and fragmented ownership pattern, a draft concept plan was prepared to assist planning for the area in consultation with property owners.

On 30 May 2017, Council endorsed (CP17.0524.007 – refer Attachment 1) a draft concept plan for targeted property owner engagement. Key outcomes of the draft concept plan included identification of:

- potential urban development opportunities for between 499 and 715 new dwellings based on land constraints and opportunities;
- required infrastructure (and estimated costs to Council) to support the development of the investigation area; and
- planning outcomes necessary to guide development of a new community involving fragmented ownership (e.g. provision of local recreation park, key internal road connections, balance of development versus environmental and scenic amenity protection).

5.3 Property owner engagement

Property owners within the investigation area were engaged in the planning for the new community commencing with a letter followed by a community inception meeting held on 28 November 2016. A summary of consultation activities include:

- 3 x letters to all property owners;
- 2 x community meetings at Upper Coomera Community Centre;
- 6 x on-site meetings (in addition to site visits for the ecological survey); and
- 5 x developer meetings (Bundall).
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During the process, property owners have been encouraged to directly contact the project team over the course of the planning investigation. A number of phone conversations were undertaken to assist property owners in making submissions and understanding the planning process.

Engagement with property owners in the development of the draft concept plan commenced with a letter to all land owners, followed by a meeting at the Upper Coomera Community Centre on 12 June 2017. Submissions were invited until 8 July 2017, allowing a period of over 20 business days.

In response to the draft concept plan, 12 submissions were received from property owners/developers representing 17 properties (58 per cent of properties). A submission report is provided at Attachment 3 outlining the issues raised and the recommended Council response.

Key points raised in submissions include:

- requests to increase the residential density;
- requests for expansion of land identified for the new community west of Courtney Drive;
- requests for details and the timeframe for identified road infrastructure works;
- objection to the location of the local recreation park;
- objection to watercourse buffers and future tenure of higher order watercourses (public vs private);
- objection to management of stormwater (request for waterways to be piped and a regional approach adopted for detention);
- objection to excessive detail on the draft Concept plan for local roads and housing design;
- concerns with impacts of a new community on existing rural landscape and environment;
- request for the proposed City Plan update to include more detail than existing CLUMs (e.g. density);
- both support and opposition to a Relocatable home park (or gated community) in the area;
- support for a Retirement facility; and
- support for a low impact Tourist park (tents / cabins on cleared areas).
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5.4 Translation of the draft concept plan to a proposed update to City Plan

In a previous Council report (CP17.0524.007), an option analysis (refer Attachment 4) was presented to determine the preferred strategy for amending City Plan to guide development of a new community in Upper Coomera. The recommended option was to utilise the Emerging community zone for areas identified with future urban development potential. This included the use of a Conceptual Land Use Map (CLUM) to guide future development in the investigation area.

The existing CLUMs in City Plan are high level plans that conceptually identify areas where green space and suburban or urban development may be suitable supported by a limited level of detail to guide future development outcomes. The draft concept plan for Upper Coomera provides more planning detail and evidence to support a stronger regulatory framework. Consequently, during the course of developing updates to the draft concept plan, an alternative approach to the development of a CLUM was explored. The alternative approach explored is described below:

![Diagram of Strategic Framework, Emerging Communities Zone, Upper Coomera Precinct]
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REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REDACTED</th>
<th>REDACTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ITEM 9 (Continued)
COURTNEY DRIVE, UPPER COOMERA INVESTIGATION AREA – DRAFT CITY PLAN UPDATE
PD113/1275/14/01(P5)

| **REDACTED** |
| **REDACTED** |
| **REDACTED** |

5.6 **Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) alignment**

The draft concept plan identified likely trunk infrastructure needs and estimated costs to support the development of a new community in the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area. These infrastructure needs are recommended to be considered within the scope of the next version of the LGIP.

The design of the proposed infrastructure to be included in LGIP version 2 will confirm the infrastructure needs, properties affected by required land acquisition, estimated cost and timeframe for Council’s planning to undertake capital works.

A Council endorsed draft LGIP (version 2) is planned to closely align with the timeframe for gazettal of the City Plan major update to rezone the investigation area.
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5.7 Development proposals prior to City Plan update gazettal

Council officers are aware of developer interest within the investigation area including three developers with commercial interests over the following properties:

- REDACTED
- REDACTED

Feedback has been received on the draft concept plan and is addressed in the attached submission report (Attachment 3).

Of note, the gated community type proposals (Relocatable home park and Retirement facility) may present issues with the delivery of key planning outcomes sought from the draft concept plan. This includes conflicts with environmental corridors, roads infrastructure, recreational open space and Emerging community zone new communities overall outcome s6.2.15.2(2)(e).

Council officers have discouraged development proposals prior to completion of the planning investigation and the draft amendment progressing through the plan making process. This is consistent with the strategic framework direction for the investigation area s3.3.7.1:

*Note: Some rural residential areas (conceptually shown on strategic framework map 1) will be investigated for land use opportunities and constraints. Until these investigations are undertaken, and any amendments to the City Plan are completed, these areas are to maintain their rural residential character and intent.*

However, given the developer interest, it is likely an impact assessable material change seeking to vary the effect of the City Plan will be made prior to the major update progressing to State interest review.

5.8 Existing development approvals

A development approval exists over the property at 350 Reserve Road (south east corner) with operational works recently completed for 19 residential lots. This property is proposed to be omitted from the City Plan major update (Emerging community zone Upper Coomera precinct). The rezoning of this land for new residential development will follow a separate City Plan minor or administrative update package once the development has been completed.

An adjacent development site on the southern boundary of the investigation area also has an approved subdivision (Highland Reserve Stage 35). This subdivision includes conditions for constructing a road to Reserve Road which will facilitate part of the Courtney Drive extension. This development has not yet commenced operational works.

6 ALIGNMENT TO THE CORPORATE PLAN, CORPORATE STRATEGIES AND OPERATIONAL PLAN
The Upper Coomera Investigation Area project is aligned to the following Corporate Plan 2022 objectives:

1.1 Our city provides a choice of liveable places
We can choose diverse lifestyle and housing options from rural to city living.

A. We plan for the future of the city
We make good choices that create a better future for the Gold Coast community

B. We manage the city responsibly
Our stewardship of the city provides value for money for ratepayers

The City Plan is an initiative in the Operational Plan.

7 GOLD COAST 2018 COMMONWEALTH GAMES™ IMPACT
Not applicable.

8 FUNDING AND RESOURCING REQUIREMENTS
Not applicable.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT
The activity supports the mitigation of the following Directorate Risk:

CO00510 – City Plan delivers inadequate and / or ineffective strategic/development policy (e.g. poor planning, built form, growth, social and environmental outcomes).

10 STATUTORY MATTERS
The identification and addressing of state interests is part of the statutory amendment process. To assist the management of state interests, the Department of Infrastructure and Local Government and Planning (DILGP) have been provided a copy of the draft concept plan endorsed by Council for targeted community engagement on 30 May 2017 (CP17.0524.007).

A briefing was held with officers from DILGP and to date no major issues have been raised.

The following State interests and proposed responses are identified:

ShapingSEQ – South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017

The proposed new community in Upper Coomera meets the goals of the SEQ Regional Plan as it contributes to a consolidated urban structure with a well-planned and compact community. Access to public transport and active transport links are provided, as well as access to employment and recreation activities. The proposed new community will replace inefficiently zoned rural residential land with a new urban community with residential densities proposed to complement site characteristics of the area.

The SEQ Regional Plan strategic themes of ‘Sustain’ and ‘Live’ are supported through the identification and creation of conservation and open areas. This includes Yaun Creek and
other key waterway corridors for future rehabilitation to provide for biodiversity connections to high ecological significant areas in nearby ranges of Willowvale and Upper Coomera (e.g. Willowvale Reserve).

The proposed Upper Coomera new community is adjacent an established urban area and is currently serviced by transport infrastructure. The integrated land use and infrastructure planning for the extension of this urban area enables low overall infrastructure costs and planning for a new centrally located 1ha local recreation park.

State Planning Policy 2017

The proposed new community for Upper Coomera is consistent with the State Planning Policy, particularly the following relevant State interests policies:

- Liveable communities and housing - Housing supply and diversity and Liveable communities;
- Environment and heritage – Biodiversity and water quality;
- Safety and resilience to hazards – Natural hazards, risk and resilience; and
- Infrastructure – Infrastructure and transport infrastructure.

11 COUNCIL POLICIES

Not applicable.

12 DELEGATIONS

Not applicable.

13 COORDINATION & CONSULTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and/or Title of the Stakeholder Consulted</th>
<th>Directorate or Organisation</th>
<th>Is the Stakeholder Satisfied With Content of Report and Recommendations (Yes/No) (comment as appropriate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Architect</td>
<td>Office of the Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Coordinator Environment</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Coordinator Strategic Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Coordinator Planning Assessment</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Yes (to be further consulted in development of consequential City Plan amendments and final overall outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator City Plan Team</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Coordinator Transport Planning &amp; Policy</td>
<td>City Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes (concern raised with ability to include in LGIP version 2 scope)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 STAKEHOLDER IMPACTS

External / community stakeholder impacts

Property owners of the investigation area were engaged in the planning for the new community commencing with a letter followed by a community inception meeting held on 28 November 2016. A summary of consultation activities include:

- 3 x letters to all property owners;
- 2 x community meetings at Upper Coomera Community Centre;
- 6 x on-site meetings (in addition to ecological survey); and
- 5 x developer meetings (Bundall).

