

PART C – Community and stakeholder communication

17. Community and stakeholder communication

17.1 Introduction

Queensland Transport and PB conducted a community consultation process which facilitated an open and transparent two-way communication process between potentially affected property owners, the community, stakeholders and Queensland Transport before the release of this document, the Environmental Impact Study.

A key focus of the consultation process was to gather community and stakeholder issues and concerns while providing detailed information about the study. This chapter outlines the consultation approach taken during the Environmental Impact Study phase of the study and related outcomes. A short account of the consultation activities undertaken during previous phases of the Ipswich to Springfield PTC study is provided below.

17.2 Consultation background

17.2.1 Background to REF consultation

During the REF phase, Queensland Transport and PB conducted an extensive consultation process with the community, to determine the best public transport corridor and station locations within the area. Community feedback provided during this phase of the study assisted the team to determine future consultation activities.

Following the development of the REF report and the announcement of the preferred corridor, the completion of an Environmental Impact Study was required to gain approval for the preservation of the preferred corridor.

17.2.2 Background to Environmental Impact Study consultation

As part of the Environmental Impact Study process, a series of activities were conducted to engage the community and gather feedback on the preferred corridor. Key issues, questions and concerns were also incorporated into the social impact assessment and other technical studies and a draft Environmental Impact Study report was released in June 2007 for public comment. Consultation outcomes and activities during the initial Environmental Impact Study as well as on the draft report are discussed in Sections 17.3 and 17.4 respectively.

17.3 Consultation summary – initial Environmental Impact Study process

The consultation process was designed to obtain comment from the local community on the preferred corridor. This section outlines the key activities that occurred during the Environmental Impact Study process, prior to release of the draft document in June 2007.

17.3.1 Consultation objectives

The broad objectives of the consultation process were to raise awareness and understanding by:

- providing information to the community and relevant stakeholders
- seeking stakeholder and community participation, input and feedback
- incorporating stakeholder views into decision-making
- ensuring the target audience was aware that the study for the identification and preservation of a public transport corridor was being conducted from Ipswich to Springfield
- ensuring the target audience could clearly and easily understand the consultation material and recall key messages.

17.3.2 Letters to elected representatives

Queensland Transport prepared and distributed letters to local state members, Member for Ipswich – Rachel Nolan and Member for Bundamba – Jo-Ann Miller prior to the announcement of the preferred corridor. The letter provided information on the process moving forward and contact points for future community enquiries.

A copy of the letter is attached in Appendix D.

17.3.3 Letters to potentially affected property owners

The study team prepared and distributed letters to potentially affected property owners on Thursday 22 February 2007 and again on 8 June 2007. The letters included the following information:

- announcement of preferred corridor
- study background
- a request to meet with the study team
- contact points for the study team.

This letter was distributed to 105 property owners affected by the announcement of Options 1A and 2A as the preferred corridor. Property owners who were common to all options were also included in this mail out.

A letter was also issued on Thursday, 22 February 2007 to all property owners no longer affected by the public transport corridor study. These included property owners affected by corridor Option 1B. The letter informed them of the result of the REF Report and the phases moving forward. The letter also stated that their properties were no longer being considered as part of the study.

Letters were sent to all potentially affected property owners, including newly affected property owners on 8 June 2007. The letter included a revised map showing alignment changes in some areas.

Copies of these letters are included in Appendix D.

17.3.4 Property owner contact

One-to-one meetings were conducted with six property owners directly and indirectly affected by the preferred corridor. These meetings were held throughout March and April 2007, at the request of property owners.

The issues raised during these meetings are outlined in Section 17.3.10 of this report.

17.3.5 Advertising

Advertisements (and a running schedule) were developed to promote the announcement of the preferred corridor and provide study team contact points. A second series of advertisements were developed to provide information on the REF report public display locations and dates. The advertisements were placed in the following newspapers:

- Brisbane Courier Mail – 3 March 2007 and 5 May 2007
- Ipswich Queensland Times – 28 February 2007, 6 March 2007 and 9 May 2007
- Ipswich Advertiser – 27 February 2007, 6 March 2007 and 9 May 2007
- Satellite Weekly Times – 28 February 2007 and 7 March 2007
- South West News (Brisbane) – 28 February 2007, 7 March 2007 and 9 May 2007.

Copies of the advertisements have been included in Appendix D.

17.3.6 Information newsletter

An eight page A4 double-gate, fold-out newsletter announcing the preferred corridor was prepared and distributed to 36,000 residents in the week commencing 19 February 2007. The newsletter was distributed to the following areas:

- Ipswich City Centre
- One Mile
- Churchill
- Yamanto
- Flinders View
- Ripley
- Deebing Heights
- Ripley
- South Ripley
- Swanbank
- Redbank Plains
- Bellbird Park
- Augustine Heights
- Camira
- Springfield
- Springfield Lakes
- Goodna.

The newsletter included:

- a map of the preferred corridor extending from Ipswich to Springfield, via Yamanto, Ripley and Redbank Plains South. The map also showed the Darra to Springfield future rail link and the SWTC
- study background and justification
- facts on community participation during the REF phase
- details of the staffed information displays
- details of the ongoing Environmental Impact Study processes
- study team contact details.

A copy of this newsletter is attached in Appendix D.

17.3.7 Study webpage

The study webpage was updated with the announcement of the preferred corridor. This webpage was hosted by PB and provided a link to the Queensland Transport website. The webpage was an important information source for the broader community and relevant stakeholders. Information on the webpage included:

- a map of the preferred corridor extending from Ipswich to Springfield, via Yamanto, Ripley and Redbank Plains South. The map also showed the Darra to Springfield future rail link and the SWTC
- study background and justification
- facts on community participation during the REF phase
- details of the staffed information displays

- details on the Environmental Impact Study process moving forward
- study team contact details
- a copy of the information newsletter
- copies of the REF Report, appendices and technical drawings.

17.3.8 Public displays

Public displays were held throughout the study area to provide information and gain feedback from the community regarding the preferred corridor.

Staffed information displays

Two staffed community displays were held at Ipswich and Redbank Plains during the second week of May 2007. Study team representatives were available at these displays to provide study information and to answer questions from the broader community.

Staffed displays were held at the following locations:

- Redbank Plains Plaza, South Redbank Plains – Thursday 10 May 2007 (5:00 pm to 8:00 pm)
- University of Queensland Ipswich, Boilerhouse Community Engagement Centre, Ipswich – Saturday 12 May 2007 (10:00 am to 1:00 pm)

At the Redbank Plains South display an estimated 55 people from the general public attended, with the display at the University of Queensland Ipswich Campus attracting 10 people.

Nine people at the displays registered their interest and provided feedback via a community comment book.

These open days were advertised as per 17.3.5.

A copy of the information display material is included in Appendix D.

17.3.9 Study information tools

Freecall number

A freecall number was established to encourage members of the community and potentially affected property owners to contact the study team. PB received 57 calls on this number between late February and May 2007. Nine of these calls were from affected property owners.

Email address

Residents were provided with an email address to assist the enquiry and submission process. PB received eight emails relating to the study between 24 February 2007 and 21 May 2007.

Written submissions

A fax number and reply paid postal address was also provided to allow community members to provide feedback on the preferred corridor. A total of three letters were received through the reply paid address up to and including 21 May 2007.

Issues raised through these study information tools are summarised in Section 17.3.10 below.

17.3.10 Consultation outcomes

Property owners, stakeholders and community members raised a range of issues relating to the preferred corridor and the initial Environmental Impact Study phase between late February and late May 2007. When consulted, community members usually raised more than one issue of concern.

Corridor announcement media

The preferred corridor announcement on Friday 23 February 2007 generated nine newspaper articles. A large number of media articles also appeared during late December 2006, January and early February 2007 in the lead up to the preferred corridor announcement.

Copies of the announcement media articles are attached in Appendix D.

Property owner contact

Directly affected property owners raised a variety of issues during one-on-one meetings and telephone conversations. These concerns included:

- general study information and study timings
- indirect impact on the lifestyle of business owners due to the potential loss of jobs, income and employees
- inadequate compensation for impacted property
- concern that compensation will not allow impacted owners to purchase similar land, home or business
- environmental impacts related to the close proximity of the preferred corridor to the local koala reserve.

Other issues highlighted during property owner meetings included noise and visual concerns.

General community contact

A number of issues were raised by stakeholders and community members through a variety of study contact points including the hotline, email address, postal address and information displays.

Table 17-1 identifies the issues and the number of times they were raised by community members.

Table 17-1: Issues raised by community members during the initial Environmental Impact Study process

Issues	Number of times raised
General study information	48
Impact on properties	16
Impact on lifestyle	3
Compensation	4
Construction	2
Noise	2
Environmental concerns	2
Corridor benefits	2
Visual impacts	1
Alternative route	1
Prefer Option 1B	1
Prefer Option 1A	1
Cultural heritage	1
Economic impacts	1

The following section provides detailed information relating to each frequently discussed issue and an outline of general issues raised during the consultation process.

Study information

A number of community members contacted the study team asking for general study information including:

- how to be placed on future mailing lists
- requests for copies of project newsletters, maps and fact sheets
- requests for other study team contact details (including email, mailing and website addresses)
- study and timing updates.

The study team also received a number of questions about the design of the transport corridor for both rail and bus travel and how often services were expected to run. The study team responded to these questions by stating that the project is still in the research and information gathering stage and therefore neither rail nor bus had been selected as the preferred mode of transport.

Impact on properties

After the announcement of the preferred corridor, a number of community members who were interested in purchasing land within the study area contacted the study team to identify any impacts on particular properties and surrounding areas.

Impact on lifestyle

Some community members highlighted that it would be difficult to sell their properties and businesses as a result of the location of the preferred public transport corridor. Participants indicated that this was due to the unknown construction timings and impacts such as noise and visual concerns. It was indicated that this difficulty may impeded future lifestyle choices.

Compensation

Several enquiries were received from indirectly affected property owners regarding compensation eligibility due to the proximity of a property to the preferred corridor. Many indicated that the compensation system was flawed as while not immediately affected, hence ineligible for compensation, owners would be impacted visually and by noise. It was also highlighted that property values would be detrimentally affected.

Construction

Consultation participants identified a number of issues in relation to the construction of the public transport corridor. These issues included the possibility of immediate construction of the infrastructure once the Queensland Government had made a decision. It was also indicated that a loop service would be beneficial should the preferred mode of transport be rail. It was also suggested that a station site be situated near Cedar Lot.

A need for a cycleway to be incorporated into the design of the public transport corridor was highlighted, as well as the availability of sufficient cyclist facilities at the stations. Suggested facilities included bike racks, lockers and showers.

Noise

The study team was contacted by two community members regarding noise issues. It was indicated that the public transport corridor would increase noise in areas surrounding the corridor. Concern was raised about the following issues:

- construction noise
- train/bus noise (if express, every 15 minutes)
- increased traffic noise around stations.

Environmental concerns

Community members contacted the study team with environmental concerns for land directly affected by the preferred corridor. Community members identified the following issues of concern:

- the location of native sting-less bee hives
- part of the preferred corridor is a nature reserve
- a section of the preferred corridor traverses a koala corridor.

These issues were included in technical studies and are discussed further in Chapter 11 of the report.

Corridor benefits

The decision of the preferred corridor was viewed as a positive step by some community members. It was highlighted by one community member that a loop service would be a beneficial transport option for the future.

The development of transit orientated communities was also viewed as a good opportunity for future growth, with a community members suggesting that education programs be put in place to publicise the benefits of these types of developments.

General issues raised

In addition to concerns frequently raised by community members during the Environmental Impact Statement consultation process, the following issues were also noted during consultation activities. These issues included:

- a preference for rail as the mode of transport
- visual impacts including impeded residential views and disruption to the outlook of the area
- the need for an alternative route which included preference for the original study Options 1A and 2A
- economic impacts on indirectly affected property owners
- cultural heritage concerns for the area surrounding Keogh Street.

17.3.11 Summary

The consultation process implemented on the preferred corridor for the initial Environmental Impact Study was an active step in gaining feedback from not only potentially directly affected property owners but general community members and stakeholders. It provided the study team with valuable information regarding issues and perceptions and informed technical studies.

Generally negative impacts associated with the preferred corridor related to:

- impact on properties
- impact on lifestyle
- compensation
- construction
- noise
- environmental impacts.

Benefits noted by community members related to the potential for a loop service and the development of transit oriented communities.

17.4 Consultation summary – draft Environmental Impact Study report

The following summary discusses activities and outcomes from the consultation process after the release of the draft Environmental Impact Study report, in June 2007.

