a study was commissioned to assess the current provision of those services and facilities in Moranbah, and also expected demand in response to population growth. The ULDA will proceed to facilitate an Implementation Strategy based on this assessment.</p> <p>The difficulty for the Census to accurately reflect the number of non-resident workers in mining towns such as Moranbah is well recognised. The Office of Economic and Statistical Research (OESR) for the last 5 years has conducted an annual count of non-resident workers in towns in the Bowen Basin to estimate the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Population. The methodology includes a survey of commercial accommodation providers. Information is also obtained through interviews and surveys of key employers and stakeholders, and analysis of data from the 2006 Census of population and Housing. The FTE provides a sound basis for the planning of infrastructure and service provision in Moranbah, and consultation with service providers indicates this information is used.</p> | |
| 214 | Additional studies commissioned were not available in time for consultation period. | A study was commissioned to assess the current provision of those services and facilities in Moranbah, and also expected demand in response to population growth. This study is a background document to the preparation of the Development Scheme. The ULDA will proceed to facilitate an Implementation Strategy based on this assessment and this will be made public once finalised. | N |
| DA Issues | | | |
| 215 | Red tape must be removed to allow development approvals to be issued quickly and efficiently. | The ULDA does have a streamlined development assessment process in order to expedite development and get land to market quickly. | N |
| BMA Caval Ridge Mine | | | |
| 216 | <p>Concerns that BMA is stating that workers do not want to permanently reside in town to push their own FIFO agenda.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the BMA proposal at Caval Ridge for a 100% non-resident workforce. Also concern that this would set a worrying precedent.</p> | This issue relates to the BMA Caval Ridge Mine and the proposed 100% fly-in-fly-out workforce. This is not a ULDA matter for response. | N |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| Guideline no. 03 Non-resident worker accommodation | | | |
| 217 | Believes that The MAC is exempt from Design benchmarks 1-2 and 1-9. | This is not a matter for the Development Scheme and would need to be taken into consideration in the assessment of any development application lodged. The ULDA are intent on ensuring compliance with the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> . | N |
| 218 | Does not agree that one car parking space per three accommodation units is enough. | Noted – however this is not a matter for the Development Scheme. | N |
| 219 | Content of the Guideline to which the Proposed Development Scheme refers to is unknown. Concern regarding the uncertainty associated with referring to a guideline that has not been made available for public consultation. | The guidelines for the ULDA Guideline no.3 <i>Non-resident Worker Accommodation</i> is available on the website and the public are able to provide feedback in respect of it. It is an evolving document that will be updated when necessary. | N |
| 220 | The principle of the guideline, that non-resident worker accommodation is located and design to be integrated into the town is to the exclusion of valid planning and operational grounds for accommodation villages to be located outside of townships. It should not preclude the opportunity to locate non-resident worker accommodation outside of towns. It is acknowledged that the ULDA's jurisdiction within resource communities is within urban areas, however, this detail may be overlooked by local government and applied narrowly given the research and preparation that the ULDA has undertaken in preparing the guideline. Recommends that a statement within the guideline providing that non-urban solutions may be appropriate would overcome this concern. | This is in relation to the guideline and not in direct response to the Development Scheme. No amendments to the Development Scheme are necessary. | N |
| 221 | Concern regarding the representation of housing types and village designs captured in the guideline. | This is in relation to the guideline and not in direct response to the Development Scheme. No amendments to the Development Scheme are necessary. | N |
| ULDA Act | | | |
| 222 | Requests that the ULDA and State Government amends the ULDA Act to ensure that whole of government policy issues must be taken into account when developing a draft UDA or accommodation guideline, particularly in mining communities. | Noted, however no amendment to the Development Scheme is required. No amendment to the ULDA Act is considered necessary – see also response to issue # 278. | |

| Issue # | Issue/Comment | Response | Amendment Y-yes/N-no |
|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| Whole of Government Policy Issues | | | |
| 223 | Requests that the ULDA and State Government work with the community to develop a whole of government policy approach for Moranbah and other mining communities to ensure that government can deliver sustainable development outcomes for the community in relation to impacts of population growth and non-resident workers – based on a sustainable approach to development and considering appropriate social, economic and cultural factors. | As the Deputy Premier has stated following representations from the Moranbah Action Group, the ULDA’s role in Moranbah is not to make policy decisions on whether camps are appropriate or not in a town, or whether they should be located on mine sites or whether there should be a cap on the number of non-resident workers. The ULDA’s role in Moranbah is principally to increase the availability of land for residential development, and specifically to address housing affordability issues. | N |

6. List of amendments arising from submissions

Following is a list of proposed changes to the Moranbah UDA Proposed Development Scheme as notified. Simple amendments are shown with text to be deleted struck out and new text in italics. Where multiple changes or additions are proposed, the notified provision and proposed amendment are included, with new text in italics.