During the process, property owners have been encouraged to directly contact the project team over the course of the planning investigation. A number of phone conversations were undertaken to assist property owners in making submissions and understanding the planning process.

Engagement with property owners for the draft concept plan commenced with a letter followed shortly by a meeting at the Upper Coomera Community Centre on 12 June 2017. Submissions were invited until 8 July 2017, a period of over 20 business days.

In response to the draft concept plan, 12 submissions were received from property owners/developers representing 17 properties. A submission report is provided at Attachment 3 outlining the issues raised and the recommended Council response. Subject to Council approval, it is recommended that property owners be provided a copy of the submission report.

Internal (Organisational) Stakeholder Impacts

Internal stakeholders (refer section 13) have been involved throughout the land use and infrastructure planning investigation and are satisfied with the outcomes of this report. Internal stakeholders will be consulted in development of consequential City Plan amendments and final zone precinct overall outcomes.
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15 TIMING

A report is proposed to be presented to Council in October 2017 with the draft content for
Major update 2 (Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area), including consequential
amendments.

Implementation of infrastructure planning is recommended to be considered for inclusion
within the scope for the next version of the draft LGIP.

16 CONCLUSION

The planning investigation for the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area is
completed, subject to Council endorsement of policy changes to inform City Plan Major
update 2 (Attachments 5, 6 and 7).

Affected property owners have been involved early in the planning process through various
meetings and have provided feedback on a draft concept plan to inform development of
policy changes for a City Plan update. Feedback received from property owners on the draft
concept plan resulted in several new planning directions for a City Plan update. Council
officer’s recommended responses to submissions are included in Attachment 3.

Infrastructure required to support the new community was identified in the draft concept plan
previously presented to Council, and is recommended to be considered for inclusion within
the scope for the next version of the LGIP. In response to submissions, some further
information is provided on roads infrastructure for Baileys Mountain Road intersections to
ensure land required for future works is protected.

A report is proposed to be presented to Council in October 2017 with the draft content for
Major update 2 (Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area), including consequential
amendments.

17 RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council resolves as follows:

1 That the report/attachment be deemed non-confidential except for those parts
deeded by the Chief Executive Officer to remain confidential in accordance with
sections 171 (3) and 200 (5) of the Local Government Act 2009.

2 That City Plan Major Update 2 (draft Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera
Investigation Area) include:
   a Changes to zones resulting in additional Rural zone and Emerging
      community zone (Attachment 5);
   b Creation of an Emerging Community zone - Upper Coomera precinct with
      overall outcomes to be informed by the principles identified in Attachments
      6 and 7.

3 That draft City Plan content to implement the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera
Investigation Area be reported in October 2017, for endorsement in City Plan
Major Update 2.
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4 That infrastructure identified to support urban development of the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area is considered for inclusion within the scope for the next version of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.

5 That the Director Planning & Environment write to property owners of the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area and provide a copy of the submission report (Attachment 3).

6 That Council endorse draft concept sketches for the Baileys Mountain Road intersections with Jenkins Court and Reserve Road (Attachment 9) identifying land required to be protected for future road works.

Author: Justin Collofello
Principal Regional Planner
25 August 2017

Authorised by: Dy Currie
Director Planning & Environment
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COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION  CP17.0913.009
moved Cr Gates  seconded Cr Vorster

1 That the report/attachment be deemed non-confidential except for those parts deemed by the Chief Executive Officer to remain confidential in accordance with sections 171 (3) and 200 (5) of the Local Government Act 2009.

2 That City Plan Major Update 2 (draft Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area) include:
   a Changes to zones resulting in additional Rural zone and Emerging community zone (Attachment 5);
   b Creation of an Emerging Community zone - Upper Coomera precinct with overall outcomes to be informed by the principles identified in Attachments 6 and 7.

3 That draft City Plan content to implement the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area be reported in October 2017, for endorsement in City Plan Major Update 2.

4 That infrastructure identified to support urban development of the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area is considered for inclusion within the scope for the next version of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.

5 That the Director Planning & Environment write to property owners of the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area and provide a copy of the submission report (Attachment 3).

6 That Council endorse draft concept sketches for the Baileys Mountain Road intersections with Jenkins Court and Reserve Road (Attachment 9) identifying land required to be protected for future road works.

CARRIED
Attachment 1

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CP16.0817.006

1. That the report/attachment be deemed a confidential document and be treated as such in accordance with sections 171 (3) and 200 (5) of the Local Government Act 2009 and that the document remain confidential unless Council decides otherwise by resolution.

2. That as part of a future City Plan major update, the following Investigation Areas be removed from Strategic Framework Map 1 – designated urban areas with the zone reviewed (where relevant) to reflect the following recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Mudgeeraba (Bonogin Road)</td>
<td>i. Review zoning of 20 Bonogin Road to consider community use on the site (Place of worship);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Review best fit zoning of 24 Bonogin Road after approved multiple dwelling development is completed; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Retain Rural residential zoning for remainder of Investigation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gilston (Pyrus Court)</td>
<td>Retain Rural residential zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Carrara (Whitian Drive)</td>
<td>Include in Low density residential (Large lot precinct).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Coomera (Amity Road)</td>
<td>Include in best fit zones to reflect commenced uses and community infrastructure designation for a new school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. That the Upper Coomera (Courtney Drive) Investigation Area be recommended for inclusion in a future City Plan update to:

   a. remove rural residential subdivision opportunity; and

   b. enable a development application for urban development of this Investigation Area to be lodged and considered prior to a City Plan update for the detailed planning being completed, where:

      i. development complies with a Council approved comprehensive plan of development for the entire Investigation Area (either Council led detailed planning or a collaborative developer led approach); and

      ii. the developer pays the full cost to service the out-of-sequence development, including provision of open space recreation areas.

4. That the Upper Coomera (Courtney Drive) Investigation Area be subject to a detailed planning investigation to inform a future City Plan update, including infrastructure modelling/costing to confirm acceptable servicing costs.

5. That in consultation with the local Councillor, the Planning & Environment Directorate be authorised to carry out targeted community engagement with
That further investigation into urban development opportunities and infrastructure costing for Mudgeeraba North, Parkwood and Oxenford Investigation Areas is carried out in the 2016-17 financial year.

That the benefits of carrying out detailed planning for urban development opportunities of Highland Park and Gaven North Investigation Areas in the 2017/2018 financial year, subject to funding, be reconsidered with additional information from detailed planning for medium density opportunities in the Mudgeeraba and Parkwood Investigation Areas.

That as part of a future City Plan update a precinct plan is prepared for the 396 Stanmore Road Yatala Investigation Area to guide future employment generating activities in a manner that protects important environmental values and nearby rural residential amenity.

That in consultation with local Councillors, land owners included within the thirteen Investigation Areas, inside the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031 Urban Footprint, be communicated Council’s recommendations for the timing of detailed planning for Investigation Areas (or for their removal).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CP17.0524.007

1 That the report and attachments be deemed non-confidential except for those parts deemed by the Chief Executive Officer to remain confidential in accordance with sections 171 (3) and 200 (5) of the Local Government Act 2009.

2 That the Draft Upper Coomera Concept Plan is endorsed for targeted community engagement with land owners in the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area.

3 That proposed content for a City Plan major update to implement the Draft Upper Coomera Concept Plan is brought back for consideration by Council, with a review of the feedback from community engagement.