17.4.1 Information newsletter

A four page A4, fold-out newsletter announcing the release of the draft Environmental Impact Study report was prepared and distributed to 36,000 residents in the week commencing 11 June 2007. The newsletter was distributed to the following areas:

- Ipswich City Centre
- One Mile
- Churchill
- Yamanto
- Flinders View
- Ripley
- Deebing Heights
- South Ripley
- Swanbank
- Redbank Plains
- Bellbird Park
- Augustine Heights
- Camira
- Springfield
- Springfield Lakes
- Goodna

The newsletter included:

- a map of the preferred corridor, which also showed the Darra-Springfield future rail link and the SWTC
- study background
- details on the draft Environmental Impact Study report and its contents
- details of the staffed displays to be held
- details of the ongoing process
- details on how to make a submission regarding the draft report
- study team contact details.

A copy of this newsletter is attached in Appendix D.

17.4.2 Draft Environmental Impact Study public displays

Public displays for the release of the draft Environmental Impact Study report were held throughout the study area to provide information and to gain feedback from the community regarding the draft report.

Staffed information displays

Four staffed community displays were held at Ipswich and Redbank Plains during July 2007. Study team representatives were available at these displays to provide study information and to answer questions from the broader community.

Staffed displays were held at the following locations:

- Yamanto Shopping Village, Yamanto – Thursday 12 July 2007 (4:30 pm to 7:30 pm)
- Redbank Plains Shopping Centre, Redbank Plains – Saturday 14 July 2007 (10am to 1pm) and Thursday 26 July 2007 (4.30pm to 7.30pm)
- UQ Ipswich, Staff and Graduate Lounge, Ipswich – Saturday 28 July 2007 (10am to 1pm)

At the Redbank Plains South displays, an estimated 170 people from the general public attended, with the display at Yamanto attracting 19 people. Twenty people attended the display at UQ Ipswich on Saturday 28 July 2007.

A total of 13 visitors to the displays registered their interest and provided feedback via a community comment book.

17.4.3 Community contact points

All community feedback was entered into PB's community database, established specifically for the study. This feedback included comments received at public displays, comments from one-on-one meetings and comments received via project information tools (including the freecall information number and written submissions).

Table 17-2: Summary of feedback by contact method

Contact method	Number of times contacted
Freecall hotline	123
Public displays	209
One-on-one meetings	16
Written submissions	18

17.4.4 Community feedback

A number of issues were raised by property owners, stakeholders and community members through a variety of study contact points including the freecall hotline, email address, postal address, the draft Environmental Impact Study displays and submissions. The following table outlines the issues and enquires made and the number of times raised by property owners, community members and stakeholders.

Table 17-3: Issues and enquiries outlined by community members on the draft Environmental Impact Study report

Issues	Number of times raised
General study information	57
Request for Draft Environmental Impact Study CD	36
Consultation	36
Study timings	23
Social information provided by community	20
Compensation	19
Economic impacts	17
Alternative route required	15
Impact on lifestyle	14
Environmental concerns	14
Concerns for future development plans	12
Noise	11
Property devaluation	6
Cultural heritage	6
Impacts on business	5
Visual impacts	4
Construction	4
No concerns	4
Access	4
Increase in crime rate	2
Safety	2
Health concerns	2
Transport system not needed	1
Compensation concerns for near-neighbours	1

A total of 18 written submissions were received on the draft report. Detailed information relating to issues raised through the submission process, as well as a response to each issue is included in Table 17-4.

Table 17-4: Submissions on Draft Environmental Impact Study report

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
Submission 1	<p>Your draft study indicates that, for the railway option, the maximum noise level for sleep disturbance is the same as the rail noise criteria during the day. Your study also quotes levels that are higher than those found in the EPA Guideline "Planning for noise control". I find these assumptions unacceptable for the preservation of current community lifestyle, including sleep patterns, and request that the levels be reviewed to a more reasonable level.</p> <p>I also expect acceptable noise mitigation strategies will be incorporated to allow the affected community to at least get a good night sleep. I accept that there will be some impact to noise levels from the public transport corridor, but to not set reasonable maximum noise levels for sleep disturbance is unacceptable.</p> <p>I also expect acceptable noise mitigation strategies will be incorporated to allow the affected community to at least get a good night sleep. I accept that there will be some impact to noise levels from the public transport corridor, but to not set reasonable maximum noise levels for sleep disturbance is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Railways are defined as a beneficial asset under the EPP(Noise) and have set planning noise levels. The EPA guideline is not applicable to noise from railways.</p>
	<p>I also note that your maximum acceptable noise levels for sleep disturbance from a busway are higher than those published in the Environmental Protection Agency's publication guideline "Planning for noise control".</p>	<p>Railways are defined as a beneficial asset under the EPP(Noise) and have set planning noise levels. The EPA guideline is not applicable to noise from railways.</p>
	<p>Using your formula (from page 105/106 of the Draft EIS). Replace SPL = 84.5dB with 62dB (from Environmental Protection Agency Guideline "Planning for noise control" - single glazed, closed window with 10% of people awakening). This is still restrictive as this means people will need to have their windows closed during the night and still 1 in 10 people will wake up. Separation distance to achieve the criteria is approximately 630m (i.e. houses within this zone will have higher risks of awakening, unless there are noise abatement strategies incorporated). Using SPL = 52dB (partially closed 10% awakening - for those of us that like to have a window open of a night...) the separation distance becomes 2000m.</p>	<p>Recommended limit is 5dB higher than EPA guideline, but 30dB(A) lower than the Main Roads criteria. Given that night time bus transport would be infrequent, the criteria are appropriate.</p> <p>The corridor design criteria was based on rail transport as mentioned in Section 1.1.1.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>I find it unacceptable to the community that no reasonable maximum acceptable level of noise for sleep disturbance for railway is allowed for in the study, and therefore no mitigation strategies incorporated or investigated if the rail option were implemented.</p> <p>In reference to Section 10 (Noise and Vibration), 10.42 (Sleep Disturbance):</p> <p>I notice the study suggests that sleep disturbance criteria are not applicable to railway noise. I find this statement to be disturbing, as the level of noise to create sleep disturbance is the same no matter what the source.</p> <p>This statement suggests that if rail was selected as the preferred option, then noise produced from the rail transport during the sleeping hours would not be a high priority, as it is deemed acceptable that people can sleep through the maximum noise levels provided for during the day.</p> <p><i>"-65dB(A), assessed as the 24 hour average equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level - 87 dB(A) assessed as a single event maximum sound pressure level."</i></p>	<p>Railways are defined as a beneficial asset under the EPP(Noise) and have set planning noise levels. The EPA guideline is not applicable to noise from railways.</p> <p>Railways are defined as a beneficial asset under the EPP(Noise) and have set planning noise levels. The EPA guideline is not applicable to noise from railways.</p>
	<p>The Queensland Transport website - Planning for rail noise (http://www.transport.qld.gov.au/home/Projects_and_initiatives/Plans/Queensland_transports_interests_in_planning_schemes/Planning_for_rail_noise/#heading07) even quotes below as preferred approach for planning schemes:</p> <p>"Noise-sensitive uses meet indoor design level noise criteria to achieve average maximum sound level (10pm - 6am) not greater than 50 decibels (dB).</p> <p>New development meets external design level noise criteria of:1) 65dB(A), assessed as the 24 hour average equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level 2) 87dB(A), assessed as a single event maximum sound pressure level when measured 1 m from the most exposed part of the noise-sensitive place."</p>	

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
Submission 2	<p>I find it unacceptable to the community... that no reasonable maximum acceptable level of noise for sleep disturbance for railway is allowed for in the study, and therefore no mitigation strategies incorporated or investigated if the rail option were implemented.</p> <p>The impact on our native wildlife needs to be assessed:</p> <p>We live near Reales Park which is full of trees, we also have beautiful, tall, green Eucalyptus trees on the existing railway land and on our property, all provide shelter and homes for many native animals: - Birds - such as magpies, butcher birds, palehead parrots, king parrots, rainbow and scaly breasted lorikeets, cockatoos, galahs, corellas, top notch doves, blue wrens and...tawny frogmouth owls, just to name a few.</p>	<p>Railways are defined as a beneficial asset under the EPP(Noise) and have set planning noise levels. The EPA guideline is not applicable to noise from railways.</p>
	<p>The impact on the culture/heritage of Ipswich housing:</p> <p>Our house was built in 1922... By the time this transport corridor comes into affect our house may be heritage listed.</p>	<p>It has been identified that the project will result in negative effects to fauna within the area through direct habitat loss, fragmentation and mortality. However, such impacts can be either largely avoided or minimised through appropriate mitigation measures. It has been recommended as part of mitigation strategies (Sections 11.4 and 11.5) that measures such as minimal vegetation clearing, translocation measures and provisions of offsets be implemented prior to construction. Furthermore, more common and robust fauna species (such as birds) should experience a lower degree of disturbance. It would be expected that such species will move and populate the nearby habitat of the area.</p>
	<p>The sentimental value of our house is paramount.</p> <p>Our financial and personal loss: We have renovated...and redesigned all the gardens.</p>	<p>A detailed Environmental Impact Statement will be undertaken prior to the Ipswich to Springfield PTC being implemented. Any changes to the heritage status of buildings and places impacted by the preferred corridor will be address in the Environmental Impact Statement and requirements outlined in accordance with the Heritage Act 1992.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	Timeline of communication/consultation:	
	Total disappointment in the lack of consultation with us, one on one.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	First found out on the 14th February via an article published in the Ipswich Advertiser that the corridor would run right past out house.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	West Ipswich was the forgotten area when it came to voicing its opinion.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	Our local council has done nothing to inform us and other residents of the study and its findings. Even after we read the articles in the local Advertiser/Ipswich News on the 14th/28th and called their office we were amazed that they knew nothing about it.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	Other residents have spoken to the council and have not received any adequate feedback either. We realise that this is a State Government issue but we all hoped our council would represent everyone in Ipswich, not just the Yamanto and Flinders View suburbs.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	Property owner attended a PB Open Day at UQ Ipswich Campus. All the large binders of information and data were there, but no one really knew anything at all.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	Our first official letter came from our federal member for Blair - Liberal - Cameron Thompson on the 22nd May 2007. He had organised a meeting for local residents of Sadliers Crossing and West Ipswich after receiving several complaints from local residents that they had not been informed of the process.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	Property owner attend this meeting, 8th June 2007. Here it was discovered that property owners should have received mail box drops regarding the progress of the corridor study. A Department of Transport expert attend the meeting, and the only knowledge he could impart was that it would be a double railway line, if it was going to be a rail corridor. Again it felt like no one really knew what was going on.	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
	We want to know more specifically what outcomes there will be if this corridor goes ahead.	Queensland Transport will continue to inform residents of progress and study decision