| Amendment | Nature of Amendment | Reason |
|--|--|--|
| 3.0 Land use plan : Zone Provisions | | |
| 1. | <p>3.4.2 Zone intents</p> <p>Map references have now been corrected and content repetition has been deleted.</p> | <p>Correcting typographical errors.</p> <p>Issue # 31</p> |
| 2. | <p>Content in the industrial zone was incomplete and has now been completed.</p> | <p>Correcting typographical errors.</p> <p>Issue # 32</p> |
| 3. | <p>Rural Zone intent</p> <p>Inclusion of the following words:</p> <p><i>“The Rural Zone may accommodate unanticipated interim uses that do no compromise the long term use of the land for its intended purpose. Any interim use must be located outside of any areas identified as being subject to impacts from the approved Caval Ridge mine project.</i></p> <p><i>Footnote: In particular any air quality impacts identified within the "Caval Ridge Air Quality Assessment - Supplementary Report, 30 October 2009, Prepared for BMA by URS Australia". This report by URS Australia was reviewed as part of the EIS process for the mine and it was considered that any adverse air quality impacts could be mitigated through the conditions recommended by the Coordinator- General.”</i></p> | <p>Provides greater clarity on acceptable interim land uses that may occur.</p> <p>Issue # 132</p> |
| 4. | <p>3.4.3 Level of assessment table</p> <p>Level of assessment table for all zones has been updated to provide greater clarity as to the requirements for houses both above and below 450m2 and multi residential uses approved as part of a Plan of Development.</p> <p>All zones have been modified to ensure less confusion and greater clarity of intended acceptable development types.</p> | <p>For the benefit of providing increased clarity to developers and the public.</p> <p>Issue # 33, 137, 153 & 155</p> |
| 5. | <p>3.2.8 Relationship with the Planning Scheme for the Belyando Shire 2009</p> <p>Table 1 has been included to describe the relationship between the Development Scheme and the Planning Scheme.</p> | <p>Enhance up front awareness of how the Development Scheme and Planning Scheme relate. Removes the need to repeat these elements within the individual Precinct provisions.</p> <p>Issue # 34</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 6. | <p>3.5 UDA Precincts</p> <p>Precinct 2:</p> <p>Insertion of the following footnote in accordance with advice from Qld Health:</p> <p><i>“The southern boundary of the Residential Zone has been informed by the future anticipated air quality impacts of the Caval Ridge Mine. In particular Figure 3-7 Fifth Highest 24-hour Average Ground-Level Concentration of PM₁₀ for Year 20, contained within the “Caval Ridge Air Quality Assessment - Supplementary Report, 30 October 2009, Prepared for BMA by URS Australia”. This report by URS Australia was reviewed as part of the EIS process for the mine and it was considered that any adverse air quality impacts could be mitigated through the conditions recommended by the Coordinator- General. “</i></p> <p>Amended to include reference to public art on the on the corner of Goonyella Road and Moranbah Railway Station Road in order to enhance and compliment the existing entry to the town.</p> | <p>Footnote included to further protect urban development from nearby mining project impacts.</p> <p>Issue # 88, 92, 96 & 98</p> <p>To ensure that opportunities for incorporating public art are not lost.</p> <p>Issue # 109</p> |
| 7. | <p>Mapping and content amended to reflect new Mixed Use Zone layout and correct location of water easement.</p> | <p>To reflect development potential for the site that does not modify the ULDA’s intent for this site.</p> <p>Issue # 73 & 113</p> |
| 8. | <p>Precinct 2 & 3:</p> <p>Maps have been amended to detail where ‘larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation’ may be considered appropriate.</p> <p>A definition of a ‘larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation’ has been included within the administrative definitions.</p> | <p>Provide more certainty for the community as to the types of development they can expect in each area.</p> <p>Having regard to concerns raised in submissions about camp-style accommodation within the town, the Development Scheme will be amended to state explicitly where these styles of accommodation may be provided.</p> <p>Issue # 162, 172 & 175</p> |
| 9. | <p>Precinct 3:</p> <p>Map has been amended to delete further extension of Belyando Avenue.</p> | <p>Fixing mapping error. Issue # 145</p> |
| 10. | <p>Buffer of 50m detailed between existing industrial uses and proposed residential uses.</p> <p>Remove reference to ‘light’ industry as not used within the Development Scheme.</p> | <p>For the benefit of applicants considering development adjacent to industrial areas.</p> <p>Issue # 95 & 150</p> <p>Fixing mapping error. Issue # 146</p> |
| All Mapping | | |
| 11. | <p>All Mapping</p> <p>Goonyella Road relabelled as both Goonyella Road and Moranbah Access Road as requested by DTMR.</p> <p>Water supply easement along Goonyella Road, not</p> | <p>Provide mapping clarify and correcting errors.</p> <p>Issue # 35, 79, 125, 134, 135 & 136</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>electricity easement.</p> <p>All maps amended where considered necessary, in line with requests by DTMR to reflect pedestrian and cycle connections and reflect these in the content of the Development Scheme document.</p> | |