4 That the Director Planning and Environment write to the State Government Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning for early identification of State interests.
Attachment B – Location Plan

- 400m and 800m radius from Baileys Mountain Road intersection
- Courtney Drive Investigation Area
- Highland Reserve Development
- Wongawallan Conservation Area
- Brygon Reserve Neighbourhood Centre
- Upper Coomera State College
Submission summary report
Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera

Land use
- Objection to impact of new community on environment and rural living amenity
- Relocatable home park
- Residential density
- Retirement facility
- Low impact Tourist park

Infrastructure
- Local park location
- Roads network
- Stormwater management
- Water and sewerage network

Mapping and environment
- City Plan mapping outcomes for new community
- Contours
- Watercourse buffers
- West Courtney Drive
- Koalas

General
- Consultation period
- General Support
### Section 1: Land Use

- Objection to impact of new community on environment and rural living amenity
- Relocatable home park
- Residential density
- Retirement facility
- Low Impact Tourist park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **S05P1**            | Concerned with the impacts of a new community on existing rural acreage lifestyle of property at **REDACTED**, which is not shown to have any future urban development opportunities:  
  - loss of scenic amenity and viewpoints during and after construction of new community;  
  - amenity impacts from construction for residential development (air pollution, dust and noise impacts) over a long period of time; and  
  - increased crime risk from introduction of a new community across Courtney Drive. | Change overtime to the landscape in this location is inevitable with the current zoning for rural residential which allows for subdivision to an average lot size of 8,000sqm (min 4,000sqm). However, with the proposed new suburban neighbourhood there will be greater impacts on the landscape with more dwellings and hard surfaces (roofs, roads, driveways etc.). Visual relief from new urban development is proposed through new vegetation within the public realm including street trees and revegetation of proposed green space corridors. Amenity impacts from construction (e.g. dust) are managed through conditions of development. This includes a requirement for a construction management plan to minimise disturbances to the environment and nearby properties.  
  Whilst a new community will create additional population, this does not necessarily mean there will be increased crime. The Queensland State Government ‘Crime Prevention through Environmental Design – Guidelines for Queensland’ asserts that crimes against people and property are less likely to occur if other people are around. For example new houses fronting Courtney Drive will provide passive surveillance which is presently non-existent. | |
| **S05P2**            | Concerned with vehicle congestion from 700 plus new dwellings and Courtney Drive becoming a residential collector, concerned there will be gridlock situations during peak traffic times. | A key element of the draft concept plan and draft City Plan update is to ensure the road network for the new community is designed to disperse traffic across three access points with Reserve Road. This includes extending Courtney Drive through to a new access point on Reserve Road. | |
| **S05P3**            | Concerned with the impacts of a new community on flora and fauna including kookaburras, wedge tailed eagles, wallabies, foxes, rabbits, frogs, snakes (including the endangered Bandy Bandy snake), bush budgies, black cockatoos, goannas and others. | An upgrade of Bailey’s Mountain Road is proposed to a sub-arterial (one lane each way) including realignment to connect to the existing roundabout at Reserve Road / Old Coach Road. This will remove an existing substandard intersection location onto Old Coach Road and improve traffic flow to and from Reserve Road. | |
| **S06P1**            | Lowering value and enjoyment of property at **REDACTED**, which is not shown to have any future urban development opportunities, due to following:  
  - impact of neighbouring land transitioning from rural residential to high density urban (noise, visual and environmental pollution from development works);  
  - loss of ratings for visual assessments;  
  - loss of quality of lifestyle representing rural living;  
  - impact to flora, fauna and waterways; | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01P2</td>
<td>Objection to a relocatable home park (or gated community) in the area.</td>
<td>A Relocatable home park (or gated community) is impact assessable in the Emerging community zone, which is the zone proposed to transition the Investigation area for urban development. A Relocatable home park (or gated community) has potential to conflict with current City Plan outcomes for development of new communities specifically around restricting access to public open space, connectivity of the road network and cohesive communities. This includes:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S02P1               | Supports the prospect of a low-cost sustainable housing gated community in this area to:  
- achieve more balanced neighbourhoods, rather than having concentrations of rental properties which are not conducive to lowering the crime rate; and  
- relieve the Council of ongoing maintenance costs.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | - Strategic framework section 3.3.4.1(7)(a) and Emerging community zone code overall outcome 6.2.15.2(a)(iii) 'contribute to safe, healthy and cohesive communities that reduce social isolation and promote community wellbeing'.  
- Strategic framework section 3.3.4.1(7)(b) and Emerging community zone code overall outcome 6.2.15.2(e)(iv) 'New communities have an interconnected system of streets and open spaces that offer a pleasant and comfortable walking and cycling environments...'.  
- Strategic framework section 3.3.4.1(7)(f) and Emerging community zone code overall outcome 6.2.15.2(e)(vi) 'achieve a high standard of urban design and safety, with dwellings and other buildings appropriately address all road frontages'. |
| S03P1               | Concerned the draft plan does not allow for a sufficient range of development options for the area to meet Council and community needs. Supports the development proposal from...  
- has potential to take advantage of the natural attractive amenity of the land; and  
- addresses community need for affordable housing for older people (releasing capital from family homes so they can be more financially independent).                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst a gated community targeted at the lower end of price market will have benefits to enhance affordable housing options in the locality and provide security for those living within the estate, there will be little or no benefits for the surrounding new community. Negative attributes arising from a large gated community include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Barriers to movement in the locality, particularly pedestrian movement. Reduces access/connectivity to services and facilities for those who can't drive such as children or the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased perception of crime in the locality, perception that inside the wall/gate is safe and that outside must therefore not be safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Detracts from 'sense of community', physical barriers can create psychological distinctions between insiders and outsiders (reduces social contact between insiders and outsiders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A proposal for a Relocatable home park would need to be accompanied with a ‘comprehensive plan of development’ (refer City Plan Policy 6.6) considering the wider precinct to demonstrate how the proposal contributes to achievement of the Emerging community zone overall outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07P3</td>
<td>Concerned with ability of density targets for investigation area to be achieved. With consideration of the various constraints across the area, a yield of approximately 459 dwellings appears more achievable (in comparison to minimum of 499 identified by the concept plan). Key issues raised in submission include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flood prone area in south east corner may reduce yield of Courtney North East precinct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bushfire constraints may reduce yield for areas west of Courtney Drive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fragmented ownership will make it difficult to delivery density.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sloping land in the south east precinct will restrict yield.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>The draft concept plan provided an estimate for yield (low and high range) based on site constraints and opportunities. As a basis for determining yield calculations, a Net developable area was identified which excluded constrained land (greenspace network and a nominal reduced buffer for lower order waterway corridors). The Courtney Drive extension and the local recreation park were also excluded from Net developable area. A density was allocated across the Net developable areas with lot size assumptions based on the slope analysis. To calculate yield, 25 per cent of the identified Net developable area was assumed to be utilised for new local roads. Earthworks were assumed for an area of land required for the Courtney Drive extension through to Reserve Road and to reduce extent of land above RL 60m AHD. It is assumed flood prone land in the south east corner will need to be part of a larger amalgamated development with bulk earthworks to facilitate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Submission reference | Point of submission | Council response
--- | --- | ---
S10P4 | Greater alignment of the growth goals as stated in Chapter 3 of the draft South East Queensland Regional Plan (SEQRP). In particular Goal 1 relating to 'Grow'. This goal advocates for consolidated urban settlement patterns and land supply meeting the projected population for the next 25 years.

Element 3 'New Communities' seeks to create "New communities [that] support a consolidated urban settlement pattern, maximise the use of existing infrastructure and deliver high-quality communities" (p. 33). whilst Strategy 3 "...plan[s] for a net residential density of 15–25 dwellings/ha in new urban areas..." to achieve greenfield dwelling supply benchmarks as stated in the draft regional plan lot sizes should comprise 400-600m² - with provision for smaller lot sizes incorporated to enable the 'net' density targets to be achieved in this new urban area.

The draft Concept Plan currently provides for a net residential density of 11-16 dwellings per net hectare which is in conflict with the draft SEQRP and does not provide an efficient use of the new urban area in so far as optimising lot / dwelling yield, particularly in assisting in meeting the greenfield supply benchmarks for the City as stated in Table 2: Dwelling supply benchmarks 2011-41 of the draft SEQRP (p. 36).

A notation is provided with the density figures on the draft concept plan to clarify 'net density = total yield divided by developable area'. Further notes are provided to explain that new local roads are assumed to account for 25 per cent of developable area and a nominal area around watercourses is excluded from developable area. The green space network and area required for the Courtney Drive extension and Baileys Mountain Road realignment were also excluded from developable area.

The new community for Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera will be included in the Emerging community zone within a precinct with overall outcomes. The density reference within overall outcomes will be more clearly expressed (e.g. reference made to dwellings per 'net developable hectare')

The density calculation based on Net developable area (refer City Plan definition) is consistent with Council's approach to the assessment of infrastructure demand for greenfield areas in the LGIP.

This approach is consistent with the ShapingSEQ Regional Plan 2017 measurement for density within new communities 'Net residential density':

and some of this area may be utilised for stormwater detention. This may also form part of a wider corridor for Yaun Creek (60m minimum only is specified on the plan).

Of note, in addition to the Relocatable home park proposal, developer interest in the Investigation Area includes a Retirement facility in the north eastern precinct and a large amalgamated development site south of Yaun Creek. Comments from the developer for CSE sub-preinct submits Council's yield estimates are too conservative, indicating pressure for a higher overall yield.

Council acknowledge that for the high yield of sub-preinct CNE to be achieved, this will require development of more intense housing form (e.g. Multiple dwellings) on flat land where the yield concept plan identifies a high yield at 1 dw per 250sqm. The draft City Plan update provides a more clear overall outcome for density which acknowledges a higher yield for Multiple dwelling development.