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	Questions:	
	Where will the boundary be?	The boundary location is shown on the Property Impact Plan that was issued in June 2007.
	Will our house be too close?	This would be determined at the as a part of the detailed design process, together with any mitigation measures that might be required.
	Will our house be moved further down our property/further from the boundary?	This would be determined at the as a part of the detailed design process, together with any mitigation measures that might be required.
	Will the street be turned into a culder sac/dead end?	This would be determined at the as a part of the detailed design process, however it is intended that Challinor Street would be lowered to pass under the corridor.
	Will noise barriers be erected?	If required to meet criteria.
	What about the movement and vibrations from passing trains?	Vibration predictions are to be assessed as part of the noise and vibration modelling during the Environmental Impact Statement.
	Health issues relating to the proximity to high voltage overhead powerlines	The Ipswich to Springfield PTC has no associated high voltage powerlines, apart from those associated with rail.
	Will there be a pedestrian overpass or pedestrian tunnel linking Sadliers Crossing to West Ipswich in Challinor Street?	This would be determined at the as a part of the detailed design process, together with any mitigation measures that might be required.
	How long before the proposed railway corridor will be built?	Currently there exists no commitment by the State Government if and when this facility would be constructed.
	If we had to sell and buy a similar house within the same area to meet our work, social and children's schooling needs - what options do we have?	Concern to be addressed during property acquisition process which makes provisions for these issues.
	What about the devaluation on the market value of our house - living next to a double railway line?	Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport
Submission 3	Financial loss/impacts	Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Impact on properties:</p> <p>The public transport corridor wipes out a lot of land and business opportunities for Ipswich.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>
Submission 4	<p>Location of corridor:</p> <p>Our first concern regards the direct route chosen, which differs from the original proposed route. The route chosen on Keogh Street, directly impacts a number of properties which are occupied. Our submission is that the exact route be re-examined to lessen the direct impact to the residences on Keogh Street.</p> <p>Examine the engineering or the feasibility of using the vacant lot directly across the road from the affect houses in Keogh Street.</p>	<p>The preferred corridor alignment was determined in consultation with Queensland Rail, who advised that the original alignment would cause significant noise and operational issues particularly as the corridor is elevated through this area.</p> <p>The preferred corridor alignment was determined in consultation with Queensland Rail, who advised that the original alignment would cause significant noise and operational issues particularly as the corridor is elevated through this area.</p>
	<p>Project timing:</p> <p>Our lives are in limbo awaiting when all this will happen, we have been told 8 to 11, to 15 years before this may happen. We would like some certainty in the compensation process to enable land holders to move on.</p>	<p>Comment noted and is included in submission to the Department of Transport for their attention.</p>
	<p>Compensation:</p> <p>If we entered talks regarding the sale of the property we would ask for suitable compensation, allowing for our purchase costs, and in and out costs, on top of the market value. Our point being that if we enter talks in the sale of the property that consideration be given for adequate compensation to allow us to move forward and enable closure on the property.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Consultation:</p> <p>In regards to the level of communication with residents regarding proposed changes to the alignment. Pamphlets were not delivered to affected residents in Keogh Street, and a special mail out was conducted after phone calls were made. Our submission is that areas likely to be affected by the railway have pamphlets posted by direct mail, by registered mail. The contractor engaged to deliver the pamphlets in our view did not deliver on outcomes to residents. The first we new of the new proposed railway route was a letter regarding the resumption of our property.</p>	<p>Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport</p>
Submission 5	<p>Financial loss/impacts:</p> <p>The owner has already invested in the property, apart from the cost of the acquisition itself.</p> <p>The club house is central to the viability of the course as a business. The costs of maintaining and running the course are not generated by membership or green fees alone, but are dependent on the course as a business prospect generating income through other means - that is the club house. Without this income, the cost of maintaining and operating the course cannot be met and the survival of the course itself is jeopardised.</p> <p>There will be little incentive to continue with plans to further develop and enhance the course to the benefit of users and the community if the business potential of the course is affected to a significant degree.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>
	<p>Future plans:</p> <p>Expansion plans for the property have been developed.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Impact on business:</p> <p>While a golf course may survive the loss of some of its greens and fairways, it cannot survive the loss of its clubhouse.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>
	<p>Location of corridor:</p> <p>If the land is taken for the corridor along the current proposed alignment, the freehold parcel will be split. The resultant lot size and configuration would not accommodate the existing club house should it be moved or allow for a club house with similar facilities to be constructed.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>
	<p>Historical importance:</p> <p>The course has existed for 87 years.</p>	<p>A detailed Environmental Impact Statement will be undertaken prior to the Ipswich to Springfield PTC being implemented. Any changes to the heritage status of buildings and places impacted by the preferred corridor will be address in the Environmental Impact Statement and requirements outlined in accordance with the Heritage Act 1992. The club house and golf course are not currently listed as being of heritage significance in any state or local government registers.</p>
	<p>The club house has historical and social importance to Ipswich.</p>	<p>A detailed Environmental Impact Statement will be undertaken prior to the Ipswich to Springfield PTC being implemented. Any changes to the heritage status of buildings and places impacted by the preferred corridor will be address in the Environmental Impact Statement and requirements outlined in accordance with the Heritage Act 1992. The club house and golf course are not currently listed as being of heritage significance in any state or local government registers.</p>
	<p>Impact of corridor:</p> <p>It is noted that the current alignment of the Corridor not only affects the club house, but also a newly established business premises on the opposite side of Lobb Street.</p>	<p>This alignment was determined after consultation with land owners in the area, a review of the potential environmental impacts to Deebling Creek, and consideration of the engineering constraints.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Minimisation of impacts:</p> <p>A previous advertised alignment of the preferred option for the Corridor saw it pass to the south east of the freehold site, avoiding the club house entirely and running through a machinery shed that services the course. The machinery shed is for storage purposed only and can easily be moved without affecting the viability of the course of offending building regulations.</p>	<p>This alignment was determined after consultation with land owners in the area, a review of the potential environmental impacts to Deebling Creek, and consideration of the engineering constraints.</p>
	<p>A further alternative would be to move the current proposed alignment of the corridor to a position between the club house and the former advertised alignment which passed through the machinery shed. If, for example, the corridor boundary aligned with the car park access driveway at the club house's southern side, the club house could remain in its present position, and the alignment of the corridor would not be affected to any great extent.</p>	<p>This alignment was determined after consultation with land owners in the area, a review of the potential environmental impacts to Deebling Creek, and consideration of the engineering constraints.</p>
	<p>General comment:</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a public transport corridor is a desirable and necessary adjunct to urban development of the nature and extend anticipated in the Western Corridor within the next 20 years, but it is equally important that areas of public, open space and opportunities for recreation be provided, and that the cultural, historical and social aspects that contribute to the character and identity of communities are retained.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Submission 6	<p>Impact on properties:</p> <p>The proposed rail corridor will reduce the area of the planned business and industry park on the land.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>
	<p>Compensation:</p> <p>The owner seeks suitable compensation for these losses.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
Submission 7	<p>Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan:</p> <p>Section 4.4.6 of the Draft EIS describes the Ripley Valley Master Planning Enquiry by Design (EBD) Workshop, which occurred in July 2006. In addition, Section 4.4.7 of the Draft EIS details 'Current and Future Developments in the Area'.</p> <p>Neither section of the Draft EIS reflects the current status of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan (of which the EBD was one component). Since the EBD, the Draft Structure Plan has gained significant momentum in completing the following key milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Finalised Draft Structure Plan - December 2006 to January 2007 2) Draft Structure Plan Approved by Ipswich City Council - April 2007 3) Draft Structure Plan Approved by Regional Planning Minister to commence public display - April 2007. 4) Second State Government Interest Check - May 2007 5) Public Exhibition of Draft Structure Plan - May 2007 to July 2007 6) Considered Public Submissions - July 2007 to August 2007. <p>The current program anticipate that State Government will give final approval of the Draft Structure Plan in September 2007, and will be formally adopted by Ipswich City Council during December 2007/January 2008.</p>	<p>Section 12.3.3 has been amended to reference the latest version of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan.</p>
	<p>The above milestones have resulted in the Draft Structure Plan having significant weight and influence with the Queensland Government, Ipswich City Council, landowners and the broader community. Therefore, the Draft EIS should reference and acknowledged the status of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Cost Benefit Analysis:</p>	
	<p>It is noted that the Draft EIS uses a Cost Benefit Analysis to translate the effects of the PT corridor into monetary terms. A downfall of using this form of analysis is that it accounts for 100% of the costs, while setting aside the environmental and social impacts of the projects. Therefore, unsurprisingly the analysis is weighed towards the cost proportion.</p>	<p>The costs and benefits, including the externalities (unquantifiable benefits) will be explored in depth during the business case.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Significant benefits which are not detailed in the Draft EIS include; impact on property valuations, reduced noise and odour emissions, improved connectivity to services and employment, and social interaction/participation. A further benefit for the PT corridor, is the master planned community catchment of 120,000 people, "Ripley Valley". Given the lack of reference and acknowledgement of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan in the Draft EIS, it is questioned whether this was considered in the Cost Benefit Analysis.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, externalities like the environmental and social benefits (such as reduced emissions and greenhouse gases, etc.) will be investigated as part of the business case. The future Ripley Valley population was taken into account during the strategic modelling and used to project patronage for the future public transport corridor. These patronage figures were used in the benefit/cost calculations. However, more detailed modelling will also be undertaken in subsequent studies which will in turn feed back into the benefit cost analysis carried out at that time.</p>
	<p>Potential project funding:</p> <p>While, the Draft EIS acknowledges that a low cost benefit ration is consistent with other public transport services in Queensland, it is nonetheless concerning that such a low cost benefit ratio will equally result in a low priority for funding. The PT corridor is a critical piece of infrastructure to ensure that the western corridor achieves the Queensland Government's aspirations and that Ripley and its surrounds will be developed using ESD principles.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Submission 8	<p>Support for corridor:</p> <p>We welcome the Government's proposal, at this time, to extent the rail system throughout the Western Corridor at some stage in the future. We also support the concept of integrating land use and transportation, particularly where it will lead to greater use of public transport in our existing and future urban areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Preferred mode of transport:</p> <p>It is noted that, while no preference is given to a particular mode of public transport in this evaluation, the focus is clearly on heavy suburban passenger rail. Alternative modes, such as light rail or bus, may have significantly less impact on the quality of the urban development while achieving the same objective. In particular, we suggest that a realistic and short term option while preserving the preferred corridor would be a rapid bus service.</p>	<p>The Ipswich to Springfield PTC study is for corridor preservation purposes only. Mode will be determined during the business case.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Development of a TOD:</p> <p>The creation of a transit oriented form of development is about fully integrating land uses and transport and encouraging mixed uses and higher residential densities around stations. It is difficult to reconcile this desired outcome with the proposals in this report which illustrate a 70 metre wide corridor for the station in the Town Centre (refer Drawing no. 519 Layout Plan sheet 9 of 16), in a 13-14 metre deep cut, below natural ground level. This is clearly quite incongruous. At the very most, a typical cross section as shown on Drawing no. 0018 (Typical Cross Section sheet 4 of 4) for the station should be no more than 30 metres wide and 'cut/constrained', as defined in the report. A satisfactory and 'model' TOD will not be achieved in a town centre divided by a wide swathe of open rail track and it would appear this point is not well understood in the impact assessment.</p>	<p>The corridor widths around the Ripley Town Centre station have been reduced to 40 m. Although wider than 30 m this will allow for an interchange with local bus routes.</p>
	<p>Timeline of construction:</p> <p>The timing of construction of the facility is unclear, but will clearly be many years and possibly decades into the future. During this time, the construction of the Ripley Town Centre will progress. It is essential, therefore, that the public transport corridor does not constrain development in the meantime and cause undue uncertainty for investors and residents alike.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Future developments:</p> <p>It is clear that to achieve the public transport objectives in this location the facility will have to be under ground, in cut and cover, with a configuration similar to the cross section as shown on Drawing no. 0017 (Typical Cross Section sheet 3 of 4) cut/constrained corridor. We request a commitment that this is to be so and that the Town Centre developer retain 'air rights' for use of the volumetric space at ground level and above.</p>	<p>It is our understanding that the Ripley Valley Master Planning process has accommodated a transport corridor in this area. In accordance with this, the corridor is submerged to reduce the visual and noise impacts of the corridor. Air rights would need to be discussed during the resumption process.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Submission comments</p>	
	<p>Construction costs:</p> <p>We note that there is no indication of cost of how this construction will be paid for in the future.</p>	<p>The Ipswich to Springfield PTC study is a planning study only and at this point in time there is no commitment from the State Government in terms of implementation and funding.</p>
	<p>Final decisions:</p> <p>To create a truly urban and vibrant Town Centres, as opposed to on divided by a wide, deep, impermeable and potentially unsightly rail corridor, we are of the view that the main centre should 'hinge' off the corridor and station. To understand better how the land use and transport will integrate and interrelate, it is recommended that no final decisions be made on this impact assessment until after the Ripley Valley Master plan Enquiry by Design process is complete. Queensland Transport representatives are invited to attend the workshops in order to assist and to understand very clearly the planning and development tasks ahead to create a successful Town Centre and Urban Core to service the future community of the Ripley Valley.</p> <p>Alternate locations:</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Decisions regarding the mode of public transport and the final corridor selection must be linked. If the final mode is to be heavy suburban rail and it is not possible to locate it in a cut and cover, or reduce the width of the corridor significantly, the clear alternative is for the corridor to move back towards the Centenary Highway, immediately adjacent to rather than directly through the Town Centre. Research and international experience indicates that heavy style rail stations are not generally located in the urban core of towns and cities, but at the edge of the core, for good reason because of the adverse physical impact. The exception is where a station is underground. It is expected that issues of this significance would be adequately addressed by a comprehensive impact assessment.</p>	<p>The corridor has been designed to heavy rail standards, as this will accommodate a busway.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
Submission 9	<p>Our understanding of QT's proposal:</p> <p>The proposal to locate the Park & Ride on our land is driven primarily by restrictions imposed on the northern side of the proposed Swanbank railway station relating to the proposed steel mill. We understand that there is an option available to Queensland Transport to acquire land for a Park & Ride on the northern side of the proposed station because of the potential for relocation of the proposed steel mill due to the environmental impact that it will have on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The railway and its associated stations and Park & Ride facilities may not be required for 15 years. Associated land resumptions would not occur until about 3 years prior to the need for the railway. Consequently our land will be encumbered with this proposal for a Park & Ride until such time as the railway is required, and this encumbrance will severely restrict our ability to develop or dispose of the land.</p> <p>The location of a Park & Ride is likely to attract significant additional road infrastructure. Planning for this part of Ripley now envisages a four-lane arterial road running adjacent to the Park & Ride. This would impact further on our land as the authority for the four-lane road would resume more of our land.</p> <p>Queensland Transport would be amenable to negotiating air-space development rights over the Park & Ride with the current land owners. Consequently the footprint of the Park & Ride could be altered depending on the form of overall development proposed. This would require coordination with the local authority in terms of land-use designations, and with the timing of development applications and the resumption process.</p>	<p>The Park & Ride has been located on the southern side of the Centenary Highway as the commuter catchment will be approaching the station from this direction.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Location of Park & Ride:</p> <p>It appears that any option of locating the Park & Ride on the northern side of the station has been prohibited because of the proposal to locate a steel mill there. This is despite the fact that the Park & Ride should be located as close as possible to the station, which would dictate its location on the northern side of the station as the Centenary Highway is already located on the southern side of the station.</p>	<p>The Park & Ride has been located on the southern side of the Centenary Highway as the commuter catchment will be approaching the station from this direction. The Park & Ride layout has been amended to meet the maximum walking distance requirement for such facilities.</p>
