

1. Performance based planning requires discretion. How do you encourage innovation in PRS where the culture is more aligned with ticking a box?

Council frequently accepts performance solutions on a range of matters, however, these performance solutions must be backed by an acceptable level of justification based on detail from the applicant.

2. Does ICC see 3 planning instruments for the city as a problem? Why not use the planning framework for Ripley or Springfield as the base for the rest of Ipswich?

The three planning instruments are not necessarily a problem, however, each framework relies on different standards and assessment criteria which can create inconsistent outcomes when compared to the other areas of the city. The process for making and amending planning instruments and deciding applications under the Economic Development Act or where subject to the Springfield Structure Plan are not consistent with the majority of planning schemes in Queensland, particularly with regard to appeal rights and infrastructure planning. Accordingly, Council needs to adapt assessment processes, standards and infrastructure programs in a way that responds to these differences, rather than make the exception the rule (in this case, the Ripley Development Scheme and the Springfield Structure Plan).

3. Does PRS see itself in the business of service provision? If so how does it develop a more responsive customer service based culture than currently exists?

PRS are a service provider. Our customers are the community, applicants and developers. Our service is balanced by the need to effectively and transparently regulate development activities. The customer service options currently offered by PRS respond to customer needs in a similar manner to other Councils, including free prelodgement meetings and a fast turn-around on enquiries. However, you can expect to see some changes to Development Planning customer service activities in the future, which will be focused on whole-of-project facilitation. You can also expect to see some changes in the way we manage survey plan processes.

4. How do you create a customer service culture in PRS where it's focused in development assessment/facilitation rather than development control?

We work within a defined regulatory framework. Many standards we contend with are specific, especially in the space of engineering standards. The planning aspects of proposals are performance based, and this is where flexibility on the outcome can be incorporated. There is a fine balance to achieve in this space. Our customers often want certainty and sometimes certainty can be at the expense of flexibility and innovation. We promote our staff to focus on the outcome, and if the framework (planning scheme, policies etc) can support the outcome proposed.

We recognise that it's also important to identify if something is not acceptable, and identify that early. Despite some views to the contrary, we don't want to be in a position of refusing

applications. We do want to be in the position of being able to provide early advice (preferably before land is purchased and a yield commitment is locked in).

The current Development Planning customer service activities largely respond to proposals put forward for consideration by potential applicants. It is recognised that some of our customer service activities could be expanded to be more proactive in the later stages of finalising a development, such as assisting customers in navigating through the numerous post-DA permits.

You can expect to see some changes to Development Planning customer service activities in the future, which will be focused on whole-of-project facilitation.

5. Would ICC consider private certification of more of the develop assessment function given its removing itself from decision making by use of assessment panels?

The Independent Decision Review Panel does not make decisions on development applications. The role of the panel to review certain officer recommendations prior to Committee or Council making a decision on an application.

At this point, there are no plans to implement Private Certification in development assessment. Nonetheless, it is recognised that the State have introduced new guidelines relating to the role of Council in regulating building work. These guidelines will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.

6. The old PD Online mapping is very clunky and difficult to use. A more interactive map on this page, or a link to improved mapping would be appreciated?

It is recognised that the functionality of ePathway is not to the standard of some contemporary services offered by other Councils. ICC is currently investigating options to improve this service. We also have a better mapping system available at <https://maps.ipswich.qld.gov.au/weave/planscheme.html> which we are working on enhancing.

7. If you're going to use panels to make decisions then why pay for ICC to assess just go straight to panel for decision? Remove ICC from assessment and outsource.

The Independent Decision Review Panel does not make decisions on applications. The role of the panel to review certain officer recommendations prior to Committee or Council making a decision on an application.

It is expected that the panel will be required to review approximately 10 recommendations a year. The vast majority of decisions are still made under delegation

8. Can council please provide details about the 'significant public concerns' regarding retaining walls?

Retaining walls are completely acceptable in many circumstances when well considered, designed and delivered. The concerns we hold relate to amenity and maintenance of large retaining walls. We also note that community concerns relate to overshadowing, access to breezes, access to usable open space, extensive terraforming and vegetation clearing. Aside from feedback on

development that is proposed and occurring, Council officers are frequently contacted in an attempt to resolve neighbourhood disputes regarding maintenance, replacement costs and stormwater impacts. We recognise that there are multiple issues at play in these circumstances, it is critically important for us to work together to achieve the right outcome. We will also need to ensure that the new planning scheme captures the balance of community expectation, and realistic responses to site conditions and density.

