

An aerial photograph of the Gold Coast, Australia, showing a dense urban area with numerous high-rise buildings, a large marina filled with sailboats, and a winding river or canal. The city is situated along a coastline with a beach and waves visible on the left. The background shows a range of mountains under a clear sky.

# DRAFT LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT

CONSULTATION REPORT  
DECEMBER 2022



## We would like to thank the community for their feedback on proposed updates to our Local Government Infrastructure Plan.

We have carefully considered all submissions received during public consultation.

In consideration of submissions, our aim is to balance the feedback received from the community and industry with the need to manage growth. In some instances community feedback may not appear to be directly reflected in the final amendment package, but it has assisted us to reflect the most balanced view of the Gold Coast community.

We would like to sincerely thank the community for taking the time to provide a submission and helping to shape the future of our great city!

### Next steps...

The amendment package and supporting information have been submitted to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning for approval to adopt.

Once we receive Ministerial approval to adopt, the amendment will be presented to Council seeking endorsement to commence.



401 web visits



25 telephone/  
email enquiries



22 public and  
18 internal  
submissions



3 talk to a  
planner session

---

# Contents

---

## **Introduction** **4**

Purpose of this report  
The Gold Coast

---

## **Public consultation** **5**

Submissions received  
How to view your submission response  
Further support

---

## **Next steps** **6**

Ministerial approval

---

## **Section 1: General enquiries** **7**

- 1.1 General LGIP enquiries
- 1.2 LGIP growth assumption enquiries
- 1.3 LGIP financial enquiries
- 1.4 LGIP Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA) enquiries

---

## **Section 2: Public parks and land for community facilities enquiries (Parks)** **9**

- 2.1 Parks Desired Standards of Service (DSS) enquiries
- 2.2 Specific Parks areas/projects

---

## **Section 3: Transport enquiries** **12**

- 3.1 General Transport enquiries
- 3.2 Specific Transport area/projects

---

## **Section 4: Water Supply and Sewerage enquiries** **16**

- 4.1 General Water Supply and Sewerage enquiries
- 4.2 Water Supply and Sewerage Desired Standards of Service (DSS) enquiries
- 4.3 Specific Water and Waste area/project enquiries

---

## **Section 5: Stormwater enquiries** **18**

- 5.1 Stormwater enquiries

---

## **Section 6: Key area enquiries** **20**

- 6.1 Key area enquiries

---

## **Section 7: Other enquiries** **22**

- 7.1 Matters not regulated by the Local Government Infrastructure Plan

---

## **Section 8: Submissions made on behalf of the City of Gold Coast** **26**

- 8.1 Transport network submissions
- 8.2 Stormwater network submissions
- 8.3 Public parks and land for community facilities (Parks) network submissions

# Introduction

## PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This draft Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) amendment public consultation submissions report has been prepared by the City of Gold Coast (**City**) in accordance with the *Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR)*, under the *Planning Act 2016 (the Act)*.

The City invests significantly in new and upgraded trunk infrastructure to facilitate urban development on the Gold Coast. The LGIP is Part 4 of the City Plan and outlines where, when and how trunk infrastructure is anticipated to be delivered over the next 15 years. The role of the LGIP is to clearly show the City's plans for trunk infrastructure to support future growth and urban development. It ensures trunk infrastructure is efficiently coordinated and delivered. The LGIP also guides the City's future capital works program and assists with long-term financial planning.

State interest review of the draft LGIP amendment was completed in June 2022, following which Council endorsed the draft LGIP amendment for public consultation. The official public consultation period was from 1 to 19 August 2022 (15 business days). Council officers reviewed and responded to all properly made submissions to the draft LGIP amendment and a Council response to each submission is provided in this report.

Council has endorsed the draft LGIP amendment to be sent to the State Government for their final review and following Ministerial consideration, the City will be advised whether the draft LGIP amendment may be adopted.

This report provides a summary of submissions received in response to the public consultation undertaken by the City.

## THE GOLD COAST

The Gold Coast is Australia's largest non-capital city, with an estimated residential population of 633,764 people. It is a city known for having one of Australia's most enviable lifestyles with its golden beaches, iconic skyline, world-class surf breaks and exceptional business and investment opportunities. It also continues to be one of the fastest growing Local Government Areas in Australia.

With this continued growth, the Gold Coast is in an exciting period that has resulted in new innovation hubs, jobs in a diverse range of industries, emerging cultural and events experiences, connectivity and amenities that support our lifestyle. However, it has also exacerbated a complex challenge for the City: managing growth.

The Queensland Government's *Shaping SEQ – South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (ShapingSEQ)* sets a framework for how the City must cater for the anticipated future growth. Specifically, this legislative document identifies that the Gold Coast will need to accommodate an additional 351,100 people, 158,900 dwellings and 180,000 jobs by 2041. To successfully do so, the City needs to guide this anticipated growth, while sustaining our environment and continuing to provide economic opportunities.



# Public consultation

During the public consultation phase, we engaged the community through advertising, “talk to a planner” sessions, fact sheets and copies of the draft LGIP amendment being available at all five of the City’s customer service centres. The draft LGIP amendment was also displayed and available for download on the City’s website, along with an interactive mapping tool to assist the public in visualising where planned trunk infrastructure will occur.

## SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Council received 40 submissions during the public consultation period, 22 submissions from members of the public, community groups or industry bodies which were analysed into approximately 70 separate points requiring consideration and 18 submissions made on behalf of the City. Some submissions received by the City raised a single issue or point relating to a specific part of the draft LGIP amendment. Other submissions raised a number of issues and related to various parts of the draft LGIP amendment. There were other submissions that raised general issues not related to the draft LGIP amendment.

All points of submission have been considered by City officers and if applicable, sent to the relevant City infrastructure network (for example, transport) team for consideration. Responses were then consolidated and reviewed internally by Strategic Infrastructure and tabled at the City Planning and Environment Committee and Council for review and final endorsement. Final responses can be viewed within this report.

All submitter comments or ‘points of submission’ have been allocated into ‘sub-categories’. A table for each ‘sub-category’ details:

- Submission number relating to each comment/point of submission.
- Summary of submitter comments or point of submission.
- Council’s response to each submitter comment/point of submission.
- Whether the comment/point of submission has resulted in a change to the draft LGIP amendment.

## HOW TO VIEW YOUR SUBMISSION RESPONSE

If you made a submission you will receive an email from the City, that will include your unique submission number (e.g. LGIP2011). Using this unique submission number, you can find the comments/points of submission you raised and Council’s response.

To find Council’s response to your submission, use the following instructions:

- For Windows, press Ctrl-F (hold down the control key on your keyboard and press ‘F’)
- For Mac, press Command-F (hold down the command key and press ‘F’)

A search field should appear on your screen. Enter your unique submission number in the search field and click “Enter”. If your submissions raised more than one issue, there will be multiple responses throughout the report. To find all responses against your submission number use the following instructions:

- For Windows, use the arrow keys to the right of the find box
- For Mac, use the next/previous buttons below the find box

## FURTHER SUPPORT

Copies of this report are available at the City of Gold Coast customer service centres (digital copies can be emailed on request). You will require your unique submission number to find the corresponding response.

If you are not able to locate your unique submission number, or for all other general enquiries regarding the draft LGIP amendment, please contact Strategic Infrastructure on (07) 5582 8229 or email [StrategicInfrastructure@goldcoast.qld.gov.au](mailto:StrategicInfrastructure@goldcoast.qld.gov.au)

## Next steps

### MINISTERIAL APPROVAL

The City has submitted the draft LGIP amendment to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning seeking approval to proceed to adoption. Following consideration, the MGR provides that the Minister can provide the City with a notice stating:

- a) *if the proposed amendment may be adopted; and*
- b) *the Minister's conditions, if any, that apply to the proposed amendment; or*
- c) *if the proposed amendment may not be adopted, and the reasons why it may not be adopted.*

The City's website will be kept up to date on how the amendment packages are progressing. Information can be found at [qld.gov.au/Planning-building/Planning-our-city/City-Plan-amendments](http://qld.gov.au/Planning-building/Planning-our-city/City-Plan-amendments).