	<p>This does not appear to be an equitable treatment of land owners. The owners of the land for the proposed steel mill appear to be immune to the needs of the community when it comes to planning and providing for an efficient public transport system, while smaller land owners have to bear the burden of providing land for these community needs.</p>	<p>The Park & Ride has been located on the southern side of the Centenary Highway as the commuter catchment will be approaching the station from this direction.</p>
	<p>The proposed location of the Park & Ride does not conform to QT's own policy and design guidelines. Its policy requires a maximum walking distance of 400 metres from car park space to the station entrance. QT's design guidelines recommend a desirable walking distance of 180 metres and an absolute maximum distance of 300 metres. The proposed Park & Ride will result in half of the car spaces being greater than 400 metres away from the station entrance.</p>	<p>The Park & Ride layout has been amended to meet the maximum walking distance requirement for such facilities.</p>
	<p>The purpose of the Park & Ride is to attract motor car users to public transport. To achieve this, the Park & Ride needs to be convenient and attractive to users and offer them a strong sense of security for their person and vehicle. The physical separation of the Park & Ride from the station, due to the location of the Centenary Highway, detracts significantly from these attributes and has the potential to produce an under-performing Park & Ride facility.</p>	<p>The Park & Ride has been located on the southern side of the Centenary Highway as the commuter catchment will be approaching the station from this direction.</p>
	<p>Impact on our land holding:</p> <p>We appear to be impacted un-commensurately in a negative way with respect to the size of our land holding.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>The resumption will mean that a further large portion of the already affected property is no longer suitable or available for its highest and best use i.e. residential development.</p> <p>The current proposal is the second time we are being forced to give up our most valuable land for community facilities and yet our neighbours who have much larger holdings have suffered no (or commensurately less) land loss due to the IS public transport corridors.</p> <p>The shift of the corridor alignment closer to our property will significantly devalue our land for residential purposes due to its negative impact on the environment as a result of increased noise and the negative visual impacts. The residents who decide to purchase our property would suffer significant disadvantages as a result of the proposed infrastructure compensating benefits. The Park & Ride and Railway station facility will mean a much higher impact on their livelihood from local traffic noise, train noise, congestion and light. They will also suffer from an increased likelihood of loss due to crime. As a result the value of our land has been significantly reduced by your plans and proposed resumptions.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p> <p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>
Submission 10	<p>Passenger projections:</p> <p>The boarding and arriving passenger projects for the Campus should be substantially higher than the figures suggested in the Draft EIS. A target objective would be to achieve greater than 50% of the travel demand to and from the University Campus via public transport. By 2018 a highly efficient system could be catering for approximately 4000 arrivals and a similar number of departures.</p> <p>Horizontal alignment for University station:</p> <p>The preferred alignment illustrated in the Draft EIS has been overlaid on an aerial view of the existing Campus and it appears that the corridor will have an immediate impact on University buildings, and the existing Campus road system.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Patronage figures used in this study were outputs from strategic modelling.</p> <p>Following discussions on this matter with university representatives, we have reviewed the corridor proximity to existing buildings in this area and do not believe that there will be an immediate impact. The station type has been amended to require a narrower footprint, which removes the impact on the campus road system.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>It is understood that the corridor illustrated on the Draft EIS is the alignment required for heavy rail and has been based upon certain speed and load capacity limitations. It is also recognised that the alignment illustrated would have greater flexibility in its position if it were for buses.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Corridor width: The corridor width at the station is illustrated as 70 metres wide which is an extraordinary width for a station compared with the width of 30 metres in a constrained cut situation as described in the report. The diagrams suggest a corridor of up to 70 metres width where a bus/rail transit station is proposed.</p>	<p>The station type has been amended to require a narrower footprint, which removes the impact on the campus road system.</p>
	<p>Preferred mode:</p>	
	<p>There is clearly a need to examine the integration of the existing University bus stop in the event of the bus option being adopted. However, the proposal has been interpreted as a dedicated corridor without transit facilities.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Vertical alignment:</p>	
	<p>The longitudinal section included in the report indicates a cut section of about 1.130 metres at the north end of the station and a fill section up to -4.301 metres toward the southern end of the station. This suggests a corridor vertical alignment with significant impact on the existing terrain.</p>	<p>The submission provided previously by the university has been considered in the alignment design and adhered to as much as possible. Further enhancements may be possible at the detailed design stage.</p>
	<p>It is also noted that the report claims the vertical alignment has already been lowered in response to University concerns regarding the visual impact. However the longitudinal section suggests little lowering of the alignment.</p>	<p>The submission provided previously by the university has been considered in the alignment design and adhered to as much as possible. Further enhancements may be possible at the detailed design stage.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Visual impact:</p> <p>In combination with land-fill up to 4 metres high there will be a bridge type structure crossing the golf course, all with aerial electrical cables and support infrastructure impeding the views.</p>	<p>The height of the bridge crossings is set by the Q100 level in the corresponding waterway.</p>
	<p>The Draft EIS acknowledges the high impact on the visual environment and recommends a further study by an expert in heritage sites on the impacts on the heritage-listed Challinor Site. This further work will highlight the concerns already expressed by the University regarding the visual amenity.</p> <p>Further study:</p> <p>The University understands that further detailed design will be necessary to determine the full extent of the impacts. Further design of a station to meet the criteria is set out in the Draft EIS will reveal the need to cross the tracks if the proposal involves a 2-track system. This will require either a walkway over the tracks or tunnel under.</p> <p>The topography of the golf course would suggest that a tunnel under the tracks should be investigated as a first option.</p>	<p>Understanding that the Environmental Impact Study is for corridor preservation purposes only, the development of a cultural heritage management plan at this stage is not deemed necessary. Further detailed investigation will be undertaken during the</p> <p>Station design and pedestrian connectivity will be addressed in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Station design and pedestrian connectivity will be addressed in the detailed design stage.</p>
	<p>Noise and vibration:</p> <p>The Draft EIS sets out general noise level impacts and design guidelines for acceptable noise limits to adjacent activities. Mitigating strategies are also proposed. The elevated corridor on high level fill and structures near the University do not meet the suggested mitigating strategy to lower the corridor into cut or tunnel.</p> <p>Noise and vibration levels can be critical to the performance of particular university teaching and research activities. Consultation with the University is essential to develop appropriate noise mitigation in the design of the transport corridor.</p> <p>It will also be important to define noise mitigation measures during any construction activity.</p>	<p>More detailed investigations and subsequent designs will follow in the business case and Environmental Impact Statement phase(s).</p> <p>Comment noted. Will be addressed in the recommended detailed noise assessment.</p> <p>Comment noted. Will be addressed in the recommended detailed noise assessment.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Security and crime prevention:</p>	
	<p>The introduction of a public transport corridor and station at the University will require appropriate levels of security and crime prevention to be provided by design.</p>	<p>Comment noted and is included in submission to the Department of Transport for their attention.</p>
	<p>The University will need to be consulted on these issues and operation issues relating to personal and property security.</p>	<p>This is a management issue and is to be addressed by Queensland Transport.</p>
	<p>Future University site development:</p>	
	<p>The University has illustrated future developments on the northern spur of our land that will be bisected by the corridor. These plans will need to be addressed in the design of the corridor.</p>	<p>This will be addressed in the detailed design stage, including resumption requirements that may arise.</p>
	<p>Selection of the bus option may lead to the University reviewing its bus stop location.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Possible disconnection of the circular ring road would impose re-direction of vehicle traffic via central parts of the Campus where there is a desire to minimise vehicle traffic in pedestrian areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Benefit: cost ratio analysis:</p>	
	<p>The analysis of Benefit: Cost in Section 5.11 appears to us to be quite inadequate.</p>	<p>Detailed benefit cost analysis will be carried out during the business case.</p>
	<p>The benefits are calculated using a very limited set of criteria. In the analysis, the only benefits calculated were user operator costs saved (presumably vehicle kilometres saved); savings in user times; saving in accident costs; and fare-box revenue. This seems to us to be quite a highly restricted set of criteria on which to assess the potential benefits of a proposed rail or bus corridor in this growing region of South-East Queensland.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Ipswich to Springfield PTC study is for that of corridor preservation, it is therefore not a detailed study. This study aims to identify any adverse impacts, potential mitigation measures and any areas that may need more detailed assessment. The outputs of the investigations therefore have a certain limitation and all the data that was available at the time was used in the benefit cost analysis.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>There is no analysis in the study of other benefits or externalities that would arise from the construction of the public transport corridor. For example, there is no analysis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ convenience for users in terms of an alternative mode of travel and commuting, and the consequent impact on lifestyle ▪ the impact of the public transport corridor on economic growth along the corridor ▪ the impact of this growth on property development, jobs creation, rate income for Councils etc ▪ the positive impact on property values in the region in general ▪ the relief which a public transport corridor would provide to the already-congested road system and attendant savings in road construction and maintenance ▪ the positive impact of a public transport corridor on access of users to services in Ipswich, Ripley, Springfield etc, particularly access to community services, education facilities, health services, shopping and other retail opportunities, and general community activities such as sport and recreation ▪ the potential for movement of light freight. 	<p>Externalities like the environmental and social benefits (such as reduced emissions and greenhouse gases, etc.) will be investigated as part of the business case. Section 14.4.2 Economic impacts, discuss issues such social connectivity benefits, deferred road investment, etc. in broad terms. The Ipswich to Springfield PTC is intended to carry passengers only.</p>
	<p>Given the proposed plans in place for Springfield and the Ripley Valley, and the potential for growth in West Ipswich (as part of the Ipswich Regional Centre redevelopment strategy), the report ignores how the public transport corridor would impact on these planned developments.</p>	<p>Section 12.3.3 has been amended to reference the latest version of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan. The Ipswich to Springfield PTC aims to provide quality public transport for these new communities.</p>
	<p>There also seems to be little account taken of the Ripley Valley Plan and the way in which that Plan proposed to incorporate potential public transport as part of the whole concept of living and working in Ripley.</p>	<p>Section 12.3.3 has been amended to reference the latest version of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan. Furthermore staging has been suggested in Section 5. However, more detailed staging will be determined during the detailed design phase.</p>
	<p>We argue that the Benefit: Cost Ratio that has been proposed in the report is far too low. We feel that it seriously underestimates the economic, social and community benefits of the proposed Public Transport Corridor, and needs re-analysis using a much wider set of criteria.</p>	<p>Detailed benefit cost analysis will be carried out during the business case. Section 14.4.2 Economic impacts, discuss issues such social connectivity benefits, deferred road investment, etc. in broad terms.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
Submission 11	<p>Location of corridor:</p> <p>This proposed line will service the future public in the Ripley Valley to Springfield area, not the established West Ipswich/Yamanto/Flinders View area, already serviced by public transport. The current residents will suffer the effects of a rail line built to benefit developers and to benefit future landowners who will have the choice of living next to a rail line or not, and live without the threat of home or business resumption.</p> <p><i>"Whilst some industry will occur in the area of the proposed Transport Corridor, the principal future industry growth area in the Ipswich region is Walloon, RAAF Amberley, the proposed Amberley Aerospace Project and the 'Inland Port' at Amberley"</i> The proposed rail line does not benefit any of these areas for freight or for access for employment.</p> <p>Newsletter 1 (October 2006) indicates the <i>'benefit of public transport to Brisbane in less than an hour'</i>, yet it headlines <i>'Connecting the western region of SEQ'</i>. It would appear areas west of Brisbane and Brisbane property, not the western area of SEQ, will be the beneficiary at the detriment to Ipswich residents.</p> <p>The narrow and blinkered view that the old railway easement of the previous Ipswich to Boonah Railway Line is the only way to connect Ipswich Central shows a short-sighted view taken by the assessors in determining the proposed routes. What about Wulkuraka, Karrabin or Walloon as exit points?</p> <p>Further studies needed:</p> <p>A completely comprehensive study to include the proposed and present industrial areas West of Ipswich needs to be conducted to give the Corridor Study credibility.</p>	<p>The future Ipswich to Springfield PTC will provide high quality public transport to residents in Ipswich and Springfield as well as the future development areas in the Ripley Valley.</p> <p>Significant population growth are experienced at present and planned for throughout SEQ. As such, several projects and studies are under way to address the various needs of the region. This study concentrates on the area between Ipswich and Springfield which will grow from approximately 135,000 to 318,000 people by 2026.</p> <p>The main aim of the Ipswich to Springfield PTC, the subject of this study, is to connect Ipswich with Springfield via the future communities in the Ripley Valley. At Springfield it will tie in with the Darra-Springfield rail (currently under construction). This enables the Ipswich to Springfield PTC to link centres such as Ipswich with centres further afield, e.g. Brisbane.</p> <p>The intentions of the Ipswich to Springfield PTC study are to address public transport needs between Ipswich and Springfield.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Visual impact:</p>	
	<p>The Ipswich Planning Scheme 2006 (4.3.2(0)) states "<i>An efficient, safe and attractive transport network is provided for a range of transport including motor vehicles, freight vehicles, public transport, pedestrians and cyclists.</i>" How a train line cutting through suburbia on pylons up to 7 metres high can be considered attractive is beyond me and surely not within the intent of the planning scheme.</p>	<p>The Ipswich to Springfield PTC aims to attract a high number of commuters by providing a high quality service that is fast, reliable and a true alternative to private cars - i.e. more attractive to commuters.</p>
	<p>Economic value:</p>	
	<p>All the businesses affected are growth businesses, contributing highly to local employment and to the local economy. The corridor will be a catalyst for future development and a retardation of existing development.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Also see Section 14.4.2.</p>
	<p>Community support:</p>	
	<p>The project does not have community support or stakeholder support (except from developers) due to business cessation, visual and noise pollution.</p>	<p>Comment noted and forwarded to Queensland Transport</p>
	<p>Functionality:</p>	
	<p>Poor standard of design, area is hilly with steep gradients.</p>	<p>Designs were done in accordance with current standards.</p>
	<p>Public transport is currently available in this area, would have finite patronage.</p>	<p>The Ipswich to Springfield PTC aims to provide high quality public transport for the growing population in Ipswich.</p>
	<p>Costs associated with corridor:</p>	
	<p>The high value of the industrial land needed to be acquired would make this option one of the more expensive.</p>	<p>The corridor alignments were determined during the previous phase (Review of Environmental Factors). A number of factors, e.g. patronage, environmental impacts, costs, etc. were considered during this process.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Environmental impacts:</p> <p>The strong possibility of acid sulfate soils along the Bremer River has not been fully investigated. The result of acid sulfate leaching into a stream has far reaching environmental consequences that have been fully documented - all flora and marine life will be destroyed.</p> <p>The disturbance of soil from the old soap factory on Lobb Street should also be of grave concern, with caustic soda, kerosene and tallow allowed to spill freely during manufacturing operations, water was pumped to and from lagoons along the Bremer River for many years.</p> <p>The statement that '<i>all impacts of the preferred corridor can be adequately be mitigated</i>' is misleading.</p>	<p>A full assessment will be carried out during the detailed design and Environmental Impact Statement stages. For purposes of corridor preservation the identification of this potential risk is highlighted so that further design includes mitigation strategies.</p> <p>Issue noted and will be taken into account during the development of the mitigation strategies and work plans of the Environmental Management Plan as part of the Environmental Impact Statement compiled prior to construction authorisation.</p> <p>This refers to the identification of potential fatal flaws. For purposes of corridor preservation, rigorous and extensive studies are not conducted. If it appears that identified impacts can be mitigated, the impact cannot be regarded as a fatal flaw.</p> <p>This conclusion has been adjusted to better conform with the direction of the rest of the report.</p>