9. Given the range of opinions regarding retaining walls will Council be providing a formal industry engagement process?

Can the engagement by council around Retaining Walls be elevated? Written submissions not enough detail. Can council consider a meeting with each project team?

Council will engage with the industry on any changes to guidelines relating to retaining walls. In the first instance, Council is participating in the project working group facilitated by Economic Development Queensland, who are also engaging the development industry on this issue. It is expected that EDQ will produce new or amended guidelines for use within the Ripley PDA. Depending on the outcome of the EDQ retaining wall review, Council may consider further guidelines for the rest of the City. Council will engage with the development industry directly through development forums and/or targeted consultation. Finally, any provisions contained within the new planning scheme will undertake the full statutory amendment process, which will provide an opportunity for formal submissions.

10. Can you give an update on team boundary changes?

For those not on the eAlert mailing list, the team boundaries have been realigned to better reflect the shifting growth fronts in Ipswich and to ensure that we are able to maintain a high level of service to all our customers. The most notable changes are the new areas in the Central and East Teams, specifically Walloon, Karrabin and Brassall moving to the Central Team and Karalee, Chuwar, Collingwood Park, and Redbank Plains moving to the East Team. You may receive notification of a change to the assessment manager for some of your applications. You can be assured that the teams will work closely together to ensure the transition is as smooth as possible.

11. Is Vendorpanel actually used anymore by ICC? Some Councillors have said no, which is confusing because there are tenders open (BUS265).

Vendorpanel is still currently being used by ICC. For more information regarding tenders, please refer to the Ipswich City Council website: <https://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/business/tenders>

12. Lately there seems to be a habit of Council using the statutory timeframes as a KPI or 'due date'. Is this common practice, or a result of officers being busy?

Statutory timeframes are important for Council to meet, particularly with the risk of Deemed Approvals for code assessable applications under the Planning Act 2016. Statutory timeframes are equally important for applicants to ensure an application is assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Development Assessment Rules. Due to the importance of meeting statutory timeframes, Council officers may occasionally refer to statutory timeframes as a 'due date'. One

reason for the focus on statutory timeframes is to be better able to prioritise workloads. Nonetheless, ICC planners assess applications promptly and on average, applications have 11 days remaining in the decision stage when they are decided.

13. When applying over lots with existing ICC Emts, it should be dealt with as an internal referral?

Owners consent for ICC easements is required for an application to be 'properly made', and therefore these matters should be resolved before lodging an application to Council for assessment. There is a difference between Council's role as an assessment manager, and Council's role as a landowner. These processes are separated for very good reasons. It is noted that at times applicants are frustrated by processes. These issues, like owners consent, should be considered before an application is lodged. In many instances, we find applications are submitted without resolving these issues.

14. Fees for DA should be based on the idea of 'cost recovery'. Is there available a clear methodology for determining fees based on 'cost recovery'?

There is no specific methodology set in legislation for determining development application fees based on 'cost recovery'. Nonetheless, ICC regularly reviews and amends applications fees based on a number of factors, such as benchmarking with other Councils and requests for variations.

15. Will external consultants be on the IDAP panel? If so is this a public tender process?

The Independent Decision Review Panel (IDRP) is entirely comprised of external consultants. A public tender process was undertaken late 2019. The panel membership is reviewed every two years, so there will be another public tender process in 2021.

16. Can Council offer a formal prelodgement fee could be charged for this service where minutes are provided?

Pre-lodgement minutes would be of benefit. Council could offer a free service (no minutes) and paid service (minutes) - particularly for major / complex DAs.

Is Council amending its prelodgement meeting process to be more in line with BCC, LCC, MBRC etc (i.e. formal minutes)

Development Planning recognise there is a balance between providing a timely, free prelodgement service and providing certainty through written advice. The prelodgement services offered by Development Planning are currently being reviewed.

17. Would ICC consider outsourcing expert review early in the assessment process as part of the applicable application fees?

Typically, Council will seek a third-party review of a specialist (economic/geotech ect) report shortly after the report has been lodged to Council. This is to allow time for any clarifications to be included in an Information Request. There is an additional fee for this to be undertaken as specified in our schedule of fees and charges. It should be noted that not all specialist reports

require third-party review if skills to review the report are available within Council, such as stormwater and traffic reports. ICC also offers a separate specialist report pre-assessment service, which is useful for identifying issues prior to lodgement. It is recommended that this option be discussed as part of pre lodgement discussions.

18. DA fees - Would be good to see a portal to request an application fee and response within 24 hours

You can send a request for a fee quote directly to development@ipswich.qld.gov.au, and we will endeavour to respond as soon as possible. Depending on the complexity and the information provided, a response is likely to be received in 24 hours.