# Section 1: General enquiries

SECTION 1.1: GENERAL LGIP ENQUIRIES						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
1.1.1.	LGIP2017 LGIP2019	Concern regarding insufficient communications and advertising of the draft LGIP amendment.	No	Public consultation of the draft LGIP amendment has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> and meets all statutory obligations for consultation. The draft LGIP amendment was advertised in the Gold Coast Bulletin, was available for inspection at all Council offices and online for 15 business days as required. City officers were also available to respond to questions and provide information sessions. Feedback on improving communications of the LGIP amendment has been taken on board for future improvement, particularly in terms of understandability and engagement with the community.	No	No

SECTION 1.2: LGIP GROWTH ASSUMPTION ENQUIRIES						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
1.2.1.	LGIP2015 LGIP2020	Concern regarding the planning assumptions used by the City in the LGIP (and to inform the Schedule of Works).	No	<p>The statutory process for reviewing, making and amending Local Government Infrastructure Plans (LGIP) is detailed in the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> (MGR). Chapter 5, Part 6 of the MGR prescribes the process for formulating development projections. In particular, Section 32.1 of the MGRs state that "Development projections must be prepared using a) "the forward projection of historical residential and non-residential growth data to estimate future growth, based on information from the Queensland Government Statistician (QGSO) and other appropriate sources..." This is the top-down approach.</p> <p>Based on this requirement, the draft amendment to LGIP is based on the QGSO 2018 edition scenario available at the time planning assumptions were prepared.</p> <p>The MGR also prescribes how development projections and planned density must be calculated. This includes development types for detached and attached dwellings as well as non-residential uses. The assumed type and scale of development for a particular location must be determined by applying a planned density to a development site. The MGR prescribes that the calculation of planned densities for the purposes of LGIP (network planning) consider the Strategic framework, zoning and development provisions within the (current) planning scheme and other planning instruments and approved plans (MGR, Chapter 5, Part 6 Section 32.6). Although draft amendments to the planning scheme cannot be included in this calculation, current development trends have been taken into consideration. Thus, in accordance with MGR requirements, the planning assumptions for the LGIP amendment (which inform infrastructure network plans and the proposed projects), are based on Version 6 of City Plan, being the version current at the time planning assumptions were prepared.</p> <p>The recent 2021 Census information is now available, and this information will be incorporated into the upcoming 2023 edition QGSO population projection scenario and future LGIP amendments. The observed lower than expected estimated resident population (ERP) at the time of the 2021 Census is likely due to unprecedented COVID-19 border closures and a temporary net loss of overseas migration. With international migration and travel now resuming, we can expect to see population increasing in the years following the 2021 Census, in-line with the rate projected by QGSO.</p> <p>As part of MGR Section 32.6, we also consider the SEQ Regional Planning framework for infrastructure including Shaping SEQ dwelling supply benchmarks for our City at 2041 to support the vision of a growing SEQ region. It is important that our infrastructure planning also reflects the long-term regional vision and projected future of our City.</p>	No	No

### SECTION 1.3: LGIP FINANCIAL ENQUIRIES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
1.3.1.	LGIP2017	Concern regarding infrastructure charges cap.	No	Many local government authorities are managing funding shortfalls to deliver trunk infrastructure under the capped charge regime. This matter has been raised with State government. The Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning announced a review of the capped charge to ensure it remains contemporary with current infrastructure costs, supports housing growth and local government financial sustainability. City of Gold Coast supports the review and welcomes any increase. At this stage the Department has not advised when the review will be completed.	No	No

### SECTION 1.4: LGIP PRIORITY INFRASTRUCTURE AREA (PIA) ENQUIRIES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
1.4.1.	LGIP2020	Concern regarding the Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA) boundary. It should include available land supply to allow for efficient and timely delivery of infrastructure and distribution of costs.	No	<p>The <i>Planning Act 2016</i> defines the Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA) as an area to be serviced with infrastructure to accommodate at least 10 years but not more than 15 years of growth. In determining the PIA, the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> require that local government consider the spare capacity of the existing trunk infrastructure networks and the cost effectiveness and efficiency of the future trunk infrastructure demand at the desired standards.</p> <p>The draft LGIP amendment includes a PIA encompassing the majority of urban zones. This is due to the predominantly infill nature of expected future urban growth to achieve urban consolidation targets under <i>South East Queensland Regional Plan Shaping SEQ</i>. The PIA is intended to assist with sequencing and prioritising trunk infrastructure. Expanding the PIA further would be contrary to this purpose and contrary to the requirement to consider capacity of the existing trunk infrastructure networks.</p>	No	No

## Section 2: Public parks and land for community facilities enquiries (Parks)

SECTION 2.1: PARKS DESIRED STANDARDS OF SERVICE (DSS) ENQUIRIES																																																																											
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?																																																																					
2.1.1.	LGIP2017 LGIP2021	Concerns regarding the reduction in public Parks' Desired Standards of Service (DSS), changes to parks catchment and implications of inadequate parklands and open space.	No	<p>The use of 'hectares per thousand residents' in park standards is the unit required by State government to measure desired standards of service (DSS) of trunk parks for Local Government Infrastructure Plans. This measure is not a real reflection of the quality, quantity or useability of our total public open space network. It does not include smaller pocket parks in neighbourhoods, our extensive network of natural areas or our 50km of beaches. If the City included its entire open space estate, it would have a DSS exceeding 24ha/1,000 residents.</p> <p>The City has changed the DSS for our trunk parks to meet the challenge of future land availability as per the planned population growth from the <i>South East Queensland Regional Plan Shaping SEQ</i>, increased land acquisition costs and capped infrastructure charges limiting available revenue for trunk parks.</p> <p>However, the City has been proactive and strategic in securing land to respond to these challenges and almost 500 hectares of parkland and land for important community facilities have been secured. The below table details land acquired through the Recreation Open Space Separate Charge and other infrastructure funds. In addition to this, the Open Space including Koala Habitat, Maintenance and Enhancement Separate Charge has recently been reactivated to allow for land acquisition for conservation purposes.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>PROJECT NAME</th> <th>AREA IN HECTARES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>Green Heart Parkland Merrimac</td><td>150</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>Regatta Waters Park Oxenford</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>Hilltop Park Labrador</td><td>0.246</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>57 Billington Street Labrador</td><td>0.46</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>Hope Island Sports Park</td><td>4.35</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>Jabiru Island Hope Island</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>90 Reserve Road, Upper Coomera</td><td>4.1</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>204 Reserve Road Upper Coomera</td><td>2.2</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>Foreshore Reclamation Southport</td><td>2.7</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>Ormeau District Sports Park</td><td>12.6</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>Bromley Park Extension, Palm Beach</td><td>0.081</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>Coomera Causeway Parklands various sites</td><td>24.27</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>Country Paradise Nerang</td><td>12.2</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>Lake Orr Foreshore Parkland, Varsity Lakes</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td>Consolidation of GC Regional Botanic Gardens</td><td>0.54</td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td>Burleigh Palms Golf Course/ Coplicks Sports Parks expansion</td><td>9.7</td></tr> <tr><td>22</td><td>Dixon Reserve Expansion Pimpama</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>24</td><td>Stewarts Family Parklands Pimpama</td><td>116</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>Stanmore Sports Park Yatala</td><td>84.5</td></tr> <tr><td>27</td><td>Country Paradise expansion Nerang</td><td>4.7</td></tr> <tr><td>28</td><td>Firth park expansion Mudgeeraba</td><td>37</td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>496 ha</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		PROJECT NAME	AREA IN HECTARES	1	Green Heart Parkland Merrimac	150	2	Regatta Waters Park Oxenford	24	3	Hilltop Park Labrador	0.246	4	57 Billington Street Labrador	0.46	5	Hope Island Sports Park	4.35	6	Jabiru Island Hope Island	1	7	90 Reserve Road, Upper Coomera	4.1	9	204 Reserve Road Upper Coomera	2.2	10	Foreshore Reclamation Southport	2.7	12	Ormeau District Sports Park	12.6	13	Bromley Park Extension, Palm Beach	0.081	15	Coomera Causeway Parklands various sites	24.27	16	Country Paradise Nerang	12.2	18	Lake Orr Foreshore Parkland, Varsity Lakes	1	19	Consolidation of GC Regional Botanic Gardens	0.54	21	Burleigh Palms Golf Course/ Coplicks Sports Parks expansion	9.7	22	Dixon Reserve Expansion Pimpama	4	24	Stewarts Family Parklands Pimpama	116	25	Stanmore Sports Park Yatala	84.5	27	Country Paradise expansion Nerang	4.7	28	Firth park expansion Mudgeeraba	37		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>496 ha</b>	No	No
	PROJECT NAME	AREA IN HECTARES																																																																									
1	Green Heart Parkland Merrimac	150																																																																									
2	Regatta Waters Park Oxenford	24																																																																									
3	Hilltop Park Labrador	0.246																																																																									
4	57 Billington Street Labrador	0.46																																																																									
5	Hope Island Sports Park	4.35																																																																									
6	Jabiru Island Hope Island	1																																																																									
7	90 Reserve Road, Upper Coomera	4.1																																																																									
9	204 Reserve Road Upper Coomera	2.2																																																																									
10	Foreshore Reclamation Southport	2.7																																																																									
12	Ormeau District Sports Park	12.6																																																																									
13	Bromley Park Extension, Palm Beach	0.081																																																																									
15	Coomera Causeway Parklands various sites	24.27																																																																									
16	Country Paradise Nerang	12.2																																																																									
18	Lake Orr Foreshore Parkland, Varsity Lakes	1																																																																									
19	Consolidation of GC Regional Botanic Gardens	0.54																																																																									
21	Burleigh Palms Golf Course/ Coplicks Sports Parks expansion	9.7																																																																									
22	Dixon Reserve Expansion Pimpama	4																																																																									
24	Stewarts Family Parklands Pimpama	116																																																																									
25	Stanmore Sports Park Yatala	84.5																																																																									
27	Country Paradise expansion Nerang	4.7																																																																									
28	Firth park expansion Mudgeeraba	37																																																																									
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>496 ha</b>																																																																									