	<p>That the potential of destroying 6 rare and threatened flora and 16 rare and threatened fauna species can be regarded as '<i>not a fatal flaw to the realisation of the project</i>' needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>Where the corridor passes through Koala Conservation Area it follows the alignment of the South West Transport Corridor to minimise impacts.</p>
	<p>Lifestyle impacts:</p> <p>A length of 2 kilometres of the Bremer River will be subject to massive earthworks and coupled with surface water and flooding poses a real danger to health.</p> <p>The construction and permanent operation of the proposed line will provide adverse visual and noise pollution that will affect all current and future residents on the opposite side of the river at Leichhardt and also the residents of Hall Street.</p>	<p>This was identified in the Environmental Impact Study as a priority issues that would require detailed planning during the construction phases.</p> <p>These impacts were noted in the Impact Study and would need to be brought into the detailed design stages of the corridor. Noise and visual mitigation measures would need to be implemented.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>General:</p>	
	<p>It appears that all sections of the study are individually assessed and classed as 'Free of fatal flaws'. However the cumulative impact of these flaws shows a real danger to the viability of the proposed project and seems to be ignored in any final summing up.</p>	<p>Cumulative impact assessing is the assessing of significant impacts in relation to one another experienced by different projects within a given area. The impacts identified during the study are not considered significant and can appropriately be mitigated, reducing any potential significance.</p>
	<p>Consultation and communication:</p>	
	<p>Despite putting in submissions and with our property fully impacted by the proposed corridor, no direct contact has been made to us or any invitation to any of the meetings forthcoming.</p>	<p>Comment has been noted and will be addressed by Queensland Transport</p>
	<p>Alternate route:</p>	
	<p>The line was able to be altered to meet the visual criteria of the University - why can't the same consideration be given to affected property owners when there is a viable alternative?</p>	<p>Due consideration has been given to the overall alignment of the corridor and the impacts on affected property owners.</p>
Submission 12	<p>The following corrections are required for accuracy:</p>	
	<p>Page 20 - Draft SPP for the Protection of Extractive Resources. "<i>The Department of Natural Resources and Water (NRW), through the Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation,...</i>" change to " The Department of Mines and Energy, through the Department of Local Government, Planning Sport and Recreation,..."</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Page 23 - 3.2.4 Approvals matrix: approvals, permits and licences Table 3-4. Change "<i>Petroleum Act 1923</i>" to "<i>Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004</i>. Reason being - pipeline licences are now under the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2005 (pipeline licences under the 1923 Act transitioned to the 2004 Act).</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Page 23 - 3.2.4 Approvals matrix: approvals, permits and licences Table 3-4. Left column: "<i>Permit/approval/licence required. Notice of work affecting pipelines.</i>" Change to "Pipeline licence holder consent required.</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Page 23 - 3.2.4 Approvals matrix: approvals, permits and licences Table 3-4. Centre column: "<i>Description. A notice of work will be required in the development impacts on gas pipelines.</i>" Change: "Refer sections 807 and 808 Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 (restriction on building on or changing the surface of pipeline land for a pipeline licence).</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Please note that the proposed transport corridor transects PPL 1 which is a petroleum pipeline (Moonie-Brisbane Oil Pipeline).</p>	<p>This is discussed in section 12.4.9 Overlay maps re. Overlay Map 11 - High Pressure oil and gas pipeline. Also Fig 12.8 references the high pressure oil pipeline.</p>
Submission 13	<p>Page 23 - 3.2.4 Approvals matrix: approvals, permits and licences Table 3-4. Right column: "<i>Responsible authority. Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Water</i>" Change to "Department of Mines and Energy". Reason being - the Department of Mines and Energy administers the Petroleum Act 1923 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004.</p> <p>Overall:</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>It is imperative that once the corridor alignment is finalised, processes and systems are put in place to ensure the preferred corridor is preserved.</p>	<p>Statement incorporated into section 12.6 Conclusion of the Land use chapter.</p>
	<p>It is particularly important that triggers are put in place as part of the Integrated Development Assessment System (IDAS) to ensure Queensland Transport and/or TransLink become concurrence agencies when assessing development applications received by Council in the vicinity of the final corridor alignment.</p>	<p>Slightly reworded statement included in 12.5 Opportunities and Constraints (with reference made to the IDAS process in Chapter 3). It was not included in Chapter 3 because it is not strictly an approval, but rather a means to protect the corridor from incompatible land uses.</p>
	<p>Delivery timing:</p> <p>The construction of the Ipswich to Springfield Public Transport Corridor should be included in a future revision of the South-East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program (SEQIPP).</p>	<p>The Ipswich to Springfield PTC has been included in previous versions of SEQIPP. Construction timing is yet to be decided.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>It is important that the delivery of a line haul public transport facility between the Ipswich City Centre and Ripley be undertaken in the medium term (5 to 10 years) to ensure sustainable travel patterns for future residents and commuters in the Ripley Valley are achieved, and align with the objectives of the South East Queensland Regional Plan of infrastructure leading development.</p>	<p>Construction timing is yet to be decided, however staging options (which could potentially include the provision of public transport between the Ripley Valley and Ipswich) for the implementation of the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been suggested in Section 5.9.</p>
	<p>Impacts on the proposed 'Redbank Plains Distributor':</p>	
	<p>Between chainages 22200 and 24700, the alignment of the corridor outlined in the draft EIS is different to the alignment outlined in the Review of Environmental Factors (REF) stage of the study.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>
	<p>Although the reasons behind this alignment modification are understood (interface issues with the Darra to Springfield railway line and to reduce the tunnel length to save costs), Council must again shift the alignment of proposed 'Redbank Plains Distributor' Road (planned east-west sub-arterial road linking Augusta Parkway with School Road and Swanbank Enterprise Park) further to the north. In turn, this impacts on a further 34 lots of the approved Augustine Heights Estate. Council has already accommodated the public transport corridor as part of the planning for the Redbank Plains Distributor with both the developer and Council accepting the need to impact on some of the Augustine Heights Estate. However, further impacts on this estate are unsustainable from both the developer's perspective as well as the potential compensation issues Council will need to address when dealing with the construction of the Redbank Plains Distributor.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>
	<p>The design speed along this section of the corridor should be reduced to allow the alignment of the Redbank Plains Distributor to remain generally in accordance with Council's planning and thus minimise further impacts on the Augustine Heights Estate.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Noise and visual impacts:</p>	
	<p>Noise impacts on sensitive receptors such as West Ipswich State School have not been assessed in the Draft EIS no have remediation/amelioration strategies been proposed. The fact that noise modelling has not been undertaken as part of the Draft EIS process compromises the robustness of the Ipswich to Springfield Public Transport Study.</p>	<p>The level of noise assessment undertaken is suitable for corridor preservation purposes only. Noise modelling to be undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Statement prior to construction.</p>
	<p>It is requested that consideration be given to undertaking noise modelling of the corridor (either as part of the study or as a separate process) and that noise strategies be put in place to inform the urban planning process in the southern suburbs of Ipswich, particularly in growth areas such as Redbank Plains and Ripley.</p>	<p>The level of noise assessment undertaken is suitable for corridor preservation purposes only. Noise modelling to be undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Statement prior to construction.</p>
	<p>Where the public transport corridor is on structure, attention should be given to ameliorating the visual and noise impacts. Specific attention should be given to ensuring that where the corridor is elevated, the design of the structure minimises visual impacts to adjoining residential areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Will be addressed in the recommended detailed noise assessment.</p>
	<p>Preferred mode:</p>	
	<p>It is disappointing that the Draft EIS has not recommended a preferred mode. However, the proposition that rail will have a greater influence in achieving a sustainable community outcome than a busway is supported.</p>	<p>The Ipswich to Springfield PTC study is for corridor preservation purposes only. Mode will be determined during the business case.</p>
	<p>Corridor width:</p>	
	<p>Large sections of the proposed corridor appear to have excessive widths. Some sections range in width from 70 to 120 metres. This does not compare favourably with the main suburban rail corridor from Ipswich to Goodna which includes areas of steep cut within an overall corridor of 20 to 50 metres (excluding stations).</p>	<p>The corridor widths have been rationalised and reduced where practical.</p>
	<p>Concern is expressed that the additional widths proposed within the design of the Ipswich to Springfield corridor may be the result of excessive design speeds and conservative construction methods.</p>	<p>The design speeds chosen for the design are in accordance with the requirements of Queensland Rail.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Extensive corridor widths, such as those proposed, will have detrimental impacts on overall urban design/build form and community severance throughout the affected areas.</p> <p>The width of the corridor in urban areas must be limited to ensure connectivity and to avoid severance of current and future urban areas. The Brisbane to Ipswich rail line generally requires a corridor no more than 25 metres wide.</p>	<p>The corridor widths have been rationalised and reduced where practical.</p> <p>The corridor widths have been rationalised and reduced where practical.</p>
	<p>References to Ripley Valley Structure Plan:</p> <p>The Draft EIS should be updated to reflect the proposed land use outcomes contained in the draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan (Section 12.3.3, Figure 12-3 and Section 12.4.1).</p> <p>Section 12.5 - Opportunities and Constraints - needs to be updated to reflect the opportunities created by the Ripley Valley Structure Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that the TOD surrounding the Ripley North Station (Secondary Urban Centre West) has not been identified. Figure's 16-23, 16-29, 16-35 depict the incorrect land use pattern for the Ripley Valley.</p> <p>The section '<i>Assumptions, Principles and Standards</i>' should reflect the outcomes contained in the Ripley Valley Structure Plan, specifically reference should be made to Traditional Neighbourhood Design (TND).</p> <p>It is also noted that a stabling area has been proposed between the Deebing Creek Station and the Ripley North Station. It is considered that given the intent to develop these areas as TODs the location of the stabling yard is not the highest and best use of the land.</p>	<p>Reworded section 12.3.3 and 12.4.1 to reflect the draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan. Figure 12.3 also amended to reflect the draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan. LUCMP is still discussed in section 12.4.1(no change)</p> <p>Reworded section 12.5 to included reference to the draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan.</p> <p>These figures are from the latest Ipswich Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Section 12.3.3 has been amended to reference the latest version of the Draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan, which includes a brief discussion of these planning principles.</p> <p>Queensland Transport and TransLink have advised that they do not require stabling along the preferred corridor.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Other land use planning:</p>	
	<p>Section 12.4.8 - It should be noted that the master developer of Springfield is undertaking a growth management plan to increase residential densities around the proposed Springfield town centre and rail station. The Springfield densification project needs to be acknowledged in the Draft EIS.</p>	<p>No change made - this section is discussing the Ipswich Planning Scheme's provisions. This section of the Ipswich Planning Scheme does not include a growth management plan or reference to the Springfield densification project. These documents cannot be found.</p>
	<p>Council, in partnership with the State Government, is currently undertaking the 'Ipswich Regional Centres Strategy'. Opportunities exist as part of the development of this strategy to provide increased residential densities and other mixed-use land use outcomes for the West Ipswich area. As such, the opportunity to locate a passenger station near Keogh Street at West Ipswich needs to be given further consideration.</p>	<p>This document is currently being prepared and is not expected to be released until late December 2007. Unable to make any amendments at this stage.</p>
	<p>Section 16.3.9 - It should be noted that the Ipswich Planning Scheme has been amended to support an 'urban village' land use pattern around the proposed School Road station, including medium density housing and a local activity centre.</p>	<p>Station function and land use chapter (Section 16.3.8 -School Road station) updated.</p>
	<p>Public utilities:</p>	
	<p>Section 5.6 and 5.7 of the Draft EIS need to make reference to local road network planning and in particular the 'Redbank Plains Distributor' and 'Kerners Road Deviation'.</p>	<p>This has been amended accordingly.</p>
	<p>Cross movements:</p>	
	<p>Where the corridor passes over riparian corridors allowance needs to be given to fauna, pedestrian and cycle movements which traverse the corridor. In some instances traffic movements (e.g. along Bundamba Creek), will also be required. As a consequence bridges are preferred to culverts and embankments.</p>	<p>Bridges are proposed for all major waterway crossings.</p>
	<p>Flooding:</p> <p>It is important that all river and creek crossings are designed to ensure that there are no significant flooding impacts. The revised flood planning for Bundamba Creek has been completed.</p>	<p>Detailed hydraulic design has not been carried out for this level of planning. However, the waterway areas chosen should not lead to significant flooding impacts.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>The requirement that the vertical alignment of the corridor be a minimum of 1.2 metres above the Q100 flood line is not supported. Standard building practice requires a height of 250mm above Q100.</p>	<p>Queensland Rail requirements for immunity have recently been revised to be 0.6 m above the Q100 flood line. This is greater than the standard building immunity.</p>
	<p>Urban design, landscape and visual:</p>	
	<p>Further work is required to reinforce the need for quality urban outcomes - Access roads parallel to the transport corridor to provide acoustic separation whilst allowing development to front the corridor (i.e. 'esplanade' roads or railway terraces) and to avoid graffiti attacks at the rear of premises fronting the line.</p>	<p>To be considered during detailed design phase.</p>
	<p>Section 13.7.2 - Screening - the intent where possible to screen with planted buffers is generally supported, However, the report has not given due recognition to the urbanisation of many of the areas where the corridor passes through. Amelioration of negative impacts in those urban environments are often best achieved through built form and land use not wide buffers or vegetated mounds.</p>	<p>The fact that some impacts will occur is definite. The timing of urbanisation and the timing of construction are unknown at this stage. Once the Ipswich to Springfield PTC enters the detailed design phase in preparation for construction, an Environmental Impact Statement will be undertaken to assess all relevant sensitive receptors that are current at that time. Mitigation measures can only be developed during this phase.</p>
	<p>Cultural Heritage and Native Title:</p>	
	<p>Page 216 - The wrong zone is referenced. The zone is 'Character Housing Mixed Density'.</p>	<p>Zoning reference amended to reflect "Character Zoning Mixed Density"</p>
	<p>Efforts should be made to relocate any intact historic (i.e. pre World War Two) buildings within the local area and to avoid demolition of these structures.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been included in section 15.4</p>
	<p>It is considered that the 'Character Listed' building located at 341 Brisbane Streets, West Ipswich (Lot 1 RP 23740) should be relocated as close as possible to the site and restored as far as possible to retain and enhance the original streetscape presence and overall setting. If the relocation of the building to a site in the immediate area is unable to be achieved, then the building should be relocated to a 'Character Zone' outlined in the Ipswich Planning Scheme and oriented and restored as far as possible to retain and enhance the original streetscape presence and overall setting.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been included in section 15.4</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Station functions:</p>	
	<p>Table 16-2 indicates Ripley North as a 'standard' station. Ripley North should be a 'key' station reflecting its designation as a 'Secondary Urban Centre' in the draft Ripley Valley Structure Plan.</p>	<p>This has been amended accordingly.</p>
	<p>It is considered that 600 car parking spaces north and south of the proposed Ripley North Station, in close proximity to the station, will defeat the intent of the TOD and potentially dislocate the Secondary Urban Centre (West) from the station.</p>	<p>This has been amended accordingly.</p>
	<p>It is critical to reduce the number of car parking spaces to a minimum and construct a 'kiss and ride' area to supplement TOD functionality.</p>	<p>This has been amended accordingly. Detailed design to investigate this further.</p>
	<p>Page 249 - Berry Street may have potential for TOD attributes dependent on the outcomes of the Yamanto Local Area Planning exercise.</p>	<p>Comment added to Section 16.3.2.</p>
Submission 14	<p>Watercourses, springs and lakes:</p>	
	<p>Chapter 8 does not address the use of water in the construction phase for dust suppression, watering vegetation, water filled barriers, truck wash down and cleaning of equipment. NRW recommends that the EIS identify the type and class of water (surface water, recycled or bore water) which will be used for such purposes.</p>	<p>This will be done in the detailed design phase and form part of the Environmental Impact Statement.</p>
	<p>NRW further recommend that the EIS include a water efficiency management plan for this phase so that water, which is scarce supply in south east Queensland, is used in the most efficient way possible.</p>	<p>Comment noted and is to be included as an Environmental Management Plan action. The compilation of a detailed water efficiency plan for purposes of project implementation is an excellent strategy. However, due to the changing environment and the fact that the construction date is unknown and considering that the current study is for corridor preservation only, the detail pertaining to a water efficiency plan developed under current conditions will not be relevant to the receiving environment within a few years.</p>
	<p>It is also noted that groundwater is located very close to the surface and the potential use of recycled water should not impact on the groundwater. There is a need to be aware of this and for the EIS to ensure that there are adequate programs to monitor groundwater usage to limit possible contamination.</p>	<p>Comment noted and is to be included as an Environmental Management Plan action.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>NRW also advises that parts of the public transport corridor are in the Bremer River catchment and subject to flooding. Accordingly, the storage of any untreated recycled water should not be in open ponds or allowed to run into any sedimentation ponds.</p> <p>Any use of untreated recycled water for dust suppression should not be allowed to run off or pond. NRW suggests that the use of the recycled water should be identified in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and that the plan specify that not recycled water be directed to sedimentation ponds.</p>	<p>Comment noted and is to be included as an Environmental Management Plan action.</p>