19. Public Hearing Panel should be required to read the submissions - not a summary of submissions from Council officers.

All of the application material is available for IDRP members to review. In some circumstances, the applicant and submitters are also able to address the panel.

20. Why does any issue which involves both I.C.C. - Planning & RS as well as overlap with I.C.C. - IED take so long to resolve?

It is expected that a limited number of projects will require this level of scrutiny. Typically, any matter which requires input from both departments will be a complex matter, usually involving some form of innovation or variation of standard. Depending on which part of the city the issue relates to, there may be other factors which can add further complexity, such as when resolving matters in relation to the Ripley Infrastructure Charges and Offsets Plan or the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement. Due to the complexity of infrastructure matters and the large amount of public funds which are associated contributed assets, an appropriate level of scrutiny is applied when an assessment carried out.

21. Do council intend to improve engagement with EDQ & QUU around Ripley development? The current un-coordinated approach does not reflect well on this region

ICC frequently engage with EDQ and QUU on development matters and Ripley, but it is acknowledged that there are improvements to be made in this space. It is expected that there will be some improvements with regard to trunk infrastructure and offsets when the Ripley Valley DCOP has been adopted.

22. How does Council reconcile the opportunity to provide quality community open space with an approach that seems to favour low maintenance environments?

Council do not consider high quality and low maintenance open spaces to be mutually exclusive, however, given the short and long term costs associated with an asset, a balance must be made somewhere along the spectrum. Open spaces which result in a low quality and/or high maintenance outcome generally come about due to the current preference from applicants for sharing open space areas with detention basins or areas with steep topography.

Development Planning are currently applying more scrutiny of open space provision during assessment of an application to ensure the right balance is being achieved.

Importantly, in some circumstances it will be acceptable for open spaces to have higher maintenance costs, especially if they are designed to provide for a district or citywide catchment. However, the sustainability of the maintenance and replacement of this asset is extremely important.

23. Enforce significantly limiting retaining wall height within residential. Give weight to replacement cost. Your ratepayers need to be able to afford this.

Council will consider a balance of outcomes when determining the appropriate height of retaining walls. These issues need to include replacement, costs, amenity, stormwater, public realm and interfaces to road reserves and open space.

24. Retaining walls for large industrial lots should not be treated in the same manner as residential lot walls.

It is noted that there are differing impacts from large retaining walls in a commercial or industrial setting compared to a residential setting. These differences are considered during the assessment of an application.

25. During COVID-19 council have recently reverted to Work From Home. Are inspections still being completed by officers as they are completed on site/out doors?

Yes. Site inspections are still being carried out where needed. Additional measures are in place to ensure appropriate social distancing is maintained.

26. Can ICC provide a Prelodgement compliance assessment meeting 2-3 weeks prior to proposed lodgement to determine foreseeable issues, particularly with bonding?

Prior to issue of an 'Outstanding Issues Notice', can ICC provide an email listing outstanding items? Often an item is frivolous and can be resolved on the day.

Council are looking to expand the current lodgement processes for plan signing and 'prelodgement' style meetings or assessments are one of the options being considered, which will ideally manage the need to send post-lodgement correspondence.

27. Can ICC issue Dev. App. Fee Invoices within 3 days of lodgement? Currently applications sit for 2 weeks than issue a 'Not Properly Made' note with the invoice.

It is recognised that there are improvements that can be made to the current lodgement and fee payment system. PRS are currently looking for ways to incorporate invoices to the lodgement process.

28. Cost-benefit of Detent. for infill sites - Council has flood studies for major flowpaths - have they modelled the effect of these numerous tiny infill basins?

Council modelling is based on existing conditions and does not consider any future developments. It does not therefore consider development solutions but it assists in defining a base case. As such, an assessment of the development including its impact and mitigation measures is required as part of the assessment of the application.

29. Are ICC embracing self-certification processes (PDA) and helping reduce the upfront information required through the DAs?

The CPM is in effect in Ripley. This process is different from the regular OPW assessment process however it is critically important to note that the CPM requires that the same level of detail is provided prior to construction as a conventional application process. In order to take advantage of the CPM, it is necessary to provide more upfront detailed technical information with the planning application.

30. Faster turnaround of uncompleted works bonding applications - these normally take weeks to be approved

There is a significant delay to get approvals and on/off maintenance letters from the eng/env sections. It suggests a lack of resources

A resource analysis is currently underway, along with process improvements to help assist in this area. Additionally officers are attending on/off maintenance inspection within a week of the request

31. Is any consideration being given to scaling the application process of operational works? Perhaps there should be a self-certification model for simple works.