## SECTION 2.2: SPECIFIC PARKS AREAS/PROJECTS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
2.2.1.	LGIP2002	Suggestions regarding the Spit parkland.	No	The Federation Walk area of the Spit is identified in the Schedule of Works (Projects CR_003, CR_004, CR_007), with works to improve nature-based recreation in that area. In addition to that, the City and the Queensland government are partnering to revegetate over 30 ha of the site with littoral rainforest, supported by irrigation using recycled water to facilitate the establishment of vegetation and mitigate the risk of bushfire.	No	No
2.2.2.	LGIP2002	Comments regarding the roundabouts and medium strip along TE Peters Drive.	No	Thank you for positive feedback on the landscaping of roundabouts and medium strips along TE Peters Drive. This feedback is noted and has been passed on to relevant business areas.	No	No
2.2.3.	LGIP2014	Suggestions regarding the Southport Central Civic Park.	No	The City has recently commenced a review of the Southport Priority Development Area Development Scheme and will be seeking community feedback on constraints and opportunities for achieving the vision in the near future. Please keep informed via the 'GC Have your say' web page to provide further input. You can subscribe to the site to receive email updates.  In terms of the development of the Civic Park and Community Centre on the site currently occupied by the Mal Burke Carpark, timing of this project may be subject to change after more detailed planning is undertaken in the future. In the meantime, the City continues to invest in Southport with further works at the Broadwater Parklands, including the recently opened play attraction and further works planned along the foreshore park generally east of the Broadwater Tourist Park. In addition, Woodroffe Park is also programmed for a significant upgrade in the next few years.	No	No
2.2.4.	LGIP2014	Suggestions regarding the proposed Cypress Central Civic Park.	No	Development of the Cypress Central Civic park will offer diversity to the public parks network and be complementary to the nearby beach. Timing of its development will be reassessed in the next five years, subject to surrounding development and demand.  The park itself will respond to high density, more single-person households in the area, as well as the emerging work-from-home workforce by providing an important outdoor 'break out' zone. It will attract tourists and encourage visitors (and residents) to frequent neighbouring retail boutiques, cafes and restaurants. The space will integrate with the planned community centre and together they will support various activities (music, arts, cinema, markets, festivals), creating a sense of community, inspiring social interaction and supporting surrounding businesses.	No	No
2.2.5.	LGIP2014	Concerns regarding the sale of Bruce Bishop Car Park.	No	Constraints associated with purchasing suitable and affordable land for public park and community facilities are evident. The City is aware of challenges that population growth and urban consolidation places on the availability, capacity and quality of open space. Notwithstanding, the City has and will continue to invest significantly in public open space.	No	No
2.2.6.	LGIP2014	Suggestions regarding the Gold Coast Regional Botanic Gardens.	No	The proposed children's garden at the Gold Coast Regional Botanic Gardens (GCRBG) will offer a place for children and their caregivers to play, learn, develop and have fun. It also presents an opportunity for visitors to enhance their appreciation of local plants and biodiversity. The children's garden at the GCRBG represents part of the continued evolution in redefining what playgrounds and such spaces can be.	No	No

## SECTION 2.2: SPECIFIC PARKS AREAS/PROJECTS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
2.2.7.	LGIP2014	Suggestions regarding Hollindale Park.	No	<p>The area north of the Surf Club at Hollindale park is identified in the Queensland Government's Spit Masterplan to include a skate facility – refer to:  <a href="https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/the-spit-master-plan-may-2019.pdf">https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/the-spit-master-plan-may-2019.pdf</a></p> <p>The Spit Masterplan describes the area as: “A flexible urban youth space that accommodates events and skating, with a viewing amphitheatre wrapped around the space, provides an exhilarating facility for skaters and onlookers. This facility is designed as a multi-purpose space and is embedded within the park landform and landscape.”</p> <p>The City is working with the Queensland Government on various aspects of the Spit Masterplans implementation including the creation of 37 ha of littoral rainforest at Federation Walk and anticipate elements such as the skate park to be developed in the medium term.</p>	No	No
2.2.8.	LGIP2014	Suggestions regarding Carey Park.	No	<p>Although trunk infrastructure works are not identified at Carey Park, it is acknowledged that the park has the potential to be improved in support of the increasing population in the surrounding area. Timing and scope of future improvement works will be considered as part of future infrastructure plans.</p> <p>Future improvements to stormwater management are proposed in Carey Park to improve local drainage. These works are not expected to impact on long-term recreation opportunities of the park. Further improvements to the park are also being considered, including investigation of potential dog park facilities given the number of dogs in the local area. Notwithstanding, improvements to the nearby Woodroffe Park are currently considered a higher priority.</p>	No	No
2.2.9.	LGIP2022	Suggestion regarding acquisition of a specific site in Ormeau Hills.	No	<p>The request for acquisition of the property at Ormeau Hills has been referred to the City's environmental unit for consideration and investigation under the natural areas acquisition policy guidelines and criteria.</p>	No	No

## Section 3: Transport enquiries

SECTION 3.1: GENERAL TRANSPORT ENQUIRIES						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
3.1.1.	LGIP2001	Suggestion to provide a transport tunnel between southern and northern Gold Coast to reduce congestion and provide better access to key services and facilities.	No	The concept of a tunnel between Southport and Broadbeach would likely be a multi-billion dollar project. The merits of this proposal, including need, constructability, community impacts and cost, have not been investigated by the City and would unlikely be a cost-effective option, nor able to be funded through revenue streams available for trunk infrastructure. It is suggested the submitter advocate their proposal to the Australian and Queensland Governments.	No	No
3.1.2.	LGIP2007	Concern regarding a number of Gold Coast roads and intersections.	No	<p>Plans are in place to improve Gold Coast roads including those projects included in the draft LGIP amendment, the Gold Coast City Transport Strategy, Gold Coast Road Network Plan, Freight Route Investment Program, Coomera Connector, M1 Varsity Lakes to Tugun Upgrade and M1 Exit 41, 45 and 49 upgrades.</p> <p>Bermuda Street is a State controlled road. The Department of Transport and Main Roads are continually making capacity improvements to Bermuda Street, including improvements to right turns.</p> <p>The M1 is a State controlled road (Federal route) and is being improved through the Coomera Connector, M1 Varsity Lakes to Tugun Upgrade and interchange upgrades at Exits 41, 45 and 49.</p> <p>The Coomera Connector (currently under construction) will provide an interconnecting road between Helensvale and Coomera. The draft LGIP amendment includes a proposal for a new road linking Coomera and Upper Coomera across the M1 (Project ID TRN_RD_0023). There is also a longer-term proposal to extend Beattie Road (at Coomera) over the M1 to connect to Reserve Road (at Upper Coomera).</p> <p>The Gold Coast Light Rail is a State provided service and any issues or concerns about the service should be reported to the Department of Transport and Main Roads.</p>	No	No
3.1.3.	LGIP2020	Comments regarding the timing of essential roadworks to ensure communities are supported by appropriate transport networks.	No	Strategic transport modelling is undertaken based on planning assumptions and growth projections for the purpose of the LGIP. More detailed project planning is undertaken to refine timing, design and cost as the project progresses, having regard to need and actual growth. The LGIP is a long-term strategic document prepared at a point-in-time. The Capital Works Program is adjusted every year and includes trunk and non-trunk infrastructure projects which have undergone more detailed project planning.	No	No