Council acknowledge the development of areas west of Courtney Drive may take a longer timeframe to develop. This area is reliant on infrastructure connections following development east of Courtney Drive and presents more development difficulties due to slope, bushfire and fragmented ownership. Consequently a lower yield is identified for this area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference is made to letter dated 16 November 2015 from Deputy Premier Jackie Trad relating to the adoption of the Gold Coast City Plan. Particular focus is made to item 1 on page 2 of the letter which requires the City Plan be amended to “Address the misalignment between residential density and the code assessable allotment size in the low density residential zone, to ensure housing choice and diversity are maintained and dwelling targets are achieved within the Gold Coast”. It is understood that this matter will be addressed in the upcoming Major Amendment Package 1B whereby minimum lot size in the low density residential zone will be 400m² and not 600m² as is currently the case. It is noted A1, A2, A3 &amp; B1 are in conflict with the draft SEQRP, the Ministerial direction, and minimum lot sizes to be included in upcoming City Plan Amendments Package 1B. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> For the purposes of consistency we suggest the provision for minimum lot size should be adjusted to reflect both the draft SEQRP and upcoming City Plan amendments.</td>
<td>The number of dwellings or single dwelling lots, or a combination, divided by the area of the lots and local roads and parks, i.e. the overall ‘engloba’ site minus the following: constrained areas (e.g. areas subject to flooding, protected vegetation, etc.); non-residential sites/uses (e.g. medical facilities, education facilities, shops, community services, non-local parks, drainage land, etc); non-local transport and other infrastructure. Estimated yields for the draft concept plan are based on the topographical constraints of the land. Larger lot sizes were assumed for slope affected land. The concept plan work does not provide the evidence (i.e. bulk earthworks plan) to support a higher density. The lot size ranges identified on the draft concept plan are not recommended to be reflected in City Plan. These lot sizes were estimates only based on slope analysis and were not intended to be the basis for a zoning plan. Development for a new community in the Emerging community zone will be impact assessable and any higher yield proposed will be subject to acceptable urban design outcomes being achieved. The City Plan update is recommended to include an outcome to acknowledge the potential for higher density subject to a large development site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P5</td>
<td>Concerned with the density statement for Courtney South East (CSE) which suggests larger lots sizes are envisaged. It is submitted that a higher density could be achieved with an amalgamated approach to development and bulk earthworks. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> Amend the precinct statement for CSE to include a clearer intent statement for the precinct which envisages increased densities / higher yields particular in situations where an amalgamated approach is proposed to development (i.e ownership and bulk earthworks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P6</td>
<td>Concerned with use of term ‘Suburban Neighbourhood’ promoting a ‘suburban scale’ not being specific enough and the statements in the concept plan relating to this are vague and not useful when distinguishing potential commercial elements: a) Retains and enhances local character and amenity... b) Generally less clustered and characterised by a feeling of openness... c) Lower density housing (has) opportunity to maximise value of individual blocks by working with the natural assets... d) Buildings positioned in a generous landscaped setting... <strong>Recommendation:</strong> There should be greater scope for small lot housing, dual occupancy and multiple dwellings to be provided within the Courtney South East precinct. This will also assist in achieving densities / yield envisaged for the investigation area, counterbalancing highly constrained and segmented sites –</td>
<td>Council have a policy for new communities relating to small lot housing, dual occupancy and multiple dwellings in new communities s3.3.4.1(5): Small lot housing, dual occupancy and multiple dwellings occur in new communities in low concentrations where they achieve a dispersed or gentle scattering effect. These dwellings are limited to the following lots where they do not adjoin existing or approved small lot housing, dual occupancy or multiple dwellings: a) corner lots; or b) lots with both street and rear lane access; or c) lots within a 400 metre walk of a mixed use centre or specialist centre. However, s3.3.4.1(4) allows higher intensity housing forms are supported where within walking distance of a high frequency public transport stop, a major employment area, neighbourhood centre or a district and regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission reference</td>
<td>Point of submission</td>
<td>Council response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which will likely prove difficult to achieve envisaged yields as standalone allotments.</td>
<td>community and recreation facility. Sub-precinct CSE does not fit the criteria for higher intensity housing forms. The characteristics of the location better fit the Strategic Framework description for ‘suburban neighbourhoods’ than ‘urban neighbourhoods’. The draft City Plan update seeks to achieve urban development which uses land and infrastructure efficiently, with response to site constraints and opportunities. An opportunity is provided for higher density where on flat land within walking distance (400m) to the local recreation park. These areas are within sub-precinct CNE. However, an outcome is recommended to enable consideration of higher density where development is part of a large scale development. This is intended to acknowledge that a larger development site may enable acceptable design outcomes with a higher density (e.g. solar access, management of earthworks etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S09P3                | Objects to density design outcomes provided which seek to limit earthworks. Seek a higher density target more consistent with the SEQ Regional Plan and the markets capacity to afford housing:  
• Seeks higher density within walkable catchment of the bus stop.  
• Seeks higher density of CNE2 based on topography of land and proximity to open space and major road reserves.  
• Concerned with estimate for local roads (25 per cent), suggested with current intent for esplanade roads there will be a higher percentage of land required for new roads.  
Concerned with statements ‘split level slab on ground homes will be common’ and the implications this will have on achieving affordable housing product (commercial implications) | Development areas within close proximity to the bus stop also coincides with land in close proximity to the proposed local recreation park and other green space. This land is also flat and capable of accommodating slab on ground outcomes. Consequently the draft concept plan has identified the highest yields in these locations.  
However, the existing bus stop on Reserve Road is not a high frequency public transport stop and consequently does not justify higher density outcomes (beyond what is identified on the draft concept plan).  
Development for a new community in the Emerging community zone will be impact assessment. A higher yield will likely require the amalgamation of properties to enable suitable subdivision design. In the Courtney North East (CNE) area, where the highest yield is identified, delivery of the local recreation park and watercourse open space areas are critical to accepting the higher density range.  
Local road estimates at 25 per cent are considered reasonable for the new community with consideration of already established roads infrastructure (Courtney Drive and Baileys Mountain Road). The extent of esplanade roads will be subject to detailed assessment as part of a development application.  
The statement regarding ‘split level slab on ground homes will be common’ is not recommended to be carried forward into the draft City Plan update. An outcome will be provided to guide development of most slope affected land (mostly located...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S04P1                | RETAILED           | **On the western side of Courtney Drive** along the following principles:  
**Development on slope affected land avoids impacts on visual amenity (e.g. avoids large exposed retaining walls or utilises slope sensitive house design).**

**Editor’s Note:** Where earthworks are proposed, amalgamation of properties may be necessary to achieve an acceptable earthworks and landscape strategy.

**Editor’s Note:** Refer to Council’s City Plan guideline for ‘Building on sloping sites’, available on Council’s website.

**Earthworks associated with the Courtney Drive extension achieves acceptable visual amenity with vegetated stepped baffles.**

---

**Retirement facility**

S04P1

Broad support of the Draft Upper Coomera Investigation Area Concept Plan with respect to residential development intent for the investigation area and medium density opportunities identified for. Strategic support is sought for a retirement facility at [REDACTED] There is economic need for retirement facilities in Upper Coomera to support ageing population. An analysis provided by Macro Plan Dimasi indicates there is an undersupply of 577 beds in the local catchment (in 2017), increasing to an undersupply of 675 beds in 202 and an undersupply of 819 beds in 2022.

The draft concept plan (yield) is not a zoning plan. The yields identified on this plan are indicative only and their purpose is to assist identifying overall yields (low and high ranges) for infrastructure servicing and the average density range allocated to precincts on the draft concept plan.

B2 areas have assumed a yield on average of between 1 dwelling per 250sqm and 1 dwelling per 399sqm (note this is not assumed lot size). These locations are assumed to have flat land (1:15 or flatter) and suitable for slab on ground without the need for significant earthworks.

These locations are also shown to be close to the local recreation park and proposed green space corridors which provide amenity for the higher yield. There are no other amenities which support a higher yield (the location is not well serviced by public transport or walking proximity to employment or convenience retail).

The draft City Plan update is recommended to include an outcome to ensure that achievement of the higher density range in the Courtney North East development area occurs subject to delivery of adequate open space.

The achievement of the higher range density yield for these locations will be subject to impact assessment development application and the urban design quality of the proposal. Aggrandisation of properties is expected to be required to ensure development at a higher yield provides suitable integration (road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S05P4                | Seeks support for a low impact tourist park (utilising existing site pads and roads) over REDACTED with lightweight cabins or tents within a natural setting. | A Low impact tourist park for nature based tourism will require a development application (impact assessable) with assessment against the City Plan strategic framework. A site visit with Council officers from Regional Planning Team on 22 June 2017 indicated strategic opportunities for a small scale Nature based tourism land use (e.g. tents / small cabins in existing cleared areas) at REDACTED, which showed the following benefits:  
  - good transport access to site;  
  - existing cleared areas within environmental setting; and  
  - close proximity to other tourist accommodation (e.g. Ruffles Lodge). Council support for a development application will depend on the proposed design and response to detailed planning issues such as:  
  - bushfire management / vegetation clearing;  
  - services (water, sewerage, electricity, general waste, drainage);  
  - access (e.g. driveways and visitor parking areas); and  
  - development interface with adjacent properties. |
## Section 2: Infrastructure

