

Date: 19 September 2024
Contact: Chelsea O'Connor
Location: City Development
Telephone: 07 5581 6437
Your reference: -
Our reference: COM/2024/236

Coomera GA PTY LTD ATF The Coomera Ga Unit Trust
C/- Saunders Havill Group
9 Thompson St
BOWEN HILLS QLD 4006

Dear Sir/Madam

Information Request

I refer to the development application lodged by:
Coomera GA PTY LTD ATF The Coomera Ga Unit Trust

in relation to development of land/premises described as:
Lot 96 RP187418 – 54 George Alexander Way, COOMERA QLD 4209

Council of the City of Gold Coast (Council) officers have reviewed the development application and supporting information and determined that further information is required to properly assess the application.

Pursuant to sections 13.2 and 13.3 of the Development Assessment Rules under the *Planning Act 2016*, the applicant may respond to this information request by giving to the assessing authority:

- 1 all of the information requested below; or
- 2 part of the information requested below; or
- 3 part of the information requested below together with a notice advising the assessing authority that it must proceed with the assessment of the application; or
- 4 a notice stating that none of the information requested below will be provided; or
- 5 a notice stating that none of the information requested below will be provided together with a notice advising the assessing authority that it must proceed with the assessment of the application.

You are advised that pursuant to section 13.1 of the Development Assessment Rules, the period for the applicant to respond to this information request is three (3) months of the date of this letter.

If no response is provided or only part of the information is provided to this request within the three (3) month period, Council will continue its assessment of the application based on the information submitted.

It would be in the applicant's best interest to address all of the information requested.
Please note that the provision of sufficient information to properly assess an application is a requirement for a favourable decision.

INFORMATION REQUEST

Advice note: The below information request involves multiple items which may result in a substantial departure from the current proposed development. Officers welcome the opportunity to workshop matters identified below prior to a formal response to information request being submitted.

Town Planning

1. State Assessment and Referral Agency (SARA)

The development is proposed over a balance lot, created by a previous approval of the subject site (COM/2023/16). The previous approval required referral to SARA as the development interfered with koala habitat trees. Condition 4 of SARA's referral response outlines that the balance lot, area subject to this development application, is to be rehabilitated.

City officers will not support any development application/outcome that conflicts with conditions of a previous approval. As such, the applicant is requested to provide justification as to how the proposed development does not conflict with conditions of the previous approval COM/2023/16.

Alternatively the applicant is requested to provide formal confirmation from SARA of their endorsement of a development outcome in conflict with their conditions of approval.

2. Stormwater easement – conveyance of external catchments

The proposed development includes stormwater pipes within the basement. The submitted Engineering drawings outline the pipes within a drainage easement which has not been applied for. The applicant is requested to provide further detail on the stormwater infrastructure within the basement noting Officers hold considerable concerns regarding potential public infrastructure within a private basement.

3. Staging

The development is proposed in Stage 1, Stage 1a and Stage 2 (consisting of Stage a, b and c). Officers hold concerns regarding the logical progression of the subject site within each stage. Further, the submitted supporting document outlines that the basement will be constructed throughout each step of stage 2. The applicant is requested to amend the staging as follows for a more logical development pattern:

- Confirm the full extent of the basement will be constructed under Part 2a.
- Confirm whether the applicant intends to not start Stage 2 until such time that a southern connection to Talpa street is formed. If this is not that case, Stage 1a is to be the last stage to ensure the temporary turning head is constructed until the connection is formed.
- Amended that Stage 1a plan to show the full construction of Talpa Street.
- Amend staging plan to show the dedication of the Bushland reserve as asked for in Item 26 of this request, in Stage 1.

It is further noted that the Landscaping Plan provides two stages which includes Stage 1 and Stage 2 as 'Stage 1'. Officers hold concerns as to the feasibility of Stage 1 of the Landscaping master plan. As such, the applicant is requested to amend the landscaping plan to ensure the delivery of Stage 1a landscaping can occur without Stage 2.

4. Townhouse product

The submitted plan set shows insufficient information relating to the proposed townhouses to allow for appropriate assessment, specifically in relation to setbacks. As such, the applicant is requested

to provide additional plans showing only the proposed town houses with all relevant information outlined including setbacks, elevations and cross-section, and all area calculations.

5. Communal open space

The proposed development includes 10 townhouses which requires the provision of Communal open space. As such, the applicant is requested to provide a communal open space area within the townhouse lot. It is noted that the area must be accessible, usable and safe.

Reliance on communal open space areas provided within the apartment product lot will not be considered to satisfy the requirements of the townhouse product.

6. Multi purpose rooms

Multiple units have nominated a multi purpose room (MPR) on the floor plans. As identified in Item 8 of this Information request, carparking calculations require that the MPR be considered as a bedroom. For clarity, Officers request that the proposed plans are amended so that MPR are classified as bedrooms.

Transport Assessment

7. George Alexander Way access

Based on review of the submitted TTM Consulting Traffic Impact Assessment, Officers hold considerable concerns with the significant increase of traffic on the local residential streets to the east. The concern specifically relates to increased traffic on Talpa Street, Bailer Street, Seashell Avenue and Seagreen Drive. In this regard, the proposed development will generate approximately 993 trips per day on the local road network. Talpa Street and Bailer Street which lead back out to Finnegan Way are both residential access (750vpd) streets. In the proposed access arrangement the development will increase the daily volume of traffic on these streets beyond the desired level. Officers are therefore not supportive of vehicular access to Talpa Street for buildings 1-3.