	<p>NRW recommends that the use of untreated recycled water be identified in Chapter 19 - Environmental Management Plan - as being used on site. In particular, it is suggested that specific reference to the on site use of recycled water be included in Chapter 19.4.4 - Air Quality - in relation to dust suppression, Chapter 19.4.6 - Hydrology ... - in relation to no adverse impacts on water ways and water quality, and in Chapter 19.4.8 - Erosion, sediment control... - in relation to no adverse impacts on groundwater, erosion and sedimentation control.</p>	<p>Comment noted and is to be included as an Environmental Management Plan action.</p>
	<p>Impacts on 'not of concern' remnant vegetation:</p> <p>For the purposes of certainty and clarity, NRW recommends amending the EIS glossary (p. xvi) to define 'remnant vegetation' as '...Native vegetation remaining after clearing has taken place and includes areas mapped as remnant 'Endangered', 'Of Concern' and 'Not of Concern' vegetation (based upon the latest version of certified regional ecosystem mapping.'</p>	<p>NRW suggestions agreed with and changed accordingly.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>The EIS, when referring to impacts on remnant vegetation, focuses on areas mapped as 'Endangered' and 'Of Concern' but is largely silent on the impacts on 'Not of Concern' remnant vegetation. Furthermore, in commentary relating to significant remnant vegetation (p. xxviii) and the requirements of the Vegetation Management Act 1999 (p. 17) there is no reference to 'Not of Concern' remnant vegetation. NRW seeks that impacts on remnant 'Not of Concern' vegetation also be addressed in the EIS. This included the EIS identifying the aerial extend and ensuring there are mitigation strategies targeting all remnant vegetation.</p>	<p>During the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), potential environmental fatal flaw issues were investigated to determine their relevance. 'Endangered' and 'Of Concern' remnant vegetation is regarded as the most likely to contain flora and fauna species of significant conservation value. By virtue of the widely occurring species found within 'Not of Concern' remnant vegetation, this category was not considered as potentially containing significant environmental value (it does however not preclude this and will be further investigated during the Environmental Impact Statement process. This study will only contribute towards corridor preservation and no environmental approval is being sought. Prior to construction, a formal Environmental Impact Statement will need to be undertaken to address all environmental impacts and the mitigation of each, including the impacts associated with 'Not of Concern' vegetation.</p>
	<p>Chapter 3.2.2 - State Law - provides an overview of legislation relevant to the project. NRW advises that any clearing of remnant vegetation for the rail corridor will require a permit under the provisions of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 and the Vegetation Management Act 1999. In addition, a clearing permit will be required if clearing of non remnant vegetation is proposed on trust land, leasehold land, state land and road reserves.</p>	<p>This point was previously mentioned within the Table 3-4 for Approvals, permits and licences that may be associated with the preferred corridor. It has been further adjusted with the NRW suggestions.</p>
	<p>NRW recommends that the EIS note that clearing applications will need to demonstrate how the application meets the performance requirements of the Regional Vegetation Management Code.</p> <p>State land tenure - resumptions:</p>	<p>NRW suggestions agreed with and changed accordingly within section 11.2.1 within the 'EPA Regional ecosystem mapping'.</p>
	<p>NRW notes that there will be requirements for Main Roads to acquire State Land. The preferred public transport corridor traverses part of Lot 108 on CC3191. NRW notes that the effect of this resumption wis to split the property into two. The NRW requests that Main Roads resume the whole property rather than part of the parcel as the residual parcel is unlikely to be economically viable.</p>	<p>Land acquisition issues including compensation will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the proponent in accordance with state legislation and current policy.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Acid sulfate soils and good quality agricultural land:</p> <p>Chapter 4.2.1.3 already refers to carrying out sediment control works in accordance with the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control - Engineering Guidelines for Queensland - Construction Sites (1996). However, it is suggested that the following policies and guidelines are relevant to acid sulfate soil management and should also be referenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SPP 2/02: Planning and Managing Development Involving Acid Sulfate Soils ▪ State Planning Policy 2/02 Guideline ▪ Guidelines for Sampling and Analysis of Lowland Acid Sulfate Soils in Queensland 1998 ▪ Acid Sulfate Soils Laboratory Methods Guidelines in the Queensland Acid Sulfate Soils Technical Manual. Ahern CR, McEInea AE and Sullivan LA (2004) ▪ Soil Management Guidelines in the Queensland Acid Sulfate Soils Technical Manual. Dear SE, Moore NG, Dobos SK, Watling KM and Ahern CR (2003) <p>Legislation and Policy Guide in the Queensland Acid Sulfate Soils Technical Manual. Dear SE, Moore NG, Watling KM, Fahl D and Dobos SK (2004)</p>	<p>Comment noted and included.</p>
	<p>NRW seeks that the EIS adopt consistent spelling for 'sulfate' when referring to ASS. In some places it is correctly spelt at 'sulfate' while in other places (most notably in the Work Plan - Chapter 19.4.8) it is spelt as 'sulphate'.</p>	
	<p>NRW notes that the preferred corridor does not traverse any Class A or Class B good quality agricultural land. As such SPP 1/92: Development and Conservation of Agricultural Land does not apply.</p>	<p>Comment noted and changes made accordingly.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Landscape salinisation:</p> <p>To avoid problems associated with salinisation, NRW recommend that the EIS identify that investigations will be carried out to assess the impacts that the Ipswich - Springfield public transport corridor may have during and following construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>There is the need to thoroughly address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) detailed soil/regolith variation along the proposed route (1:10000 - 1:25000 scale) b) quantify salt loads in soil landscapes recognised along the proposed route c) locate, map and quantify the presence of shallow groundwater in soil landscapes along the proposed route (particularly salt characteristics and loads) d) determine the potential effects and consequences associated with changes to shallow groundwater hydrology as a result of the significant cut and fill construction proposed along the corridor e) assess the salinity risk for infrastructure construction along the proposed route and design structures accordingly. <p>Potential soil instability and erosion hazard:</p> <p>The potentially fine grained nature and sub-labile to labile characteristics of most of the sedimentary litho Logies along the public transport corridor route suggest fine sand and silt fractions are likely to be elevated in both surface soil and subsoil materials increasing inherent erodibility. In addition, subsoil materials formed from many of the Jurassic sedimentary rocks in the area may be sodic to strongly sodic making them inherently dispersive and at increased risk of significant rill, gully and tunnel behaviour following exposure and disturbance.</p> <p>To avoid problems associated with potential soil erosion and erosion hazard, NRW recommends that the EIS identify that investigations will be carried out to ameliorate for potential soil erosion and excessive sediment transfer due to the fragile nature of the sedimentary lithologies along the route during and following construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This item is not included in the scope of works for purposes of corridor preservation. It will however be required in the eventual Environmental Impact Statement that will be prepared for the route. If these are to be addressed at this stage, they would need to be dealt with as an order variation.</p>
	<p>Potential soil instability and erosion hazard:</p> <p>The potentially fine grained nature and sub-labile to labile characteristics of most of the sedimentary litho Logies along the public transport corridor route suggest fine sand and silt fractions are likely to be elevated in both surface soil and subsoil materials increasing inherent erodibility. In addition, subsoil materials formed from many of the Jurassic sedimentary rocks in the area may be sodic to strongly sodic making them inherently dispersive and at increased risk of significant rill, gully and tunnel behaviour following exposure and disturbance.</p> <p>To avoid problems associated with potential soil erosion and erosion hazard, NRW recommends that the EIS identify that investigations will be carried out to ameliorate for potential soil erosion and excessive sediment transfer due to the fragile nature of the sedimentary lithologies along the route during and following construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted - The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would need to address this prior to the construction activities commencing.</p>
	<p>To avoid problems associated with potential soil erosion and erosion hazard, NRW recommends that the EIS identify that investigations will be carried out to ameliorate for potential soil erosion and excessive sediment transfer due to the fragile nature of the sedimentary lithologies along the route during and following construction.</p>	<p>Comment will be taken up in the detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that is an EMP requirement.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>There is the need to address thoroughly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) detailed soil/regolith variation along the proposed route (1:10000 - 1:25000 scale) b) comprehensive sampling to measure subsoil chemistry, particle size analyses, dispersion and appropriate geotech analyses (e.g. shrink - swell) to quantify soil instability and dispersive behaviour for identified soil units along the route. c) describe in detail proposed design and amelioration strategies to overcome soil instability, slumping behaviour and tunnelling on final cut surfaces and constructed fill better. Management and design recommendations need to consider more than just traditional geotech parameters and will need to take into account potential dispersive soil behaviour and appropriate stabilisation and management techniques. <p>Aboriginal cultural heritage and native title:</p>	<p>Comment noted. These are tasks for inclusion during the compilation of the Environmental Impact Statement and detailed design stages of the project. The level of detail required for corridor preservation does not consider such detail. These items do however need to be included in the next phase of the project.</p>
	<p>The implementation strategy for Cultural Heritage (Chapter 19.4.9) states that the Environmental Protection Agency should be notified if surface or buried material or artefacts are discovered. However, in relation to Aboriginal cultural heritage it is suggested that the Cultural Heritage Unit of the NRW also be contacted. Under section 23 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003, a person who carries out an activity must take all reasonable and practicable measures to ensure the activity does not harm Aboriginal cultural heritage (the "cultural heritage duty of care") Native title must be addressed for the project in accordance with the Commonwealth Native Title Act 1993 (NTA). It is the responsibility of the relevant State Government department or agency before granting any approval required for the project to appropriately address native title in accordance with the State Government Native Title Work Procedures which are based upon the NTA.</p>	<p>Reference to the EPA has been replaced with NRW in the implementation strategy.</p>
Submission 15	<p>Corridor width:</p> <p>Heavy Rail Design Criteria Section 5.5.1 (p. 40) - Formation Criteria for alternative corridor width to be determined and stated depending on amount of cut required, retaining wall alternatives and whether cut and cover will be implemented.</p>	<p>The concept design produced for this study is appropriate for corridor preservation purposes. This will be further refined during the detailed design phase.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>The corridor width will ultimately affect development yield of adjoining land, and should be minimised where possible, particularly near retail and residential precincts to facilitate greater utilisation of land within close proximity to public transport.</p>	<p>The corridor widths have been rationalised and reduced where practical.</p>
	<p>Preferred mode of transport:</p>	
	<p>Bus Rapid Transit Design Criteria Section 5.5.2 To adequately assess bus as an alternative to rail, greater consideration should be given and specified for the design criteria for the bus corridors, rather than adapting to the rail corridors, as vertical and horizontal alignments are less restrictive for buses.</p>	<p>The purpose of this study is corridor preservation. A reference mode of heavy rail was chosen, as this has the most constraining geometric requirements. A vertical design for the busway has been developed using the corridor determined by the heavy rail design criteria.</p>
	<p>Kerners Road extension:</p>	
	<p>Section 5.6.1 A development application has been lodged with ICC for the Yamanto Shopping Centre. The Centre will gain access to Kerners Road via a newly created road corridor approved by ICC in April 2006. The proposed rail corridor may alter the previously agreed vehicle access arrangements for the Shopping Centre. QT as a concurrence agency to the development application will need to be involved in the design process.</p>	<p>QT is in discussions with Ipswich City Council and the developer of the shopping centre on this matter.</p>
	<p>Benefit Cost Analysis:</p>	
	<p>Section 5.11 It would be beneficial to include a comparison of the BCRs with existing operating rail/bus corridors. Existing services in SEQ may be subsidised by the State, and therefore an assessment would need to consider that amounts of subsidy needed.</p>	<p>Detailed BCA will be carried out during the business case.</p>
	<p>Note that BCRs should be used with caution as 'benefit' may not be clearly determined or measured in terms of environmental and social benefits.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Noise:</p>	
	<p>Construction and Operational Noise Assessment Section 10.6 - 10.7 While the draft EIS identifies possible noise mitigation strategies for construction and operational phases, impacts also need to be considered in terms of who is responsible for implementing the measures.</p>	<p>The proponent is responsible for implementing noise mitigation.</p>
	<p>It is assumed that QT and its contractors will be responsible for construction mitigation.</p>	<p>The proponent is responsible for implementing noise mitigation.</p>
	<p>For ongoing operational noise impacts, the mitigation strategies and responsibilities need to be identified for existing and future receptors. In the past responsibility has been placed on land owners and developers to incorporate noise attenuation measures (often involving costly acoustic assessments) as part of the development approval process. This approach is unreasonable given QT is providing the source of the noise. Clear frameworks need to be established to identify which operational noise attenuation measures will be the responsibility of QT and landowners/developers. The EIS should state that the responsibility ultimately rests with QT, and flag these issues for further refinement.</p>	<p>Mitigation of existing properties will be the responsibility of proponent. Once the project is approved, any new developments would be responsible for their own noise mitigation.</p>
	<p>Work Plan for Noise and Vibration Section 19.4.3 The EIS Work Plan should state that the responsibility for attenuation in terms of existing and future receptors lies with the Government.</p>	<p>The proponent is responsible for implementing noise mitigation.</p>
	<p>Urban design, landscaping and visual:</p>	
	<p>Section 13 The EIS should supply the responsible entity for screening either within or adjoining corridors. Such treatments may be incorporated into development codes within the Planning Scheme.</p>	<p>As above, once the corridor enters the detailed phase of design and the Environmental Impact Statement is prepared, these concerns will be addressed.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Environmental:</p>	
	<p>Environmental Management Plan - Work Plan for Land use Planning, Social and Economic Section 19.4.1 Agree that opportunities to encourage TODs should be explored with ICC, as well as key landowners within walking distance of railway stations. The EIS Work Plan should state that this consultation is envisaged at a high level master planning stage and during the development assessment process.</p>	<p>Comment included in chapter.</p>
Submission 16	<p>Suggested solutions/outcomes sought:</p>	
	<p>Section 3.1 (p. 8) "<i>Therefore, planning approval will be required</i>". Suggestion: delete and replace with "Therefore, development approvals will be required".</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Section 3.1.1 (p. 8) "...all development is assumed to be non-assessable...". Suggestion: add "(i.e. exempt)" after "non-assessable".</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Section 3.1.1 (p. 9) "...whether development of the preferred corridor will constitute assessable or exempt development...". Suggestion: delete and replace with "the required level of assessment for the preferred corridor".</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Section 3.1.1 (p. 9) "<i>Code assessable development...code assessable</i>". This paragraph is not fully reflective of the provisions of the IPA in regard to code assessable development. Suggestion: reword this paragraph to ensure it is consistent with section 3.5.13 of the IPA.</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Section 3.1.1 (p. 9) The discussion of the four stages of IDAS should be improved. Please refer to IDAS Implementation Note 1 at http://www.ipa.qld.gov.au/idas/idasNotes.asp for assistance. Suggestion: in particular, Section 2.0 of this implementation note should be reviewed and the text amended accordingly to accurately reflect the four stages of the IDAS process. It would be helpful if the EIS included a link to the Implementation Note on the IPA website: http://www.ipa.qld.gov.au/idas/idasNotes.asp.</p>	<p>Wording amended and expanded based on IDAS Imp Note 1.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	Text should include a reference to section 3.5.5 of the IPA which details the process to be followed in assessing an impact assessable development application.	
	Section 3.1.1 (p. 9) "...the IDAS process involves three stages". Suggestion: delete 'three', replace with 'four'.	Wording amended.
	Section 3.1.1 (p. 9) Stage 3. "This stage is only relevant if the proposed development is impact assessable". This repeats the preamble to the listing of the stages. Suggestion: delete.	Amended and reworded section 3.1.1.1.
	Section 3.1.2.2. Public benefit (p. 11) "The Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor easily satisfies the test of public benefit". The basis on which this opinion is unclear and needs to be substantiated in the EIS, and within the context of the legislation. Suggestion: For instance if the public benefit test is considered to be met through item (d) Satisfy the community's expectations for the efficient and timely supply of infrastructure, the document should outline: - what community expectations are - how these expectations have been identified - how the proposed development will satisfy these expectations.	Amended and reworded. More reference made to planning docs (SEQRP, SEQIPP etc) that support the public benefit of the PTC. Also reference to workshops in particular Ebd workshops (which involved various stakeholders including the community).
	Section 3.1.2 (p. 11) "Because the Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor satisfies both tests, it is envisaged that it would be eligible to qualify for designation as community infrastructure under the IPA". This sentence is premature given that: - it has not been adequately established that the corridor does satisfy both tests - any designation of land for community infrastructure must undergo a Ministerial designation process. Suggestion: delete this sentence.	This sentence was deleted.