- Local park location
- Roads network
- Stormwater management
- Water and sewerage network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S03P2</strong></td>
<td>Objects to the prescriptive location of parkland and treatment of rainwater runoff which unreasonably limits development opportunity for [REDACTED]. The parkland location should be open to negotiation with proposed developers. There is more than one model which could meet community and Council goals (grounds for recommendation of parkland on 288 Reserve Road are not reasonable to the exclusion of other options). The proposed park area would not especially contribute to the amenity of the area, in that it would not be visible from Reserve Road (more so since the road was widened and lowered by a metre, and is a busy section of road). There is no easy road access from Reserve Road, as the land drops away steeply and Yaun Creek needs to be crossed.</td>
<td>A number of options were considered for location of a 1ha local recreation park to meet Council’s standards of service for a new community in the investigation area. The local park option located mostly over 288 Reserve Road was determined the most suitable location with reasons outlined in the draft concept plan report. The following responses are provided in response to issues raised with Council’s preferred local recreation park location. <strong>Issue 1:</strong> Lack of visibility to Reserve Road. <strong>Response:</strong> The visibility to Reserve Road is not a necessity due to the proposed use of the park – i.e. it is a local park that would be used by residents who live within a 500m walkable catchment – a local park is not intended to attract users on a district basis (i.e. passers-by) – this is reflected in absence of carpark spaces associated with a local park. <strong>Issue 2:</strong> Co-location to existing open space is not valid reason. <strong>Response:</strong> Co-location of new open space is desirable for following reasons: it can build upon existing amenity; there is potential for the park use to expand into the adjoin public open space – i.e. walking trails, local connections etc.; and there are efficiencies gained in the whole of life cost of the infrastructure. <strong>Issue 3:</strong> Park would likely require earthworks to achieve Q5 flood immunity. <strong>Response:</strong> Many local parks delivered through the development process require earthworks to achieve Q5 flood immunity. <strong>Issue 4:</strong> The site comprises of the best land available for urban development. <strong>Response:</strong> This issue conflicts earlier issue which indicates that earthworks would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S07P2</strong></td>
<td>Objection to proposed 1ha local recreation park in current location of draft Concept Plan. Key issues with proposed location: 1. lack of visibility to Reserve Road; 2. co-location to existing open space is not valid reason; 3. park would likely require earthworks to achieve Q5 flood immunity; 4. the site comprises of the best land available for urban development; 5. difficult to achieve park with a development proposal as it covers most of developable area of property; 6. new community does not need 1ha local recreation park with consideration of existing open space and proposed park with development of 350 Reserve Road; 7. access to proposed local recreation park is restricted by two waterway crossings; 8. potential CPTED issue due to low lying nature of land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. | Option C is considered a more suitable location for following reasons:  
- limited impact on overall yield;  
- can be provided in part by part of a development proposal;  
- centrally located;  
- collocated to existing tributary;  
- has good view lines and improved casual surveillance;  
- is better suited to a smaller park; and  
- earthworks would be expected as part of residential development proposal (site could be engineered for open space). | be required to improve the site to a Q5 immunity. If this is the case, substantially more earthworks would be required to make the land available for urban development.  
**Issue 5:** Difficult to achieve park with a development proposal as it covers most of developable area of property.  
**Response:** When considering the development of the entire investigation area – this location represents the best location.  
**Issue 6:** New community does not need 1ha local recreation park with consideration of existing open space and proposed park with development of 350 Reserve Road  
**Response:** Considering the area and proposed yield of the investigation area – it has been determined that a trunk local park in that location is required to ensure that the organisation’s service standards are achieved.  
**Issue 7:** Access to proposed local recreation park is restricted by two waterway crossings  
**Response:** A large percentage of recreation space within the City is co-located with a waterway or a waterbody. Accessibility to the parkland is typically overcomes through standard infrastructure including pedestrian bridges.  
**Issue 8:** Potential CPTED issue due to low lying nature of land.  
**Response:** The park can be designed any suggested CPTED taken into consideration. Any potential risks can be mitigated through the design of the space.  
**Issue 9:** Option C is considered a more suitable location  
**Response:** Option C presents similar constraints as Option A – officers suggest that Option A has a greater potential to fulfill the requirements of a local park servicing the local catchment within the investigation area than Option C.  
<p>| S09P2 | Support is provided for current Local Park option A (objects to any proposed change to local park site which would affect REDACTED which is already burdened by Yaun Creek corridor) | Noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roads network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P7</td>
<td>The extension of Courtney Drive only needs to be 16.5m road reserve (not 20m as shown in draft concept plan report). There is no benefit for earthworks at 20m.</td>
<td>The Courtney Drive road reserve width details shown in the draft concept plan report were for yield planning assumptions and will not be included in the draft City Plan update. The draft concept plan report identified a wider road reserve to cater for potential earthworks. In the development assessment process, Council will assess road design based on the merits of the proposal (which could result in a standard 16.5m road reserve width subject to appropriate earthworks response).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P8</td>
<td>The Baileys Mountain Road - Courtney Drive - Reserve Road 'loop' needs to be reviewed in light of the wider land use pattern, and a transport study undertaken. This would provide certainty to the owners in regard to costs. The draft concept plan report identifies the wider benefits that the Courtney Drive extension provides the community. It is also fronting two existing developments (Highland Reserve, and Sleep at 350 Reserve Road) and would benefit these developments and their future residents. The draft concept plan report does not provide discussion of these developments or others outside the investigation area (north of Baileys Mountain Road). <strong>Recommendation:</strong> The draft concept plan should be amended to consistently identify trunk infrastructure with broader analysis undertaken acknowledging the benefits to existing and approved development in the wider area of which this required infrastructure will provide. The draft concept plan should acknowledge approved developments (Stockland Highland Reserve, and Sleep -350 Reserve Road) and provide some commentary on the limitations imposed by those approvals on the feasible extension of Courtney drive.</td>
<td>An important outcome of the draft concept plan was to enable Council to be informed of the likely infrastructure cost implications from the development of a new community in the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera Investigation Area. Without a detailed lot layout for the area, Section 5.2.1 of the draft concept plan report estimates Courtney Drive traffic will split 50-50 between north and south direction accommodating a total of 2,800 vehicles per day (VPD) in each direction. Courtney Drive is assumed non-trunk because it serves only a local catchment (with total VPD estimated under 3,000) and is assumed to be unsuitable for a future bus route due to grades of land. Baileys Mountain Road is expected to accommodate wider traffic movements (e.g., Jenkins Court and Upper Coomera west of the investigation area). Trunk road infrastructure identified for the investigation area is recommended to be considered for inclusion within the scope for the next version of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). The design of proposed new road infrastructure to be included in LGIP version 2 would confirm the infrastructure needs, properties affected by land acquisition, estimated cost and timeframe for Council’s planning to undertake capital works. Draft concept sketches for the Baileys Mountain Road intersections with Jenkins Court and Reserve Road are available to show land area recommended to be protected from development prior to Council finalising detailed design. The approved layouts for the adjacent developments (Highland Reserve and 350 Reserve Road) were reviewed when preparing the draft concept plan. These development approvals both account for construction of a section of unformed road reserve linking to Reserve Road (i.e., extension of Courtney Drive). A change to subdivision layout for High reserve Stage 35 seeks to reduce...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission reference</td>
<td>Point of submission</td>
<td>Council response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P9</td>
<td>To provide separation between Courtney Drive and Baileys Mountain Rd / Jenkins Crt intersection, resumption of private property will likely be required (which could hold up <strong>REDACTED</strong> if it is conditioned as part of an MCU for their site). More clarity is needed in explaining who is responsible for updates, timing of when it is to occur, and if not trunk, arrangements to be put in place to share cost amongst all land owners / developers.</td>
<td>The extent of road along the unformed road reserve (although still accounting for approximately two thirds of new road required on the unformed road reserve). The development proposal for 350 Reserve Road includes temporary T-intersections within the unformed road reserve until such time as the new road is constructed for Highland Reserve Stage 35. The reconfiguration of the Courtney Drive / Jenkins Court intersections onto Baileys Mountain Road is identified as necessary to improve the separation distance between intersections. Council's draft concept drawing for this intersection identifies that land acquisition is necessary for part of the southern part of 135 Baileys Mountain Road (Lot 206 RP171313) to offset the Jenkins Court intersection north. These works may be trunk and are recommended to be considered in the planning for version 2 of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). The design of proposed new road infrastructure to be considered for inclusion in LGIP version 2 would confirm the infrastructure needs, properties affected by land acquisition, estimated cost and timeframe for Council's planning to undertake capital works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P10</td>
<td>Greater clarity is needed to confirm whether intended creek crossing will be a bridge or other (Baileys Mountain Road intersection with Reserve Road).</td>
<td>The design of the road crossing of Yaun Creek at Baileys Mountain Road, required as part of future intersection works, will be part of a future capital works program. The draft City Plan Update will identify the need for this crossing to utilise a fauna friendly design. These works may be trunk and are recommended to be considered in the planning for version 2 of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). The design of proposed new road infrastructure to be included in LGIP version 2 would confirm the infrastructure needs, properties affected by land acquisition, estimated cost and timeframe for Council's planning to undertake capital works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P11</td>
<td>Greater clarity needed to confirm whether a channelised right hand (CHR) intersection is possible (Courtney Drive extension with Reserve Road).</td>
<td>A channelised right hand (CHR) intersection is proposed for the intersection with Reserve Road and extension to Courtney Drive. A design for this intersection is included as part of the approved subdivision layout for Highland Reserve Stage 35. The stormwater crossings (culverts) under Courtney Drive were assumed trunk infrastructure for the draft concept plan estimates of potential infrastructure costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P12</td>
<td>More clarity is needed to confirm the extent of key road and stormwater crossings which will be trunk (draft concept plan report s5.3.1, 5.4.2 and 5.5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission reference</td>
<td>Point of submission</td>
<td>Council response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      |                     | to Council.  
It is recommended LGIP version 2 consider the stormwater trunk infrastructure needs for the investigation area. At this stage it is unknown what culverts will be creditable as trunk infrastructure. A draft LGIP version 2 is planned to be completed to closely align with the City Plan update to rezone the investigation area to support a new community.  