## SECTION 3.2: SPECIFIC TRANSPORT AREA/PROJECTS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?																																				
3.2.1.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding traffic congestion at the intersection of TE Peters Drive and the Gold Coast Highway; and the intersection of Hooker Boulevard and Gold Coast Highway.	No	<p>The intersection between Gold Coast Highway and TE Peters Drive is not a trunk intersection, as a tactical decision was made to exclude any works along the Gold Coast Highway from the LGIP due to proximity to the existing and future light rail corridor. The Transport and Traffic Branch will however investigate safety and congestion issues raised for possible mitigation as part of future non-trunk works.</p> <p>The intersection between Gold Coast Highway and Hooker Boulevard is a State-controlled intersection. It is suggested that commentary on this intersection be reported to the Department of Transport and Main Roads for investigation and action.</p>	No	No																																				
3.2.2.	LGIP2003 LGIP2005 LGIP2006 LGIP2009	Concern regarding safety and traffic congestion on Binstead Way and Gaven Arterial corridor due to recent growth and the need to bring forward the upgrade of these roads.	No	<p>The Transport Network in the draft LGIP amendment includes the following items along the Gaven Arterial Road - Binstead Way corridor:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>LOCATION</th> <th>SECTION</th> <th>WORKS DESCRIPTION</th> <th>ORDER OF COST</th> <th>TIMING COHORT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TRN_INT_0022</td> <td>Gaven Arterial / Felling Dr (Stage 1)</td> <td></td> <td>Install right turn lane</td> <td>\$670,000</td> <td>2022-2026</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TRN_INT_0023</td> <td>Gaven Arterial / Felling Dr (Stage 2)</td> <td></td> <td>Install traffic signals at Felling Dr</td> <td>\$3,440,000</td> <td>2027-2031</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TRN_RD_0016</td> <td>Binstead Way</td> <td>Pitcairn Way - Heslop Rd</td> <td>Upgrade two roundabouts with traffic signals</td> <td>\$8,120,000</td> <td>2032-2036</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TRN_RD_0028</td> <td>Gaven Arterial - Binstead Way</td> <td>Maudsland Rd - Pitcairn Way</td> <td>Upgrade to 4 lanes + 3x traffic signals</td> <td>\$44,510,000</td> <td>2037-2041</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: right;"><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>\$56,740,000</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Strategic traffic modelling indicates that the existing two-lane configuration of Gaven Arterial Road (between Maudsland Road and Pitcairn Way) will have sufficient capacity until 2041. As such, its upgrade to a nominal four-lane configuration is listed in draft LGIP amendment within the 2037-2041 timing cohort.</p> <p>Council has programmed the installation of a right turn lane on Gaven Arterial Road at the Felling Street intersection in 2023-24 to address safety issues. The signalisation of the Gaven Arterial Road / Felling Street intersection is listed in the draft LGIP amendment in the 2027-2031 timing cohort.</p> <p>The Transport and Traffic Branch is undertaking a planning study of the Gaven Arterial Road - Binstead Way corridor in 2022-23 which will provide more detailed analysis of the scope, timing, staging and cost of its future upgrade.</p>	ID	LOCATION	SECTION	WORKS DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF COST	TIMING COHORT	TRN_INT_0022	Gaven Arterial / Felling Dr (Stage 1)		Install right turn lane	\$670,000	2022-2026	TRN_INT_0023	Gaven Arterial / Felling Dr (Stage 2)		Install traffic signals at Felling Dr	\$3,440,000	2027-2031	TRN_RD_0016	Binstead Way	Pitcairn Way - Heslop Rd	Upgrade two roundabouts with traffic signals	\$8,120,000	2032-2036	TRN_RD_0028	Gaven Arterial - Binstead Way	Maudsland Rd - Pitcairn Way	Upgrade to 4 lanes + 3x traffic signals	\$44,510,000	2037-2041	<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$56,740,000</b>		No	No
ID	LOCATION	SECTION	WORKS DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF COST	TIMING COHORT																																					
TRN_INT_0022	Gaven Arterial / Felling Dr (Stage 1)		Install right turn lane	\$670,000	2022-2026																																					
TRN_INT_0023	Gaven Arterial / Felling Dr (Stage 2)		Install traffic signals at Felling Dr	\$3,440,000	2027-2031																																					
TRN_RD_0016	Binstead Way	Pitcairn Way - Heslop Rd	Upgrade two roundabouts with traffic signals	\$8,120,000	2032-2036																																					
TRN_RD_0028	Gaven Arterial - Binstead Way	Maudsland Rd - Pitcairn Way	Upgrade to 4 lanes + 3x traffic signals	\$44,510,000	2037-2041																																					
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$56,740,000</b>																																						
3.2.3.	LGIP2005	Concern regarding the condition of Gaven Arterial Road (flooding and potholes) and safety of pedestrians using or crossing the road. There is also a question as to why Studio Drive doesn't connect at the Entertainment Drive end to ease congestion on Binstead Way.	No	<p>The City's Transport and Traffic Branch is undertaking a planning study of the Gaven Arterial Road - Binstead Way corridor in 2022-23, which will provide more detailed analysis of the scope, timing, staging and cost of its future upgrade. The study will include investigating the merits of extending Studio Drive to Entertainment Drive to provide an alternative access route between the M1 and Pacific Pines.</p>	No	No																																				

## SECTION 3.2: SPECIFIC TRANSPORT AREA/PROJECTS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
3.2.4.	LGIP2006	Concern regarding the volume of heavy vehicle traffic travelling to and from quarries on Maudsland Road.	No	<p>The preferred haul route for the JGI Quarry to/from the M1 is via Maudsland Road and Tamborine-Oxenford Road which are a state roads.</p> <p>Further information on State heavy vehicle route maps and restrictions is available on the Department of Transport and Main Road's website:</p> <p><a href="http://tmr.qld.gov.au">Heavy vehicle route maps and restrictions (Department of Transport and Main Roads) (tmr.qld.gov.au)</a></p>	No	No
3.2.5.	LGIP2008	Concern regarding traffic congestion in Robina.	No	<p>Congestion on Christine Avenue, Robina Parkway and Varsity Parade will be improved by the following projects identified in the draft LGIP amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TRN_INT_0053 Robina Parkway / Laver Drive</li> <li>• TRN_INT_0057 Christine Avenue / Varsity Sound Avenue</li> <li>• TRN_INT_0055 Christine Avenue / Varsity Parade</li> <li>• TRN_INT_0049 Robina Parkway / Cheltenham Drive</li> </ul>	No	No
3.2.6.	LGIP2009	Concern regarding pedestrian safety at Binstead Way, particularly the roundabout and bridge at Saltwater Creek/Park Lake area.	No	<p>There is an upgrade planned for this section of Binstead Way in the draft LGIP amendment, including the provision of quality pedestrian facilities along and across the road (Item TRN_RD_0016). A pedestrian refuge island was also installed on this section of Binstead Way in October 2018 to provide for safer pedestrian crossing movements. Given there are no land uses on the southern side of this section of Binstead Way, the provision of a path is not considered a value for money proposition given other citywide priorities.</p>	No	No
3.2.7.	LGIP2011	Supportive comment regarding the inclusion of the Stadium Drive / Ghilgai Road extension in Council's draft LGIP amendment (LGIP ID: TRN_RD_0032).	No	<p>Support for the proposed Ghilgai Road Extension (TRN_RD_0032) is noted. Refer to Item #8.1.2 below for further information on this project.</p>	No	No
3.2.8.	LGIP2011	Comment regarding the land component associated with the Stadium Drive / Ghilgai Road extension.	No	<p>The \$4,185,000 land cost associated with Ghilgai Road Extension (TRN_RD_0032) will be removed as the land is owned by the City.</p>	Yes	Sch. 3 SOW