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Section 3.1.2 (p.11) This section needs to more fully articulate the nature of the Ministerial designation process. Community Infrastructure Designation Guidelines are not provided in section 5.9.9 of the IPA, section 5.9.9 provides direction on the chief executives' ability to issue guidelines in general. Suggestion: This section needs to be enhanced to accurately reflect the community infrastructure designation process. Information on this process can be found on the IPA website and via Community Infrastructure Implementation Note 1.</p>	<p>Reworded and expanded based on Community Infrastructure Implementation Note 1, as well as IPA.</p>
	<p>Section 3.1.4 (p.12) "<i>Section 108 does not prescribe a mandatory environmental assessment process...</i>" While this is true, it appears the reference to Section 108 of the SDPWOA may be incorrect as Section 108 does not refer to environmental assessment in any sense. Suggestion: Check and amend reference if necessary.</p>	<p>Deleted reference to s108 which was not relevant. Changed to the SDPWO Act, which is a more correct statement.</p>
	<p>Section 3.1.4 "...<i>exempt under Schedule 9 of IPA...</i>" It would be helpful to the reader to know the exact manner in which the provisions of Schedule 9 are being applied. Suggestion: Identify and document the appropriate table under Schedule 9 of IPA and any subsequent steps in the exemption process.</p>	<p>Included reference to the table and item # relevant in Schedule 9 of IPA.</p>
	<p>table 3-2 IDAS, Actions (p.14) "<i>Lodgement of impact assessable application with Local Council</i>". Suggestion: Insert 'development' between 'assessable' and 'application'.</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>table 3-2 Authorised Works, Legislation. All legislation under which is relevant should be listed. Suggestion: Add 'Integrated Planning Act 1997' as this is the legislation under which exception from a planning scheme is gained.</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Section 3.2.3 (p. 18) "<i>Draft SPP for the Protection of Extractive Resources</i>" SPP 2/07 Protection of Extractive Resources was adopted on June 8 2007 and will commence on 3 September 2007. Suggestion: amend accordingly.</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
	<p>Section 3.2.3 SPP 1/07 Housing and Residential Development is missing from the discussion of SPPs. Suggestion: Include this SPP in the list.</p>	<p>Included a brief outline on this SPP although only in very general terms. It applies only to the preparation and amendment of planning schemes i.e. not DA and not CID.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Table 3-4 (p.22) "<i>Development not associated with infrastructure designation may require ...</i>" Suggestion: delete and replace with "Development which is not exempt development may require..."</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p>
Submission 17	<p>Impact on properties/plans for properties: The recent advices of QT indicate that an even larger quantity of land will be required for the Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor, if adopted, the alignment further reduces the net developable area of the Augustine Heights residential development. Due to the uncertainty created by the Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor, we have been unable to progress development of our residential properties. Preliminary layouts have been derived from previous advices however have been forced on hold for several months pending confirmation from QT and ICC.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF. The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>
	<p>Horizontal alignment: The proposed horizontal alignment of the Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor incorporated exceptionally large curve radii along the section of road adjoining the Augustine Heights development. We request that QT reconsider this proposal and utilise smaller horizontal curve radii. We acknowledge that this may require a slight reduction in the current 120km/hr speed zone designation however expect the impact upon overall time travel to be minimal. The suggested smaller curve radii would be consistent with those currently proposed further along the corridor from South Riley to Yamanto and again from One Mile to West Ipswich.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>
	<p>Financial feasibility: It is out understanding that the land immediately south of the approved Augustine Heights residential development is not approved for development. As such resumption of the land south of the approved Augustine Heights development is likely to attract a lesser compensation value and improve the financial feasibilities of the Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Alternative location:</p>	
	<p>We urge QT to realign the Ipswich to Springfield public transport corridor further south to minimise the impact upon our land holdings and the approved Augustine Heights residential development.</p>	<p>The corridor has been amended to more closely reflect the alignment shown in the REF.</p>
	<p>Impact on properties/plans for properties:</p>	
Submission 18	<p>Acoustic and visual aesthetics:</p>	
	<p>There is an obligation to the future community to provide infrastructure that doesn't blight the horizon in a ludicrous and hideous manner i.e. a rail structure 12 to 16 metres above natural ground level.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area.</p>
	<p>We believe that the design concepts currently presented create an unacceptable level of acoustic and visual intrusion in what is prime development land.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>With a rail line 10.5 to 12.3 metres above natural ground level, for most of the distance between Deebing Creek and SDCR, and with the addition of 3 metres for a train and another metre for angries for the power to run the trains, the current plans create a visual intrusion and an exacerbated level of acoustic intrusion.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Will be addressed in the recommended detailed noise assessment.</p>
	<p>From the annexed longitudinal section for the Centenary Highway extension it can be seen that the levels are around 4 to 5 metres above natural ground level. We believe that heights within or close to that range can be achieved with a reconfiguration of line grades within the parameters set for a track with a speed rating of 120kph and by the relocation of the station and a reconfiguration of the SDCR/SWTC interchange.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area.</p>
	<p>Future upgrades:</p>	
	<p>Integration of the road and rail corridors should involve providing for any foreseeable upgrades in the future.</p>	<p>The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.</p>
	<p>In researching for this submission, we have become aware the planners know of a conflict</p>	<p>The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>Property impacts:</p> <p>Consideration needs to be taken to alleviate the detrimental affects caused by the severance of a portion of our property which results in a fracturing of our development in a very significant way.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights.</p>
	<p>Location of station:</p> <p>We believe that the elevations of the rail line have been caused by the inappropriate location of the South Deebing Heights Station.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area.</p>
	<p>The design of the South Deebing Creek Road and South West corridor Interchange:</p> <p>This interchange is at the centre of the problem of the rail elevation.</p>	<p>The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.</p>
	<p>Great detail has been provided of the Interim Roundabout, but as the planning has to look beyond the immediate future it has to be able to be integrated with a minimum of inconvenience to the future residents of the Deebing Valley Community. This does not become immediately apparent when one looks at the plans and they show a future flyover of SDCR over the SWTC, with the rail line above the flyover. From our own observations and after consulting with engineers and town planners, we are of the opinion that there is insufficient height separation between the three levels proposed.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area.</p>
	<p>Our suggestion is for the interim roundabout to be raised, somewhere between 3 to 5 metres and that the rail cross SDCR at an elevation of approximately 7 metres on a rising grade of 2%. By doing this there would be a comparatively simple solution of an interchange by lowering SDCR under the SWTC. This would result in a similar interchange to what is at the intersection of Queen Street and the Ipswich Motorway at Goodna.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area.</p>
	<p>Relocation of Deebing Heights Station</p> <p>By relocating the Deebing Heights Station to the east, between Deebing Creek and SDCR, the height of the c/line from Deebing Creek to SDCR can be lowered, because rather than trying to achieve a near level platform area at close to the natural surface area west of SDCR, the line can be at the 120kph design grade of 2% and within a cutting rising to intersect the design level further west. This would reduce the visual and acoustic intrusion by an enormous degree.</p>	<p>The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area. The station has been relocated to the eastern side of South Deebing Creek Road.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	Of course lowering the rail would be dependant on SDCR being made an underpass instead of a flyover.	The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.
	Having the station further east would allow land under the line to be used for a park and ride car park. This would negate the necessity of resuming over 3 hectares of land, at some substantial cost, to the north of the station.	The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area. The station has been relocated to the eastern side of South Deebing Creek Road.
	With the station further east and a road access under the SWTC and rail line near Deebing Creek it would be far more accessible for cycling and walking from the major residential area of Deebing Creek Valley to the south and east. This would better conform to the goals of the Ripley Valley Master Plan of encouraging less use of motor vehicles.	The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area. The station has been relocated to the eastern side of South Deebing Creek Road.
	If the rail line grade was maintained at near level just west of Deebing Creek it would cross a point between chainage 9400 and 9500 that would be within a metre of ground level, a perfect place for access to a station and at a level that would easily be accessible for wheelchairs with reserved parking close by for the handicapped.	The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area. The station has been relocated to the eastern side of South Deebing Creek Road.
	A very minor change in the horizontal direction of the line could result in the necessary straight section of about 200 metres for a station.	The corridor alignment has been amended in Deebing Heights to reduce the height near the Deebing Creek area. The station has been relocated to the eastern side of South Deebing Creek Road.
	Major conflict between the South West Transport Corridor and the rail corridor	
	There is a fatal flaw in accepting the current rail corridor layout and elevations and the projected final, long term, SWTC layout and elevations with a flyover.	The interim and future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.
	There would be inadequate height between the flyover and the rail line.	The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.
	In would be verging on insanity not to allow for ease of construction of the ultimate design of the intersection of SDCR and the SWTC.	The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>In the case of SDCR not being made an underpass and an allowance for clearance over the flyover then the rail line would have to be another 4 metres (approx) higher to allow adequate clearance and in that case the height of the rail, the train and the gantries would be in the vicinity of 20 metres above natural ground level between Deebling Creek and SDCR.</p>	<p>The future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.</p>
	<p>Suggestions in relation to the Ripley Valley Master Plan</p> <p>The location of the only Major Neighbourhood Centre in Deebling Creek Valley is away from the logical TOD location close to the proposed future station which is to be located near the intersection of South Deebling Creek Road and the SWTC.</p>	<p>The station has been relocated to the eastern side of South Deebling Creek Road.</p>
	<p>The Ripley Valley Structure Plan states in many places and professes to wanting to adhere to TOD principles, but when it comes to the location of the ONLY Major Neighbourhood Centre in the Deebling Creek Valley it is put over 2 kilometres away from what is the most logical place i.e. within a short walk of the Transit Station. I would suggest that the most logical place for it would be on the eastern side of South Deebling Creek Road between Winland Drive and the SWTC. I base this on the fact that the natural topography is the most suitable within the vicinity, it is closest to the population centre of the Valley, it is the most suitable for walking and cycling for the most number of residents, it offers the best opportunity for transit passengers who walk or cycle to access before proceeding to the homes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>To place it so far to the south as proposed does nothing to reduce the use of motor vehicles, if anything it encourages that very thing in that the people using the Transit Station would more likely go directly home then hop in their cars to drive to and from the Centre. In support of my suggestion one only has to calculate the distance from the overpass of the Cunningham Highway to the most southern tip of the development area of the Valley and the centre point is very close to where the high tension power lines cross South Deebling Creek Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Submission #	Submission comments	Response
	<p>If we are to engender any sense of community for the residents of Deebing Valley then it is imperative that the community hub be in a central location. The added benefit that such a centre is within a short walk of the Transit Station is a bonus that should not be overlooked.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>One should be aware that the residents of Paradise Heights use Winland Drive as the entry point to that estate from South Deebing Creek Road and an imposition of another kilometre each way to travel to access the Major Neighbourhood Centre makes a mockery of any professed aim to reduce car usage.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>There are many mentions of good reasons within the Ripley Valley Planning Report as to why the Major Neighbourhood Centre should be further north and closer to the Transit Station.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>The aims of the Ripley Valley Master Plan clearly include a road crossing under the Deebing Creek Bridge. We continue to press our argument that the best site for the station geographically and demographically is the area we suggest.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Summary/General:</p>	
	<p>We would like to express our dismay at having to formulate a submission on such a major construction as the Ipswich Springfield Public Transport Study when the information supplied has so many conflicts with what is available from the Queensland Department of Main Roads through their consultants SKM.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>The plans and longitudinal sections for the Centenary Highway Extension is for the interim roundabout at the intersection of SDCR and the SWTC, whereas the plans and longitudinal sections for the rail shows a perceived vision of the intersection at its ultimate completion.</p>	<p>The interim and future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.</p>
	<p>We believe that there should be serious discussion between all the parties involved in both corridors and that those conflicts be resolved before again opening the issue for further submissions on all aspects of both the road and rail design.</p>	<p>The interim and future requirements of the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield PTC have been considered in producing the preferred alignment.</p>