Objection to statement on draft concept plan restricting local road crossings of Yaun Creek. This statement is unjustified (as waterway corridor is presently degraded) and limits opportunities for the movement network.  

An alternative movement network is proposed from Richardson Crescent through to Courtney Drive resulting in a road crossing over Yaun Creek and no further road crossing of other watercourse. This proposal would seek to make the road crossing of Yaun creek trunk infrastructure.  

This option would result in a central road, consolidating multiple intersections presently proposed on Courtney Drive and providing a more direct rout to the bus stop on Reserve Road.  

Courtney Drive is considered to provide a suitable connection east-west. Another crossing of Yaun Creek is not recommended on the draft concept plan due to the impacts this will have on the rehabilitated environmental qualities of Yaun Creek (and its role as a fauna corridor), hydraulics and flood resilience.  

Yaun Creek is the main watercourse through the site, providing the main carriage way for overland flow and flood storage. Creek crossings enlist a range of sub sequential management issues despite appropriate design; such as scour, erosion, disaster management implications (road closures, washouts), disturbance to waterway stability etc. Where possible, the City chooses to minimise creek crossings so these issues can be mitigated in the first instance.  

A road crossing is encouraged over the second higher order watercourse to provide more direct access between the proposed higher density residential areas and proposed local recreation park.  

Esplanade roads adjacent conservation open space areas (e.g. Yaun Creek) will provide a number of benefits to the new community including:  
- Improved amenity for the local area (viewing of open space from public realm, encouraging residents to pursue active recreation e.g. walking).  
- Provide continuous public access and parkland corridors for recreation, walking and cycling.  
- Access to open space by Council and community groups for maintenance.  
- Reduced threat from weeds and other impacts to the green space network.  
- Reduced impact on fauna populations utilising linear corridors to move through the site.  
- Provide visual relief from the built environment and a retreat from developed areas.  
- Ability for watercourse buffers to assist with management of stormwater quality and quantity.

Objection to overzealous application of esplanade roads adjacent to Yaun Creek and overland flow paths. This will result in excess area of local roads reducing iSPOT:#63348614 SUBMISSION REPORT - COURTNEY DRIVE, UPPER COOMERA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S04P3</td>
<td>Requests realignment of Baileys Mountain Road be altered to represent a proposed alternative design solution prepared by REDACTED in accordance with applicable design standards for a sub-arterial road. An alternative conceptual “2-dimensional” road reserve alignment layout has been developed and is provided in Attachment D. The alternative seeks to minimise impacts of the realignment on the proposed development site. A high-level comparison between the currently proposed and alternate realignments identifies that the alternative alignment will result in a reduction of approximately 3,471m² of land dedication when compared to the original realignment. For completeness, the key design considerations are as follows: the road reserve width is consistent with the original configuration of Baileys Mountain Road at 20.5m (i.e. urban road sub arterial); the radius of the reverse curves is based on 50km/h (55m centreline radius) and 40km/h (38m centreline radius) geometric approach speeds in accordance with Austroads Guide to Road Design: Part 3 Geometric Design; Austroads guide stipulates that, “reverse curves with a common point of tangency are possible for operating speeds less than or equal to 80km/h if the superelevation of each curve does not exceed 3% and a nominal rotation rate of 0.025 rad/s is used”; and three equal chord of 6m radius are used to truncate the corners of the road reserve with the property boundary in accordance with Council’s Transport Code. Based on the above and attached conceptual layout, there is sufficient evidence to warrant detailed design to be undertaken for the realignment in order to optimise the geometric road design and reduce the loss of viable land for the property owner and related compensation, and limiting impact on identified ecological and scenic amenity values.</td>
<td>Council has prepared a draft concept which identifies area of land required for the realignment of Baileys Mountain Road intersection to the roundabout with Old Coach Road and Reserve Road utilising a straight line approach. An alternative conceptual “2-dimensional” road reserve alignment layout developed by REDACTED seeks to optimise the geometric road design through a curved approach to minimise impacts of the realignment on REDACTED. The final area of land required to be dedicated to Council for the realignment works will be confirmed upon completion of a detailed design which will occur shortly before the timeframe identified for capital works. Should development be proposed prior to detailed design being completed, Council will seek to acquire the area of land identified in the draft concept plan. These works may be trunk and are recommended to be considered in the planning for version 2 of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). The design of proposed new road infrastructure to be included in LGIP version 2 would confirm the infrastructure needs, properties affected by land acquisition, estimated cost and timeframe for Council’s planning to undertake capital works. A draft concept sketch for the Baileys Mountain Road realignment for the intersection with Reserve Road is available to show the land area to be protected from development, prior to Council finalising detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission reference</td>
<td>Point of submission</td>
<td>Council response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esplanade roads adjacent conservation open space areas (e.g. Yann Creek) will provide a number of benefits to the new community including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved amenity for the local area (viewing of open space from public realm, encouraging residents to pursue active recreation e.g. walking).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide continuous public access and parkland corridors for recreation, walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to open space by Council and community groups for maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced threat from weeds and other impacts to the green space network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced impact on fauna populations utilising linear corridors to move through the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide visual relief from the built environment and a retreat from developed areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability for watercourse buffers to assist with management of stormwater quality and quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The intersection with Baileys Mountain Road is indicative only and is intended to illustrate the intent for the new community to have a well-connected road network. A new local road access point on the lower section of Baileys Mountain Road will assist to reduce travel times for access to the arterial road network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst the draft City Plan update is note proposing to include the indicative location of esplanade roads and intersection with Baileys Mountain Road, an overall outcome is recommended to reflect the intended design principles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stormwater management**

| S09P5 | Objection all internal stormwater costs for the development being borne by the developer (not considered trunk). This strategy will result in a very high whole of life cost to Council, with potentially every land holding that gets developed independently providing its own detention and water quality infrastructure. This will reduce developable areas across the investigation area and increase cost of development. An alternative solution is to consider the implications of either one or small number of trunk detention and water quality devices, consolidated at the end of line(s) to increase developable area of the Investigation Area, reduce whole of life cost to Council and be identified as trunk infrastructure to share the costs across the catchment. |
|       | Based on the strategic nature of the planning investigation, the likely staging of development and the timing at which development will occur, it is not practical to identify end of line solutions for either detention or water quality at this level of assessment. As such, and with the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Version 2 (LGIP) still being developed, it is not economically viable for the City to commit to funding this level of upfront infrastructure (regional solutions). The City is still undertaking assessment in determining the cost benefit of ‘regional’ / ‘at source’ solutions in terms of capital / whole of lifecycle costs; as such the current version of City Plan reflects this with site based detention and treatment as a requirement for development. The LGIP is focused on determining trunk infrastructure and regional solution potential and will inform City Plan accordingly in the near future. There may be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Water and sewerage network</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S10P13               | Confirm if future modelling will affect the height of water pressure servicing for the investigation area, currently set at RL 60m. | A water network modelling assessment carried out by Gold Coast Water & Waste determined new development (as identified on the draft concept plan) can be serviced with water up to RL55m without any augmentation. To achieve servicing to RL60m AHD, two new x-connections are required to be made available (in addition to already proposed upgrades).

These works have been assumed to be trunk and are recommended to be considered in the planning for version 2 of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP).

Areas above RL 60m AHD are identified on the draft concept plan are recommended to be identified in the draft City Plan update with a statement to identify these areas are constrained due to water infrastructure limitations and may require an alternative approach to servicing (subject to network capacity assessments and approval by Gold Coast Water & Waste). |
| S10P14               | Confirmation all infrastructure stated in Table 5-5, Tables 5-1 and 5-3 (water) and Tables 5-2 and 5-4 (sewer) will be trunk. | All infrastructure identified in Table 5-5 is assumed trunk for the purpose of the draft concept plan to estimate potential costs to Council.

The sewerage servicing costs in Table 5-2 are assumed trunk for the purpose of the draft concept plan to estimate potential costs to Council.

Water servicing costs in Table 5-1 are assumed trunk for the purpose of the draft concept plan to estimate potential costs to Council.