In future, Council may consider first-track option for small scale non trunk OPW applications. There is no plan to implement self-certification of Civil Works.

32. Can Council consider adopting the ADAC standard/format for submission of as-constructed survey as opposed to Access database-type system?

Council will be adopting ADAC.

33. The maintenance period for infrastructure is intended to managed 'latent defects', but is increasing being used as a catch-all at off maintenance.

Outside the Ripley PDA council attends all hold point inspections as required by PSP3 and will continue to do so. Self-certification for minor defects at these hold point inspections is adopted from time to time. Council completes all hold point inspections in accordance with the CPM where self-certification is occurring. Within the Ripley PDA the CPM requires all damage and defects (including builder's damage) to be rectified by the developer. Outside the PDA any operational issues (e.g. builders damage) are not put on the developer to rectify, only items where it is clear that there is a problem with construction and/or defects in the design and performance.

34. Decision Ready for OPW Certification was a great initiative - Will Council consider this pathway again?

Following several issues, Council has ceased this initiative. ICC are giving consideration to fast-track for non-trunk small scale OW applications.

35. The level of service of Council during the construction period has declined. Would Council consider self-certification?

Outside the Ripley PDA, Council attends all hold point inspections as required by PSP3 and will continue to do so. Self-certification for minor defects at these hold point inspections is adopted from time to time. Council completes all hold point inspections in accordance with the CPM where self-certification is occurring. Within the PDA area, the project co-ordinator and certifier are responsible for construction supervision and quality control. A resource analysis is currently underway, along with process improvements to help assist in this area.

36. Council owned street lighting has a 12 month maintenance period vs Energex street lighting that has no maintenance period. How do we move to the Energex model

Under the current planning scheme Council requires rate 3 street lighting. Under the planning scheme Council requires 12 months maintenance period for as the owner of this asset. Energex model is applicable for rate 2 street lighting, which they are the asset owner.

37. Will council be increasing the resourcing around oversight for street lighting? Council have created this new requirement without the corresponding resourcing.

Resource analysis is currently underway, along with process improvement considerations to help assist in this area.

38. Standard of landscaping maintenance req during the maintenance period significantly exceeds the standard of landscaping maintenance provided by Council after.

Often residential development provides significant landscape maintenance to assist in presentation and marketing of the development. Council maintains landscaped areas at an interval which may not be as regular as the developer's contractor. This is one of the reasons why adopted standards do consider maintenance.

39. The term 'defined flood event' is used in the new scheme. Should we be using "AFRL" like we have to date?

Until such time as Council resolves to adopt a planning scheme, the current Ipswich Planning Scheme and the terms and provisions contained therein will apply.

40. Is the allowance for "transferable building entitlement" being removed from the new scheme?

The draft planning scheme is currently under preparation. This cannot be confirmed at this point in time.

41. Why has the Draft Scheme taken so long?

Consultation has occurred on a Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic Framework) indicating the policy direction for the new planning scheme. A new Council has since been elected and is now in place. A number of studies are currently underway to inform preparation of the new planning scheme. Drafting of the new planning scheme is currently underway. The timeline for preparation of the planning scheme including approach to stakeholder engagement is yet to be finalised and will be advised in due course.

42. Is the entire Draft Planning Scheme currently being reviewed independently under tender?

No. The new planning scheme is currently under preparation. Council will seek specialist input on key components.

43. SEQWater code has some items that say "to LGs requirements". For consistency can ICCs requirements be spelt out in the new planning scheme?

These matters will be considered in drafting of the new planning scheme

44. When will you be reaching Stage 3 (formal public consultation) for the draft planning scheme? Will any additional consultation be held with the dev industry?

A new Council has been elected and is now in place. The timeline for preparation of the planning scheme including approach to stakeholder engagement is yet to be finalised and will be advised in due course.

45. Will Council be making the raw data for new planning scheme mapping/overlays available (i.e. open data policy)?

It is anticipated this information will be available as open data when available

46. Will the Ipswich River Flood Study (already adopted by Council) be released for review prior to the Planning Scheme public comment review process?

It is unclear to which project specifically the question relates. However, there are two relevant and related projects that fit the question.

- The Ipswich Rivers Flood Study Update (IRFSU) has been finalised and is a technical study.
- The technical outputs of the IRFSU are being used as part of the Ipswich Integrated Catchment Plan (IICP) which will provide a local floodplain management plan as required by the Brisbane River Catchment Strategic Floodplain Management Plan (SFMP). This project will include a community consultation phase.