## SECTION 3.2: SPECIFIC TRANSPORT AREA/PROJECTS

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
3.2.9.	LGIP2011	Suggestion regarding the overall cost estimate for the delivery of the Stadium Drive / Ghilgai Road extension should be revised to reflect the most cost-effective construction method.	No	The order of cost for the Ghilgai Road Extension (TRN_RD_0032) as proposed in the draft LGIP amendment is circa \$100M based on detailed planning undertaken in 2018. More recent investigations indicate the cost of the proposal would more likely be greater than \$150M given significant design and construction complexities traversing land with flooding and geotechnical constraints. The 2009 Priority Infrastructure Plan order of cost of \$11.6M was based on a rural configuration and no engineering investigations. These costs were significantly underestimated and outdated. As per issue number 3.2.8, the cost estimate will be revised to remove the land acquisition component.	Yes	Sch. 3 SOW
3.2.10.	LGIP2013	Suggestion regarding transport upgrades required for Hinkler Drive Worongary given the SkyRidge Estate development.	No	The upgrade of Hinkler Drive to an urban sub-arterial standard between the M1 interchange and the northern access point for the SkyRidge Estate is a project in the current LGIP (Version 1) - refer to Project ID RD_037. As part of the SkyRidge Estate development approval, the developer is upgrading this section of Hinkler Drive and receiving an offset for trunk works.  It is likely that this Hinkler Drive upgrade will be reflected in a future LGIP amendment as existing trunk infrastructure.	No	No
3.2.11.	LGIP2013	Suggestion the LGIP should be amended to provide the necessary external road network trunk infrastructure to service the approved SkyRidge development at Worongary, including a necessary east-west connection to Gilston.	No	Traffic modelling and associated analysis indicates that an east-west trunk road between Hinkler Drive and Gilston Road through the SkyRidge Estate would only be used by 14% through traffic. The balance 86% traffic using the east-west road would have an origin or destination within the SkyRidge Estate.  This indicates that the proposed east-west link road called for in this submission is not required from a network perspective and would not function as a trunk road (arterial / sub-arterial). A non-trunk major collector street is being constructed as part of the SkyRidge Estate development approval to provide access to and from Hinkler Drive.	No	No
3.2.12.	LGIP2014	Query regarding a Short St extension project in Southport.	No	The current LGIP (Version 1) included distributor roads (major collector roads) as trunk infrastructure. The proposed LGIP amendment only includes arterial and sub-arterial roads as trunk infrastructure and as such, does not include any distributor roads.  According to this criteria, Short Street is not classified as a trunk road and is therefore not captured in the draft LGIP amendment. Notwithstanding, the Short Street extension forms part of Council's transport planning framework with its merits further to be investigated as part of the review of the Southport Priority Development Area Development Scheme.	No	No
3.2.13.	LGIP2014	Support for the Ashmore Road to Smith Street upgrade to 4 lanes.	No	Upgrades to Ashmore Road are supported and will be realised through project TRN_RD_0031, proposed in the draft LGIP amendment.	No	No
3.2.14.	LGIP2018	Request for a pedestrian crossing on Varsity Parade near Christine Avenue due to safety concerns.	No	The criteria for trunk roads for the draft LGIP amendment is that they are classified as arterial and sub-arterial roads. Varsity Parade does not function as an arterial or sub-arterial, rather it is classified as a distributor road.  However, the proposal for a pedestrian crossing on Varsity Parade is being investigated as part of the Varsity Lakes Local Area Transport Plan currently being undertaken by the Transport and Traffic Branch.	No	No

# Section 4: Water Supply and Sewerage enquiries

SECTION 4.1: GENERAL WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE ENQUIRIES						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
4.1.1.	LGIP2015	Comment regarding infrastructure for projected growth arising out of targeted growth areas.	No	<p>The <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> (MGR) prescribe that the calculation of planned densities for the purposes of LGIP (network planning) consider the strategic framework within the planning scheme; zoning and development provisions within the planning scheme; and other planning instruments and approved plans (MGR, Chapter 5, Part 6 Section 32.6). In accordance with the MGR, draft amendments to the planning scheme are not included in this calculation and planning assumptions informing infrastructure network plans are based on Version 6 of City Plan, the version current at the time of preparation.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the water and sewer networks include a longer planning horizon to 2066 as part of the Water Supply Sewerage Infrastructure Plan:</p> <p><a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Council-region/Future-plans-budget/Plans-policies-strategies/Our-plans/Water-Supply-Sewerage-Infrastructure-Plan">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Council-region/Future-plans-budget/Plans-policies-strategies/Our-plans/Water-Supply-Sewerage-Infrastructure-Plan</a></p> <p>Whilst not directly incorporating City Plan Major Amendment Package 2 and 3, the draft LGIP amendment does consider additional growth trends likely in Southport, Labrador and Biggera Waters.</p> <p>City Plan amendments once adopted, will be incorporated into a subsequent amendment of the LGIP.</p>	No	No

SECTION 4.2: WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE DESIRED STANDARDS OF SERVICE (DSS) ENQUIRIES						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
4.2.1.	LGIP2020	Concerns regarding provision of certain pipes as trunk infrastructure and questions around proposed work on STP upgrades.	No	<p>Irrespective of pipe size, trunk water and sewer infrastructure are defined as that which services more than one development. The <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> provide further examples of indicative non-trunk and trunk infrastructure in Schedule 6, where non-trunk water and sewerage infrastructure is identified as infrastructure internal to a development or connecting to the external network.</p> <p>As such, a 150mm sized pipe can still be considered as trunk infrastructure where it services more than one development. Also note that the works included in the water and sewer Schedule of Works will only include the additional size required to service new demand and, in some cases, may be planned as a 150mm diameter parallel augment of an existing pipe.</p> <p>All Sewerage Treatment Plant (STP) upgrades included in the Schedule of Works are capacity upgrades, with the description detailing the additional demand they are planned to service. As noted in the extrinsic material, where a project also caters for a renewal driver, the proportion of growth is noted in the text as a percentage; for example, Item ME_DEWAT: Merrimac STP Dewatering upgrade (Note: Total project cost \$20M, with 20% being growth driven).</p>	No	No

## SECTION 4.3: SPECIFIC WATER AND WASTE AREA/PROJECT ENQUIRIES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
4.3.1.	LGIP2010	Submission regarding planning assumptions, existing and proposed sewer and water infrastructure and possible options for service of future development at Sanctuary Cove.	No	Investigations are currently underway to determine what has been approved for Sanctuary Cove over and above the approved 4050 equivalent persons (EPs). As this is a private development and services have been provided on-site within private property, further discussions will be required with the developer on future capacity of receiving public trunk infrastructure.	No	No
4.3.2.	LGIP2013	Submission regarding trunk water infrastructure required to service proposed development at Gilston.	No	<p>The draft LGIP identifies trunk infrastructure to service identified growth at the desired standards of service (DSS). The water supply network DSS includes a minimum service pressure of 22 metres in the main adjoining a property boundary.</p> <p>The subject site at Blackstump Court, Gilston has a water supply point at the property frontage which meets the DSS requirement and it is considered that provision of an adequate water supply to the site is achieved via Blackstump Court.</p> <p>Non-trunk infrastructure is development infrastructure internal to a development, therefore, the infrastructure required to service development at the subject site is considered non-trunk infrastructure.</p> <p>Should further water supply connection points become available in the future, alternate connection points may be considered in due course. However, it is noted that such connection points are not currently available, and provision of an adequate water supply is achieved via Blackstump Court.</p>	No	No
4.3.3.	LGIP2016	Concern regarding sewer provision to Courtney Drive, Upper Coomera.	No	<p>The Courtney Drive Investigation Area in Upper Coomera is proposed as Emerging Communities zone in the City Plan Major Amendment Package 2 and 3. Major Amendment 2 and 3 has not yet been adopted and in accordance with the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i>, planning assumptions used to inform network planning is based on the current planning scheme strategic framework, zoning and development provisions.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, a sewer servicing plan has been developed for this area, which provides for an efficient and effective long-term sewerage solution. The proposed servicing plan is detailed in the <i>Water Supply and Sewerage Infrastructure Plan 2019</i> and proposed LGIP amendment. It relies on the orderly progression of development. It is acknowledged that private negotiations between developers and/or interim servicing solutions may be required.</p>	No	No