| 4.0 Infrastructure Plan | | |
| 12. | <p>Inclusion of the following wording:</p> <p><i>“Relocation of the Skate Park in association with the redevelopment of Ted Rolfe Oval. “</i></p> | <p>To ensure redevelopment takes into consideration the relocation of this community use.</p> <p>Issue # 108</p> |
| 13. | <p>Insertion of new text after mention of infrastructure charges being based on Isaac Regional Council's applicable infrastructure charging document:</p> <p><i>‘unless the ULDA has prepared a replacement infrastructure charges schedule under section 97 of the ULDA Act’.</i></p> <p>Insertion of text to ensure consultation with DTMR and IRC and other relevant infrastructure providers.</p> | <p>Recognition that another infrastructure contributions mechanism may potentially be available under the ULDA Act.</p> <p>Issue # 196</p> |
| 5.0 Implementation strategy | | |
| 14. | <p>Inclusion of the new elements contained under the heading 'Population, social and community facilities and service analysis'.</p> <p>Inclusion of additional content regarding relocation of Skate Park.</p> <p>Additional text to ensure ongoing consultation with IRC in respect of trunk infrastructure and water and sewer requirements.</p> <p>Reflect wording to further identify ongoing consultation with DTMR and ensure they and IRC are consulted in regard to further provision of safe crossing for Goonyella Road.</p> | <p>Ensure proper implementation and facilitation of the social and community elements detailed within the development of the Moranbah UDA Social, Cultural and Community Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>Ensuring that supporting information can be updated with new population data as it comes to hand.</p> <p>Issue # 83, 109, 112, 198, 199, 202 & 203</p> |
| Schedule 2: Definitions | | |
| 15. | <p>Administrative definitions:</p> <p>Inclusion of definition of larger-scale non-resident worker accommodation.</p> | <p>This is defined in the relevant sub-precincts but a further administrative definition was also required.</p> <p>Issue # 162, 172 & 175</p> |
| Appendices | | |
| 16. | <p>Constraints Maps – Appendix 1 & 2</p> <p>Most up to date flood data from Council has been incorporated – to reflect recent approvals. Footnote also updated to ensure any ongoing changes can be made in light of Flood Inquiry outcomes.</p> <p>Removal of elements that were not constraints to</p> | <p>Ensure most up to date information is reflected.</p> <p>Issue # 84, 87, 101</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | development assessment. Update map showing Endangered Regional Ecosystems. Inclusion of Medium risk bushfire map. | |
|--|---|--|

7. List of amendments arising from operational and legal review

| Amendment | Nature of Amendment | Reason |
|--|---|---|
| 2.0 Vision (previously Strategic Context) | | |
| A. | Change of title from 'Strategic context' to 'Vision'. Replacement of dot points with roman numerals. | To improve readability and clarity. |
| 3.0 Land use plan | | |
| B. | 3.1 Components of the land use plan Replacement of dot points with roman numerals. Insertion of replacement text: 3.1.1 Components of the land use plan <i>The land use plan identifies the UDA development requirements which regulate development to achieve the vision for the UDA.</i> Rewording of text from section 3.2 | To improve readability, clarity and consistency with the law. |
| C. | 3.2 Development assessment Change of title from 'Development assessment procedures' Replacement of dot points with roman numerals. | To improve readability, clarity and consistency with the law. |
| D. | 3.2 Development assessment (continued) Wording enhancements to improve clarity. | To improve clarity and consistency with the law. |
| E. | 3.2 Development assessment (continued) Insertion of new section: Infrastructure agreements <i>A UDA development condition may require the land owner to enter into an infrastructure agreement, under section 97 of the ULDA Act, to address the provisions and requirements of the infrastructure plan and implementation strategy.</i> | To improve clarity and consistency with the law. |
| F. | 3.2 Development assessment (continued) Insertion of replacement text (shown in italics): 3.2.6 Consideration in principle <i>A request may be made to the ULDA for consideration in principle for proposed development.</i> In considering the request the ULDA may decide to do one of the following: (i) support <i>all or part</i> the proposed development, with or without qualifications that may amend the proposed development | To improve clarity and consistency with the law. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | <p>(ii) oppose <i>all or part</i> of the proposed development,</p> <p>(iii) give no indication of either support or opposition <i>to all or part of the proposed development</i>.</p> <p>The ULDA when considering a UDA development application:</p> <p>(i) is not bound by any decision made regarding a request for consideration in principle, and</p> <p>(ii) may give such weight as it considers appropriate to the decision on the request for consideration in principle.</p> | |