LGIP version 2 is recommended to consider the trunk infrastructure needs for the investigation area. A draft LGIP version 2 is planned to be completed to closely align with gazettel of the City Plan update to rezone the investigation area to support a new community. |
Section 3: Mapping and environment

- City Plan mapping outcomes for new community
- Contours
- Watercourse buffers
- West Courtney Drive
- Koolas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Plan mapping development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S10P15 | Request the CLUM for inclusion in City Plan incorporates a higher level of detail than existing CLUMs (as provided in the draft concept plan). Key information of density and yield is important to benefit both developer and planning assessment officers. | The draft City Plan update will include overall outcomes for the new community specifying target average densities based on net developable area. 
Dwelling yields are not included in the draft City Plan update as these were only estimates to inform the draft concept plan and depend on the extent of developable area (to be confirmed with development applications). |
| Contours |
| S11P1 | Concern is raised with the accuracy of contour lines provided on maps with several dwellings, buildings and dams with contour lines though them indicating a change of heights on a level slab | The contours on the draft concept plan utilise 2014 data from Department of Natural Resources and Mines. This data was suitable for the purpose of slope analysis as part of the draft concept plan to inform recommendations for average density across the new community. 
Note that a change in level of land is not represented by a contour line, rather by the difference between two contour lines. A contour which runs along the middle of a flat area (e.g. house or dam) may represent the level of land between the other two contours either side. |
| Watercourse buffers |
| S02P2 | Objection to 60m wide watercourse corridor on REDACTED (and objection to future open space for this area). The watercourse centre lines on the draft concept plan over REDACTED are in the incorrect location (a plan is provided to show correct location). | The future development intensification of the investigation area will impede the existing opportunities for fauna to move from the Hinterland Core Habitat System mapped in the west and priority species habitat mapped in the east. 
To minimise the impact to these fauna populations, the draft City Plan update identifies two watercourses through the middle of the new community to be retained (and rehabilitated) as part of the green space network. By aligning the fauna corridor with the existing watercourse the identified environmental constraints (stormwater quality and quantity management and fauna movement) |
<p>| S07P1 | Objection to noting an outcome for a 60m wide watercourse corridor on REDACTED and objection to future public open space. The ecological values on site are determined to be of limited value and do not require a 60m | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S08P1</td>
<td>Request the proposed open space for the watercourse north of Yaun Creek be reviewed to remove future open space requirement and specified buffer, to address concerns of the residents of [REDACTED]. The dam on [REDACTED] discharges into the dam on [REDACTED]. The dam on [REDACTED] provides a good retention value as never more than 50% capacity. The dam on [REDACTED] has no retention value as it is spring fed and most of the year discharges a small volume to the dam on [REDACTED]. Overflow pipes installed on the dam on [REDACTED] have coped with all rain events of the last 10 years and the dam wall has never been breached. Selection of adequate size of pipes on [REDACTED] will dramatically improve the yield of the proposed development.</td>
<td>The dam on [REDACTED] are combined reducing the overall impact to the potential developable area. The main role of this corridor is not only the protection of the visible intrinsic values identified on site but includes the protection of the existing landscape functions that Yaun Creek provides. Any reduction in the minimum 60m corridor for these watercourses would reduce the ability of this corridor to service its purpose as a fauna conduit through a highly modified landscape. Research has confirmed that 'edge affects' penetrate a linear corridor from 15-50m (dependant on species, topography, physical processes and vegetation type). As such the reflection of the existing Environmental significance overlay code requirements, as found within the City Plan, are considered reasonable for both mapped watercourses. This will include a requirement to rehabilitate cleared areas to improve the ability for this waterway to act as a fauna corridor. The ability to refine the location the watercourse centreline and extent of the corridor either side to achieve a minimum 60m wide corridor can occur during the development assessment stage to take into consideration detailed studies that will accompany the application. Upon review, future ownership of the second higher order watercourse can be determined as part of the future green space network with opportunity for management in private ownership using a protective mechanism such as a statutory environmental covenant (subject to acceptable design outcome which minimises fragmentation of watercourse and enables rehabilitation). This will be reflected in the draft City Plan update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09P1</td>
<td>Objection to stating specific watercourse buffer widths on the concept plan, specifically the 60m wide corridor for Yaun Creek. Requests the ultimate alignment and width of waterway corridors be determined at development assessment stage. Largely devoid of vegetation, highly disturbed and currently low environmental value Subject to erosion and without discernible top of bank in many areas. Alignment of creek does not represent its natural position. Recommendation for 60m does not appear to have any basis in either hydrological or demonstrable environmental outcomes.</td>
<td>The future development of the investigation area will impede the existing opportunities for fauna to move from east to west through the site. The proposed intensification will become a barrier to species moving between the Hinterland Core Habitat System mapped in the west and priority species habitat mapped in the west. When fauna is unable to move across a landscape, populations can become isolated which can result in local extinctions as the ability to access mates, food and other resources is restricted. The main role of the Yaun Creek corridor is not only the protection of the visible intrinsic values identified on site but includes the protection of the existing landscape functions that Yaun Creek provides. The proposed intensification will become a barrier to species moving between the Hinterland Core Habitat System mapped in the west and priority species habitat mapped in the east. By aligning the fauna corridor with the existing watercourse the identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04P2</td>
<td>Requests realignment of the proposed greenspace network corridor to align with the identified ecological values and watercourse corridor within the subject site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission reference</td>
<td>Point of submission</td>
<td>Council response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03P2</td>
<td>REDACTED Objection to mapping and protection of watercourses and corridors on [REDACTED]. Yaun Creek runs across the Reserve Road side of our property and does not enter the back of the property; apart from Yaun Creek, where there seems to be a spring, other water points are purely storm water run off and can be managed as such; and the treatment of rain water run should be open to negotiation with prospective developers and open to being managed by an engineered solution.</td>
<td>environmental constraints (stormwater quality and quantity management and fauna movement) are combined reducing the overall impact to the potential developable area. Any reduction in the minimum 60m corridor would reduce the ability of this corridor to service its purpose as a fauna conduit through a highly modified landscape. Research has confirmed that ‘edge effects’ penetrate a linear corridor from 15-50m (dependant on species, topography, physical processes and vegetation type). As such the reflection of the existing Environmental significance overlay code requirements, as found within the City Plan, are considered reasonable for this mapped watercourse. This will include a requirement to rehabilitate cleared areas to improve the ability for this waterway to act as a fauna corridor. The draft City Plan update seeks to restrict ability to reduce the minimum 60m wide corridor for Yaun Creek which is the highest order tributary in the investigation area. However, the ability to refine the location the watercourse centreline and extent of the corridor either side to achieve a minimum 60m wide corridor can occur during the development assessment stage to take into consideration detailed studies that will accompany the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10P1</td>
<td>Request consideration be given to enabling the 60m wide linkage corridor for Yaun Creek to be achieved by varied buffer setbacks from the waterway (i.e. 15m on one side and 45m on the other). This approach could help to resolve some of the isolated ‘islands’ of development created by the waterway buffer requirements.</td>
<td>The draft concept plan indicates a minimum waterway buffer of 30m to Yaun Creek and in addition nominates key pedestrian / cycle linkages along either side. In addition it is likely that stormwater treatment devices will be located adjacent to these areas. Given the current degraded condition of the existing waterways, is it Council’s intention to allow for the integration and co-location of environmental buffers / open space linkages and stormwater treatment within the 30m buffers? Or is Council’s intention to restrict the open space linkages and stormwater treatment outside the proposed 30m buffers? An illustration of Council’s preferred option for the above outcomes would be of assistance. The main role of this corridor is not only the protection of the visible intrinsic values identified on site but includes the protection of the existing landscape functions that Yaun Creek provides. Any reduction in the minimum 60m corridor would reduce the ability of this corridor to service its purpose as a fauna conduit through a highly modified landscape. Inclusion of infrastructure such as paths, and stormwater treatment (which requires regular sediment removal and maintenance) would result in a fauna corridor that does not function sufficiently for the fauna it has been designed to service. As such the draft City Plan update will seek to restrict ability to reduce the minimum 60m wide corridor for Yaun Creek which is the highest order tributary in the investigation area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Submission reference | Point of submission | Council response
--- | --- | ---
S10P3 | The draft concept plan nominates a number of waterways to be maintained within private ownership; however, limited information is provided as to what can be achieved for these features. Most of these waterways are mapped on the City Plan Overlay and therefore would be subject to code provisions. This could result in 30m setbacks. This appears to be in conflict with the proposed intent of these features. Further clarification would be helpful in regard to reduced setbacks for waterways maintained in private ownership. | The draft City Plan update proposes an overall outcome for other watercourses outside of the mapped green space network to provide natural overland flow paths for stormwater management with buffers to be determined subject to assessment against Environmental significance overlay code. The extent of any development within the acceptable solution (30m setback) will need to be determined subject to detailed assessment. The draft concept plan yield estimates have assumed there would be some development within the 30m setback however; this is not intended to preclude the development assessment outcome. |