# Section 5: Stormwater enquiries

SECTION 5.1: STORMWATER ENQUIRIES								
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?		
5.1.1.	LGIP2020	Request for further explanation on why Desired Standards of Service exceed State Planning Policy on quality component.	No	<p>The Desired Standards of Service for the stormwater quality component exceed the requirements as set out in the State Planning Policy (and City Plan) Design Objectives to reduce the impact from development on receiving waters. The State Planning Policy sets the Design Objectives for urban development to remove a portion of the pollutant loads they generate to mitigate subsequent environmental impacts. As urban development only removes a portion of the pollutant loads they generate in order to satisfy the State Planning Policy (and City Plan), the outcome of the Desired Standards of Service is to reduce the impact from development on receiving waters.</p> <p>This concept of the stormwater quality Desired Standards of Service is presented in the image below as per the <i>Draft Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment Extrinsic Material Report Stormwater Network</i>.</p> <p>The chart illustrates the pollutant load (kg/yr) for four scenarios. The y-axis represents Pollutant load (kg/yr). The x-axis categories are: Base case (Existing development), Future development (with no trunk or non trunk infrastructure), Future development with non trunk (residual pollutant load), and Future development with non trunk and DSS trunk. A dashed red line indicates the 'Pollutant load to meet Design Objectives'. The 'Future development (with no trunk or non trunk infrastructure)' scenario shows the highest pollutant load, significantly exceeding the Design Objectives. The 'Future development with non trunk (residual pollutant load)' scenario shows a reduction in pollutant load to meet State Policy requirements (non-trunk). The 'Future development with non trunk and DSS trunk' scenario shows a further reduction in pollutant load to meet DSS (trunk infrastructure) requirements, bringing it closer to the Design Objectives.</p>	No	No		

## SECTION 5.1: STORMWATER ENQUIRIES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
5.1.2.	LGIP2020	Concerns with stormwater demand calculations based on impervious areas as Council requires that post-development flows are reduced to pre-development flows, net effect of impervious area being zero. Concerns the impervious ha calculation is incorrect and there should be no charge.	No	<p>Consistent with the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i>, the standard demand units of impervious hectare have been used for the stormwater network as an appropriate proxy for measuring demand. Whilst development is typically conditioned to mitigate any increase in peak flows resulting from the development (no increase in peak flows), such development will still create changes in hydrology and contribute to aggregate demand, for trunk stormwater quantity infrastructure. The rationale for this position is because, despite the imposition of the City's standard conditions on development, development will generate extra demand for the trunk stormwater infrastructure network for, amongst other reasons, any of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development, either on its own or in aggregation with other development, will result in greater runoff volume, longer durations of runoff, and/or changed flow regimes within the development or within the catchment.</li> <li>• The construction of detention basins within each development to meet the requirements of the City Plan, only manages peak flows within the respective development and will result in flow worsening elsewhere within the catchment.</li> <li>• Development, either on its own or in aggregation with other development, will result in the need for higher immunity road access (including associated trunk stormwater infrastructure such as culverts and waterway crossings) through the City due to changed flow regimes.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the net effect externally to such development for the increase in impervious area is not zero, as only peak flow rates are mitigated by development.</p>	No	No

# Section 6: Key area enquiries

SECTION 6.1: KEY AREA ENQUIRIES						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
6.1.1.	LGIP2004 LGIP2022	Concerns regarding key resource areas and land use at a specific address.	No	<p>The Key Resource Area (KRA) mapping, shown in the City Plan Extractive resources overlay map, is not a part of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP), nor part of the LGIP amendment's public consultation process. As the LGIP is a part of the City Plan, its mapping is shown in the same mapping website which appears to have caused some confusion.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the Queensland Government's (State) KRA mapping shown on its State Planning Policy Interactive Mapping website has been updated: (<a href="https://spp.dsdp.esriaustraliaonline.com.au/geoviewer/map/planmaking">https://spp.dsdp.esriaustraliaonline.com.au/geoviewer/map/planmaking</a>)</p> <p>The City Plan has similar mapping included within the Extractive resources overlay map: (<a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Planning-building/Planning-our-city">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Planning-building/Planning-our-city</a>)</p> <p>Whilst it is generally consistent with State mapping, there are intentional localised variations and instances where it has not yet been updated to reflect the latest State mapping (such as to reflect the latest KRA67 mapping). It should be noted that the City Plan Extractive resources overlay map prevails in terms of regulating development under City Plan (the State mapping generally only assists Council's preparing and amending of planning schemes).</p> <p>The City Plan maps are updated periodically through statutory processes set out by the State, either through minor, administrative or major amendments. This potential update will be considered for inclusion as part of a future minor and administrative amendment to the City Plan.</p> <p>Please note though that if the Extractive resources overlay map was amended to align with the latest State mapping:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The subject land would remain in or partly in the 'separation area', which means the Extractive resources overlay would continue to apply to your property.</li> <li>2. This does not affect zoning – the subject land would remain in the Rural zone.</li> <li>3. Regardless of what is included in the Extractive resources overlay mapping, the City Plan provides a range of requirements that would influence whether, and if so where, extractive resources could occur in KRA67 (even within the Extractive industry zoned land). For example, this is a key section from section 3.5.5.1 of the City Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>... the extraction and haulage of the resource protects environmental values on the land as far as practicable; prevents significant impacts on nearby sensitive uses, including the use of appropriate separation areas/buffering; and does not scar vegetated ridgelines and elevated land when viewed from outside the resource area.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>This means the KRA mapping and the extent of the Extractive industry zone in City Plan does not necessarily depict the ultimate footprint of extractive industry operations. That needs to be determined through the development assessment process. Such development applications would require impact assessment which requires public consultation to occur. This could result in a very different outcome to that shown in the KRA mapping, especially in instances where residential land uses exist in the KRA separation areas such as occurs in KRA67.</p> <p>The primary role of KRA mapping (from the State and within the City Plan) is to prevent additional incompatible development (primarily residential) within the KRA area (i.e., the resource/processing area, separation area and land within 100m of identified transport routes). It should not be viewed as depicting the future extent of extractive industry operations.</p> <p>With the above in mind, the City is of the view that the City Plan provides an appropriate response in order to protect the amenity of residential dwellings, even where they are within identified KRA areas. However, should you wish to seek further changes to the KRA mapping itself, you will need to request this through the State government (as the primary KRA mapping sits within the State Planning Policy).</p>	No	No

## SECTION 6.1: KEY AREA ENQUIRIES

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
6.1.2.	LGIP2006	Concerns regarding development in the Maudsland area giving rise to traffic issues and the need to bring forward upgrades to road infrastructure.	No	<p>Concerns are raised about changed circumstances and growth pressures in Maudsland including Quarry traffic and new commercial and residential development. It is argued that the nature of recent growth and development and resultant impacts on the Gaven Arterial Road between Binstead Way and Maudsland Road are such that future planned upgrades should be brought forward.</p> <p>These concerns are acknowledged however the City's strategic traffic modelling indicates the current road configuration currently has sufficient capacity. The Transport and Traffic Branch is undertaking a planning study of the Gaven Arterial Road - Binstead Way corridor in 2022-23. This will provide more detailed analysis of the scope, timing, staging and cost of its future upgrade.</p> <p>The City response to issue number 3.2.2 provides further detail in relation to road upgrades proposed in this area.</p>	No	No