| G. | <p>3.4 Zoning provisions</p> <p>Footnote updated to refer to ULDA Guidelines.</p> <p>3.4.3 Level of assessment tables, tables 2 to 6</p> <p>New replacement text in column 1 UDA exempt development and deletion from column 2 UDA self-assessable development</p> <p>1. <i>An environmentally relevant activity if:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) <i>a code of environmental compliance has been made for that activity under the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008, and</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) <i>the activity complies with that code.</i></p> | To recognise that the Development Scheme does not impose any additional self-assessable criteria for this type of development. |
| H. | <p>3.4 Zoning provisions (continued)</p> <p>3.4.3 Level of assessment tables</p> <p>New replacement text in column 1 UDA exempt development:</p> <p><i>'(iii) making a material change of use of premises if in accordance with an approved Plan of Development, or</i></p> <p><i>(iv) carrying out operational work or building if in accordance with a Plan of Development'</i></p> | To clarify the provisions that make development consistent with a Plan of Development exempt from further assessment under the Development Scheme. |
| I. | <p>3.4 Zoning provisions (continued)</p> <p>3.4.3 Level of assessment tables, tables 2 to 6</p> <p>New replacement text in column 3A UDA Permissible development:</p> <p>1. <i>Reconfiguring a lot that is not mentioned in schedule 1.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Making a material change of use of premises if:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) <i>the use is not defined in schedule 2, or</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) <i>the change of use is not mentioned in columns 1, 2 or 3B.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Carrying out operational work or building work if the work is not mentioned in columns 1, 2 or 3B.</i></p> | To clarify the 'default' provisions that make development permissible if it is not mentioned in the other tables. |
| J. | <p>3.4 Zoning provisions (continued)</p> <p>3.4.3 Level of assessment tables</p> <p>New replacement text in column 1 UDA Exempt development:</p> <p><i>(v) development for a House if all of the following apply:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) <i>on a lot 450m² or more</i></p> | To clarify the provisions in the Residential zone that make development for a House exempt if it complies with appropriate State-wide siting and amenity provisions (as stated in the Queensland Development Code), unless the House incorporates a secondary |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>(b) a frontage of 12.5m or more</p> <p>(c) the House does not include a secondary dwelling</p> <p>(d) the development complies with the acceptable solutions in Element 1 of the Queensland development code (QDC), MP 1.2 - Design and siting standard for single detached housing-on lots 450 m² and over.</p> | dwelling, in which case, it becomes self-assessable development. |
| K. | <p>3.4 Zoning provisions (continued)</p> <p>3.4.3 Level of assessment tables,</p> <p>New replacement text in column 1 UDA Exempt development:</p> <p>(ii) development for the following:</p> <p>(a)</p> <p>(b) Other residential if not involving building work (other than minor building work)</p> | To avoid unnecessary regulation of this type of use and for consistency with development schemes for other UDAs. |
| 4.0 Infrastructure Plan | | |
| L. | <p>Insertion of new text in paragraph 4 after: 'infrastructure charges' or a special rate or charge under section 101 of the ULDA Act, ...the Moranbah UDA Social, Cultural and Community Infrastructure Strategy.</p> | To recognise the other provisions in the ULDA Act under which infrastructure may potentially be funded, and also the potential to impose those charges also for the Social, Cultural and Community Infrastructure Strategy. |
| M. | <p>Insertion of new text after paragraph 1:</p> <p><i>A UDA development condition may require the land owner to enter into an infrastructure agreement, under section 97 of the ULDA Act, to address the provisions and requirements of the infrastructure plan and implementation strategy.</i></p> | To improve clarity about infrastructure agreements and conditions of development approval and for consistency with Development Schemes for other UDAs. |
| N. | <p>Change to text in table for Community facilities:</p> <p><i>Works meeting the requirements of the relevant provider, and generally in accordance with the Moranbah UDA Social, Cultural Community Infrastructure Strategy.</i></p> | To recognise that the analysis has been completed and will be followed by a strategy for implementation. |
| Schedule 1: Exempt development | | |
| O. | <p>Inclusion of a reference to development that is exempt under SPA, and consequential deletion of references covered under that exemption.</p> <p>Deletion of exempt material changes of uses (Park, Home based Business, Sales office and display home) and relocation to the respective Level of assessment tables.</p> <p>Deletion of references to development that is exempt if in accordance with an approved Plan of Development and relocation to the respective Level of assessment tables.</p> <p>For filling or extraction, deletion of a reference to depth (1 m) and inclusion of a quantity for volume (50m³).</p> | For consistency with SPA and to improve readability. |