17.5 Conclusion

The consultation process for the Ipswich to Springfield PTC study was developed with the aim of facilitating an open and transparent two-way communication process between potentially affected property owners, stakeholders, the broader community, Queensland Transport and PB. This process helped Queensland Transport to understand how the preferred corridor would impact property owners and the community.

The community consultation enabled the study team to gather information including:

- property owner attitudes, issues and concerns about the preferred corridor
- information about the individual impacts the preferred corridor would have on property owners
- general community attitudes relating to the existing social environment.

The key activities undertaken as part of the program include:

- meeting with property owners
- holding public displays
- developing project specific communication materials
- maintaining community contact points.

A total of 189 contacts were made with the study team over the course of the Environmental Impact Study. The majority of contacts were made by phone and enquiries relating predominantly to the processes and timelines involved in the Environmental Impact Study. Other caller enquiries included requests for meetings, study information and to register concerns.

As part of the consultation process, affected property owners were provided with study information and encouraged to provide feedback relating to any potential impacts the preferred corridor may have on their personal circumstances. Frequently raised issues included property impacts, study timings, impact on lifestyles, compensation, environmental impacts and construction timing.

Overall information provided during the consultation process indicated that the preferred corridor will provide great benefits for the community, with mitigation measures available to assist directly affected property owners.