## Section 7: Other enquiries

SECTION 7.1: MATTERS NOT REGULATED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN						
	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
7.1.1.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding number of hospital beds and roads.	No	<p>The draft Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) amendment is a forward looking, long-term plan for future trunk infrastructure to service the growth predicated for the City. It is developed using population and employment projections provided by the Queensland Government Statisticians Office and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The LGIP plans infrastructure for water, sewer, public parks and land for community facilities, stormwater and roads.</p> <p>Health infrastructure such as hospitals and State controlled roads (motorways and higher order roads) are planned for and provided across the State by the Queensland State Government. The State government has recently released the State Infrastructure Strategy 2022, which covers State infrastructure including digital and innovation, transport, energy, water, health, education and training, justice and public safety, arts, culture recreation and tourism and social and affordable housing. More information on State health and transport plans can be found at <a href="https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/industry/infrastructure/state-infrastructure-strategy">https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/industry/infrastructure/state-infrastructure-strategy</a></p>	No	No
7.1.2.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding South East Queensland trainline.	No	<p>Rail services are planned for and provided by the Queensland State Government. The State Infrastructure Strategy 2022 has identified a 'priority action' to "continue to enhance and optimise the SEQ rail network to deliver faster, more efficient and reliable journeys throughout the region, with a focus on the strategic corridors between Brisbane and the Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast. Planning for the region's network will maximise the benefits of Cross River Rail and evaluate opportunities for network expansion, including passenger rail services from Ipswich to Springfield, Varsity Lakes to the Gold Coast Airport, Salisbury to Beaudesert, and between Toowoomba and Brisbane".</p> <p>Future heavy and or light rail connections to Gold Coast airport will enable better connections to NSW. Intergovernmental planning and coordination will be required in the future in this regard. Further information can be found at: <a href="https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0027/72099/state-infrastructure-strategy-transport.pdf">https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0027/72099/state-infrastructure-strategy-transport.pdf</a></p>	No	No
7.1.3.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding cruise ship terminal.	No	The proposal for an ocean-side cruise ship terminal made by the City of Gold Coast is currently suspended.	No	No
7.1.4.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding beach walkways.	No	This is not an LGIP amendment matter. It is noted that the design standards for footpaths, trails and bike tracks with a dual use as a footpath specify widths and outlined in the City's Land Development Guidelines in the City Plan (Policy in Schedule 6). The standards for footpath design are not currently under review. Any future review of the design standards and Schedule 6 of the City Plan would be notified on the 'GC Have your Say Page'. Register to the GC Have Your Say Page to stay informed.	No	No
7.1.5.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding electric scooters.	No	This is not an LGIP amendment matter. Speed limits for e-scooters were brought in earlier this year.	No	No
7.1.6.	LGIP2002	Comments made regarding Kurrawa Park.	No	<p>This is not a matter for the draft LGIP amendment. However, the City has endorsed a Homelessness Action Plan that considers the issues raised. Further information and access to the plan can be found at:</p> <p><a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/files/sharedassets/public/pdfs/policies-plans-amp-strategies/gold-coast-homelessness-action-plan-2024.pdf">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/files/sharedassets/public/pdfs/policies-plans-amp-strategies/gold-coast-homelessness-action-plan-2024.pdf</a></p>	No	No

## SECTION 7.1: MATTERS NOT REGULATED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
7.1.7.	LGIP2002	Suggestions regarding water storage.	No	<p>The City of Gold Coast does not own or operate drinking water sources, treatment plants or bulk supply mains. Bulk drinking water is supplied by Seqwater (a State government entity).</p> <p>Further information on water supply and dam upgrades can be found at:  <a href="https://www.seqwater.com.au/what-were-doing">https://www.seqwater.com.au/what-were-doing</a></p>	No	No
7.1.8.	LGIP2002	Concerns regarding planned tower developments in beachside suburbs.	No	<p>Council has a number of plans and strategies to plan for population growth, strengthen the City's economy, protect the environment and improve services and facilities for our residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>The South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017: ShapingSEQ (ShapingSEQ) has tasked the City with planning for an additional 127,900 dwellings, within the City's existing urban area by 2041. These new dwellings will support the long-term population growth, with the city expected to grow by 351,100 people, bringing our total population to approximately 919,000 people by 2041.</p> <p>The City Plan provides a planned settlement pattern which is aimed at responsibly managing growth across the city. It specifically promotes urban growth within existing developed areas to reduce the pressure to expand into the City's green areas and to utilise the City's existing infrastructure networks. Under the City Plan, development intensity and height will continue to vary across the city. High rise residential development or taller buildings will continue to be focused in mixed-use centres, public transport hubs and along high frequency public transport corridors consistent with the requirements of ShapingSEQ.</p> <p>The State-wide planning legislation requires all Queensland local governments to adopt performance-based planning schemes to provide a level of certainty for communities, whilst providing for innovation and flexibility. The City Plan content and structure accords with this legislative framework including quantifiable provisions as the foundation (usually as Required outcomes or Acceptable outcomes within codes) to be read alongside performance-based provisions (Performance outcomes, Overall outcomes and the Strategic framework). It is important to note that within this assessment framework, meeting the Acceptable outcome is not mandatory or determinative. A development application can achieve compliance with City Plan assessment benchmarks by meeting either the quantifiable provisions or the performance-based provisions.</p> <p>This assessment framework is a valid and accepted way of achieving compliance with the City Plan and this is the reason why you will see varying built form outcomes on the ground.</p> <p>Development applications, and particularly those seeking development approval for the construction of high-rise residential development in the coastal strip must go through a development assessment process from lodgement to decision. This ensures all applications are assessed with the right information, by suitably qualified professionals, and follow the same process. This also ensures the development assessment process is fair, reasonable and transparent. To meet Council's legislative obligations, development applications must be accompanied by a planning report prepared by a Council planning officer which documents the assessment undertaken against the assessment benchmarks of the City Plan and includes a recommendation for Council. This will address matters such as car parking, landscaping, land use mix, etc.</p> <p>Copies of these planning officer reports can be found on Council's website via PD Online where you can search for development applications either by property or by application number. Please refer to:  <a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Planning-building/PD-Online">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Planning-building/PD-Online</a></p> <p>With respect to proposed City Plan changes, the Our City Our Plan amendment package is currently with the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning seeking approval for adoption. Council is still awaiting the Ministerial approval to adopt and commence the Our City Our Plan amendment package.</p>	No	No

## SECTION 7.1: MATTERS NOT REGULATED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
7.1.9.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding building designs and skyline.	No	The opportunity for commenting on development applications including scale, density and height occurs when impact assessable applications are advertised for community feedback. The provisions addressing minimal lot size, height, privacy, setbacks and landscaping are provided for in the City Plan. The performance-based system provides developers with an opportunity to present design options which meet the desired outcomes.	No	No
7.1.10.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding housing on the intersection of Hooker Boulevard and Southport Burleigh Road.	No	Feedback on development in Carrara is noted.	No	No
7.1.11.	LGIP2002	Concern regarding building heights close to the beach.	No	Concerns with regard to impact of shadow from high-rises on the beach and foreshore walkways at Surfers Paradise are noted. The City Plan includes provisions for shadow impacts on the beach. Where impact assessable high-rises are proposed, submissions can be made on individual development height and design as those developments will undergo public consultation.	No	No
7.1.12.	LGIP2002	Comments regarding light rail and building density.	No	Light and heavy rail are planned for and provided by the Queensland State Government; however, more information on the City's Transport Strategy can be found online at: <a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Council-region/Future-plans-budget/Plans-policies-strategies/Our-strategies/Gold-Coast-City-Transport-Strategy-2031">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Council-region/Future-plans-budget/Plans-policies-strategies/Our-strategies/Gold-Coast-City-Transport-Strategy-2031</a>  The State Infrastructure Strategy 2022 has identified a 'priority action' to "continue to enhance and optimise the SEQ rail network to deliver faster, more efficient and reliable journeys throughout the region, with a focus on the strategic corridors between Brisbane and the Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast". Future heavy and or light rail connections to Gold Coast airport will enable better connections to NSW. Intergovernmental planning and coordination will be required in the future in this regard. Further information can be found at: <a href="https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0027/72099/state-infrastructure-strategy-transport.pdf">https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0027/72099/state-infrastructure-strategy-transport.pdf</a>	No	No
7.1.13.	LGIP2002	Comments regarding orange hire bikes.	No	The bike share system is not related to trunk infrastructure or the draft LGIP amendment; however, further information is available and issues can be reported via the following website: <a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Services/Roads-transport-parking/Active-travel/Bike-riding/Bike-share">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Services/Roads-transport-parking/Active-travel/Bike-riding/Bike-share</a>	No	No