**West Courtney Drive**

S11P2 | Concern is raised with the development restriction identified for areas above RL60m and the approach taken for identification of significant vegetation (question why such high value is placed on one or two large trees on site amongst black wattle). Comparison is made to the Heights development (Stage 2) at Rifle Range Road, Pimpama where large areas of oversize trees are allowed removal and development up to RL65 is achieved. This is inconsistent and unfair. Requests a less conservative approach to development west of Courtney Drive, which allows for reshaping of a knoll at the back of the site to rectify fill requirements for development works on western side of Courtney Drive. | A water network modelling assessment carried out by Gold Coast Water & Waste determined without any augmentation, new development can be serviced with water up to RL55m AHD. To achieve servicing to RL60m AHD, two new x-connections are required to be made available (in addition to already proposed upgrades). The trunk works necessary to enable servicing to RL60m AHD will be considered in the planning for the version 2 of Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). Areas above RL60m AHD are identified on the draft concept plan are recommended to be identified in the draft City Plan update with a statement to identify these areas are constrained due to water infrastructure limitations and may require an alternative approach to servicing (subject to network capacity assessments and approval by Gold Coast Water & Waste). Following several site visits and further review of site analysis mapping, for the development area west of Courtney Drive Council officers have identified a limited area of land above RL60m AHD where not constrained by slope in excess of 1:3 and outside of high constraint vegetation mapping. These areas are recommended for inclusion in the Emerging community zone and clearly mapped to show above RL60m AHD. Existing Rural zoned areas on elevated land west of Courtney Drive form part of the City’s existing green space network. Historically, west of Courtney Drive was zoned rural in the Albert Shire Planning Scheme 1995. Lower elevated parts of this area were zoned rural residential in City Plan, reflecting the intent of the previous Coomera Local Area Plan (2003). |

S12P1 | Request Council review the area of future new community to extend beyond RL60m to account for the location of house and surrounding land on REDACTED. | |

S12P2 | Concern is raised with the reasons for vegetation on REDACTED being classified as a high constraint, noting more significant vegetation seems to be permitted to be cleared as part of other developments in the area (e.g. The Heights at Rifle Range Road, Pimpama). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                      |                     | The assessment of the vegetation community’s importance and protection is not solely based on quality but location within the broader City context. This vegetation links to a mapped core habitat biodiversity area. As referenced within the City Plan Strategic Framework (3.7.4.1) these areas are the last remaining tracts of intact habitat. They are fauna strongholds, supporting a variety of vegetation associations, habitat for diverse fauna populations; and require the highest level of protection. The flora and fauna study for the Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera investigation area identified the ‘general priority’ vegetation which is mapped over the back part of REDACTED (refer Figure 2 of GHD Flora and Fauna Study) as ‘regrowth’ Brush box open forest with rainforest understorey on metasediments (RE 12.11.3a). The area has ecological value and provides connectivity for fauna between areas of remnant vegetation and other areas of regrowth vegetation. The draft concept plan report also provides an explanation of environmental constraints (pages 6 and 11). In addition to vegetation and water supply constraints, other major constraints which have resulted in restricting the area of new community west of Courtney Drive included: 1) slope of land 1:3 or greater; 2) very high bushfire hazard; and 3) scenic amenity (visual exposure of area). The development outcomes for ‘The Heights’ development were not a consideration for planning of Upper Coomera. This development is part of the Nambucca Development Plan which was approved in 2009. The clearing of vegetation for this development was for areas which had been committed to development for over 20 years through the Coomera Local Area Plan and previous Future Urban zone of the land (Albert Shire Planning Scheme 1995). Since these historic planning outcomes, habitat has been constricted by urban activities and as a result the remaining core habitat areas have become more significant over time. The draft concept plan and recommended draft City Plan update ensure the correct balance occurs between allowing development and protection of significant habitat and the fauna species that utilise it. Of note, the development conditions for the Nambucca Development Plan restrict supply for water to RL55m AHD. A note to the condition states ‘methods of supply for land above RL55m AHD will be determined at the time of future development.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S06P3                | Concerned with extent of ecological constraint mapping and slope assessment on property was not accessed for the ecological assessment. Concerned with transparency on which lots have been assessed. Note a natural spring on another property is shown to have A1 yield on concept plan. Appendix E (Ecological Assessment) only available upon request via electronic format. | On site ecological assessment of properties occurred shortly after the community meeting on 28 November 2016 with lots assessed following acceptance of owners at the meeting or responding to the initial Council correspondence. A follow up visit was carried out on 23 February 2017 to visit the site proposed for the Courtney Drive extension. The primary focus for ecological assessment was on areas east of Courtney Drive where greatest development opportunity existed (due to lower elevation and less steep slopes). The more elevated areas west of Courtney Drive were constrained by topography (visual amenity, slope and elevation) which restrict development opportunities as much as vegetation communities. Consequently access for all sites west of Courtney Drive was not deemed essential as these other constraints preclude development opportunity. The vegetation west of Courtney Drive links directly to a core habitat biodiversity area, significant species habitat including koala. As referenced within the City Plan Strategic Framework (3.7.4.1) these areas are the last remaining tracts of intact habitat. They are fauna strongholds, supporting a variety of vegetation associations, habitat for diverse fauna populations; and require the highest level of protection. Sites visited west of Courtney Drive enabled assessment of the strategic nature of environmental characteristics of this area which has historically been zoned rural (already forming part of the cities greenspace network), with some land as future rural residential since the superseded 2003 Planning Scheme. In relation to, a major reason for restricting future urban development opportunities is the location of Yaun Creek along the front of the property and a second watercourse along the northern boundary. Future road crossings of Yaun Creek are not recommended due to further impacts on the watercourse and the intent for this corridor to provide for fauna movement. A small area of the site is located below RL60m AHD outside of the watercourse buffers. This is where the exiting house is located. However, the area of land beyond the house is slope affected. Five metres below RL60m AHD is affected by slopes of between 26 and 46 per cent. Five metres above RL60m AHD is affected by slopes approximately 27 per cent. Further elevated land is even greater.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affected by slope in excess of 33 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The current Rural and Rural residential zone applying to the site is recommended to be retained. There is approximately 16,960m² in the Rural residential zone which enables subdivision of the site. However, many constraints would need to be overcome which may limit the potential number of lots (e.g. vehicle access on land with steep grades and crossing of watercourses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In summary there are five major constraints which have resulted in restricting the area of new community west of Courtney Drive:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) slope of land 1:3 (33 per cent) or greater;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) very high bushfire hazard;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) water servicing issues for land above RL60m AHD;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) vegetation already part of a wider greenspace network; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) scenic amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koalas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S03P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5: General

- Consultation period
- General Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission reference</th>
<th>Point of submission</th>
<th>Council response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06P2</td>
<td>Insufficient time to make an informed decision.</td>
<td>The consultation period was open for just over 20 business days following letters mailed on 6 June through to 8 July 2017. During this time Council officers carried out an open consultation meeting with property owners on 12 June and opened doors to other meetings as requested by property owners. A statutory consultation period will take place for the public to provide submissions on the draft City Plan update when it is publicly notified as part of a future City Plan major update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01P1</td>
<td>Supports the draft concept plan.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D - City Plan major update options analysis

This attachment provides an extract from the City Planning Committee report (CP17.0524.007) for draft Upper Coomera Concept Plan:

‘To implement the draft concept plan in a future City Plan update, two zoning options have been considered.

Option 1 (recommended): Emerging community zone

This option involves including future development areas in the Emerging community zone, together with a Conceptual Land Use Map. It is recommended that those areas currently in the Rural zone without urban development opportunities remain in the Rural zone.

The reasons for recommending the Emerging community zone include:

- The Emerging community zone purpose is the best fit for zoning of residential greenfield land. The purpose of the Emerging community zone code is to:
  
  (a) identify land that is suitable for urban purposes and protect land that may be suitable for urban development in the future;
  (b) manage the timely conversion of non-urban land to urban purposes; and
  (c) prevent or discourage development that is likely to compromise appropriate longer term land use.

- The boundary of suburban and greenspace areas can be subject to refinement through the planning assessment process, following consideration of more detailed site based technical assessments.

- The Emerging community zone requires residential development to be impact assessable ensuring development proposals have consultation with adjacent property owners. This assists to ensure development integrates with adjacent sites and does not prejudice development opportunities.

- The Emerging community zone provides flexibility and requires development to establish its own built form parameters based on site characteristics. For example lot sizes, setbacks, and distribution of dual occupancy/multiple dwellings.

Option 2: Low density residential, Rural, Rural residential and Open space zones to reflect the precinct intents.

This option involves including suburban neighbourhoods in the Low density residential zone; local recreation park and some greenspace network (key watercourses) as Open space zone; and retaining existing zones over private greenspace (Rural and rural residential zones). This option is not recommended for the following reasons:

- Precise boundaries need to be defined to zone areas for Open space and Low density residential. As such, these boundaries should be refined or confirmed through the planning assessment process, following consideration of more detailed site based technical assessments.
The Low density residential zone enables code assessable subdivision with a minimum lot size of 600m². This minimum lot size is not appropriate for some constrained parts of the Investigation Area and is too large for areas where greater density is envisaged. This could influence a developer's decision to keep lots larger to avoid impact assessable development, resulting in underutilisation of infrastructure.

The Low density residential zone does not enable design flexibility e.g. ability to group multiple dwellings / dual occupancy development on lower constrained land, increased setbacks to address site constraints etc.'
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Attachment 5, 6, 7 & 8 - REDACTED