## SECTION 7.1: MATTERS NOT REGULATED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

	SUBMISSION REFERENCE	POINT OF SUBMISSION	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	RESULTS IN A CHANGE?	LGIP PARTS CHANGED?
7.1.14.	<b>LGIP2012</b>	Suggestions for Surfers Paradise streetscape and other miscellaneous topics.	No	<p>The City's Place Making team has developed a plan for Surfers Paradise. The plan covers a wide range of initiatives including a location for a skate park and can be found here:  <a href="https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Council-region/About-our-city/Designing-public-places/City-place-making/Place-making-master-planning/Surfers-Paradise-Business-Centre-place-making-master-plan">https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/Council-region/About-our-city/Designing-public-places/City-place-making/Place-making-master-planning/Surfers-Paradise-Business-Centre-place-making-master-plan</a></p> <p>There is a current project for Orchid Avenue and funding has been allocated in the budget for lighting, in both Orchid Avenue and Cavill Mall.</p> <p>These initiatives are not categorised as "trunk infrastructure" and are not included in the draft LGIP amendment. However, the City Place Making team can be contacted on 07 5582 8065 or by email (cpm@goldcoast.qld.gov.au) for further information.</p>	No	No
7.1.15.	<b>LGIP2019</b>	Submission against Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 4.	No	<p>The Gold Coast light rail project is run by the Department to Transport and Main Roads. Any concerns with the design timing and functionality of the light rail, should be raised through their website:  <a href="https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/projects/gold-coast-light-rail">https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/projects/gold-coast-light-rail</a></p>	No	No

## Section 8: Submissions made on behalf of the City of Gold Coast

SECTION 8.1: TRANSPORT NETWORK SUBMISSIONS						
	ORIGINAL SCOPE OF WORK	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	SCOPE OF WORK	COST DIFFERENCE	TIMING
8.1.1.	<b>LGIP ID: TRN_INT_0018</b> Replace roundabout with traffic signals at intersection of Helensvale Road and Monterey Keys Drive.	No	The intersection is already signalised (typographical error). The proposed scope of work involves capacity enhancements to the existing signalised intersection.	Capacity upgrade (additional lanes)	-\$4,910,000	No change
8.1.2.	<b>LGIP ID: TRN_RD_0032</b> Ghilgai Road extension - Extend road to connect Merrimac and Robina over Mudgeeraba Creek (2 lanes plus a bridge).	No	Early investigations indicate the proposed sub-arterial link has only marginal network benefit in the next 10-15 years, along with significant design and construction challenges of traversing land with flooding and geotechnical constraints, which may impact on its constructability, cost and value for money. A longer-term network benefits (needs) analysis for the link and detailed engineering investigations will need to be undertaken to ascertain the function, form and engineering solution for the road. As such, this submission proposed to delay the project to the 2037-2041 timing cohort of LGIP2. However, on 2 December 2022, Council resolved that the Ghilgai Road extension remain in the 2027-2031 timing cohort, pending further investigation. The land acquisition component of the cost is proposed to be removed.	No change	-\$4,185,000	No change

SECTION 8.2: STORMWATER NETWORK SUBMISSIONS						
	ORIGINAL SCOPE OF WORK	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	SCOPE OF WORK	COST DIFFERENCE	TIMING
8.2.1.	<b>LGIP ID: LO_CRS_0033</b> Logan (Milbrook Crescent, Pimpama) - Upgrade existing culvert crossing with 13 x 900 x 600 RCBC.	No	Early investigation has identified that whilst forecast 2021 cohort demand has occurred in the upstream catchment, this will not trigger the culvert crossing upgrade. As such, a change in timing is proposed to align the upgrade with the 2031 cohort forecast development within the upstream catchment.	No change	No change	2031
8.2.2.	<b>LGIP ID: TA_CRS_0003</b> Tallebudgera (Valley Drive, Tallebudgera) - Upgrade existing culvert crossing with 2 x 900 dia RRJ pipes.	No	Early investigation has identified that the development forecast to occur in the 2021 cohort has not occurred. As such, a change in timing is proposed to allow for future evaluation of the upgrade subject to forecast impervious area demand occurring in the upstream catchment.	No change	No change	2041
8.2.3.	<b>LGIP ID: TA_CRS_0004</b> Tallebudgera (Valley Drive, Tallebudgera) - Augment existing culvert crossing with 1 x 1050 dia RRJ pipes.	No	Early investigation has identified that the development forecast to occur in the 2021 cohort has not occurred. As such, a change in timing is proposed to allow for future evaluation of the upgrade subject to forecast impervious area demand occurring in the upstream catchment.	No change	No change	2041
8.2.4.	<b>LGIP ID: TA_CRS_0005</b> Tallebudgera (Valley Drive, Tallebudgera) - Upgrade existing culvert crossing with 2 x 900 dia RRJ pipes.	No	Early investigation has identified that the development forecast to occur in the 2021 cohort has not occurred. As such, a change in timing is proposed to allow for future evaluation of the upgrade subject to forecast impervious area demand occurring in the upstream catchment.	No change	No change	2041

### SECTION 8.3: PUBLIC PARKS AND LAND FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES (PARKS) NETWORK SUBMISSIONS

	ORIGINAL SCOPE OF WORK	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	SCOPE OF WORK	COST DIFFERENCE	TIMING
8.3.1.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0004</b> Local Park 23 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.2.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0005</b> Local Park 2 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.3.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0006</b> Local Park 3 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.4.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0007</b> Local Park 26 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.5.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0008</b> Local Park 24 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.6.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0009</b> Local Park 28 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change

### SECTION 8.3: PUBLIC PARKS AND LAND FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES (PARKS) NETWORK SUBMISSIONS

	ORIGINAL SCOPE OF WORK	STATE INTEREST MATTER?	CITY RESPONSE	SCOPE OF WORK	COST DIFFERENCE	TIMING
8.3.7.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0012</b> Local Park 25 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.8.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0014</b> Local Park 5 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed below does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The size of the park does not meet the minimum Desired Standard of Service size for local recreational parks. The intent of these parks was to provide nodes / break-out spaces along a corridor linkage. There is a concern that the size may pose risk for conversion application. It is proposed to replace these with consolidated nodes within the linkage and facilitate through detailed design of development assessment.	Consolidated into another project	-\$342,938	No change
8.3.9.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0010</b> Local Park 4 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed above does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The cost will increase as this park will change to an open space linkage, including parks proposed to be deleted above. Revised cost estimate \$2,149,070.	Cost, size & description (consolidating local rec. parks proposed to be deleted above)	\$434,379	No change
8.3.10.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0011</b> Local Park 27 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed above does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The cost will increase as this park will change to an open space linkage, including parks proposed to be deleted above. Revised cost estimate \$2,149,070.	Cost, size & description (consolidating local rec. parks proposed to be deleted above)	\$434,379	No change
8.3.11.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_LR_0013</b> Local Park 29 (Coomera) – Land and embellish	No	This change in combination with the changes proposed above does not result in any change to proposed area or cost and will achieve the same policy outcomes. The cost will increase as this park will change to an open space linkage, including parks proposed to be deleted above. Revised cost estimate \$2,149,070.	Cost, size & description (consolidating local rec. parks proposed to be deleted above)	\$1,874,719	No change
8.3.12.	<b>LGIP ID: REC_DS_0013</b> Hope Island Sports Park Major Upgrade - Embellish	No	There is no change in the extent and intent of the proposed sports park, other than to align with another project for cost effectiveness. The proposed change is in the public interest. This change aligns the timing of the sports park infrastructure (currently 2036 cohort) with the timing of the community centre i.e., 2031. Shared facilities such as carparking and public amenities will be better value for money if developed at the same time.	No change	No change	2031 cohort

**FOR MORE INFORMATION**

**P** 1300 GOLDCOAST (1300 465 326)

**W** [cityofgoldcoast.com.au](http://cityofgoldcoast.com.au)