As such, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings relocating the access to George Alexander Way at the northern most end of frontage. Vehicular movements must be restricted to left in and left out through use of a 600mm wide raised concrete centre median on George Alexander Way as set out in Condition 18 of COM/2023/16. The median must extend 10m north and south of the vehicle crossing location to discourage right turn movements. U-turn movements are available at the existing single lane roundabout located 310m north of the stipulated vehicle access location.

The applicant is further requested to prepare interim and ultimate concept plans with dimensions showing how the proposed vehicular access will be facilitated. The vehicle access must include a minimum 2m wide pedestrian refuge and separate entry and exit lanes. The driveway and vehicle crossing must accommodate the largest design service vehicle, ensuring a minimum 50mm ground clearance at all points on route to and from the designated service area.

Advice note - necessary trunk infrastructure (LGIP identified) land on George Alexander Way

George Alexander Way is identified in the city's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) for upgrade to urban standards. Transport Asset Planning and Management (TAPM) has undertaken concept planning that has identified the requirement for land dedication along the frontage of the site to George Alexander Way. This land is considered trunk and the extent is identified on City of Gold Coast Plan 27132.P307 revision B dated 30/01/2022. The area identified as parcel A is required for the road infrastructure whilst the area identified as parcel B is required for the associated earthworks. To enable the applicant to prepare an alternative design which ties in with the existing and future levels of George Alexander Way, officers can provide the relevant design drawings upon request.

8. Carparking

Based on review of the submitted drawings, Officers note that many of the proposed units include study/multi-purpose rooms which could potentially be used as bedrooms. Furthermore, the submitted town planning report suggests that the development, including car parking, will be rolled out over six stages. The car parking calculations prepared by TTM Consulting do not appear to have factored any of these parameters. The applicant is therefore requested to submit the following:

- a. A revised assessment of car parking including the study/multi-purpose rooms as bedrooms (i.e. 1 bed units will become 2 bed units etc.)
- b. A summary table showing how many commercial, resident and visitor car parking spaces are provided on each level at each stage. Do not include any assessment of car parking required.
- c. An amended suite of drawings showing that car parking provided at each stage meets the requirements of Acceptable outcome AO1 of the Transport code.
- d. Individually number each car parking space for ease of reference.

9. Servicing

The current servicing design is based on vehicle access from Talpa Street. However, as mentioned above, Officers have requested that access be relocated to George Alexander Way which will change how service vehicle access and service buildings 1 to 3. The applicant is therefore requested to readdress Performance outcome PO3 of the Transport code based on the revised vehicular access location. An amended suite of drawings must be provided demonstrating how the buildings are serviced at each proposed stage and where service vehicle turn around to exit the site in a forward gear. The temporary turnaround areas must be located entirely within each stage.

10. Bicycle parking

The development is proposed in 6 stages. The bicycle parking calculations prepared by TTM Consulting do not appear to have factored in staging. The applicant is therefore requested to submit the following:

- a. A summary table showing how many commercial, resident and visitor bicycle parking spaces are provided at each stage. Do not include any assessment of bicycle parking required.
- b. An amended suite of drawings showing that bicycle parking provided at each stage meets the requirements of Acceptable outcome AO7.1 of the Transport code and clear delineation between security level B resident and security level C visitor bicycle parking.
- c. An amended suite of drawings showing visitor bicycle parking located at ground level within visible line of sight to the lobby entrances in areas that will not obstruct pedestrian movement

11. Pedestrian connection

Based on review of the submitted drawings, no provision has been made for pedestrian connections to George Alexander Way. Ultimately, this will be the primary street frontage and residents may desire this route to access local bus stops and other nearby services in preference to the local road network to the east. The applicant is therefore requested to make allowance in the design for a pedestrian connection to George Alexander Way clear of any vehicle movements. The footpath is to have a minimum width of 2m.

This will need to accommodate pedestrian movements for both apartment and townhouse product lots.

12. Amended drawings

Based on review of the submitted drawings against the requirements of AS2890.1:2004, Officers have identified several matters of non-compliance requiring submission of amended drawing as follows:

Buildings 1-3

- a. A designated turnaround area has not been provided at the far end of the visitor car parking area prior to the security gate. The applicant is therefore requested to submit amended drawings and provide associated swept paths on a separate drawings showing the turn around area and the capability of a B99 to turn around in this area and exit the basement in a forward gear.

Townhouses

- b. Based on review of the vehicle crossing alignment and positioning of car parking on each townhouse lot, Officers are concerned that it will be difficult for vehicles to access the parking spaces on the outside, particularly when a car is parked on the inside space of each unit. The applicant is therefore requested to either:
 - i. Submit amended drawings showing a tandem car parking arrangement for each dwelling; or
 - ii. Submit swept paths prepared by the project Traffic Engineer showing a B85 vehicle accessing townhouse carport and garages when a car is parked in the inside space of each unit.

Environmental Assessment

13. Impacts to Medium priority vegetation

The proposed development contemplates the removal of approximately 5,700m² of Medium priority vegetation (MPV) mapped as occurring on the subject site. The impacts on MPV are not proposed to be offset due to the overlap with state mapped koala habitat that requires offsetting in accordance with the *Queensland Environmental Offset Policy*. Despite this, to comply with both the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014* and Acceptable outcome AO10 of the Environmental significance overlay code, the applicant is required to also offset any impacts to locally mapped MPV as it represents a separate and distinct matter to koala habitat.

Further to this, the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014* framework requires that impacts are addressed in a hierarchy of first being avoided, then mitigated before any significant residual impacts are offset as a final consideration.

Offsetting the majority of MPV does not adequately avoid or mitigate impacts in the first instance before offsets are proposed. As such, the application does not satisfactorily meet *Environmental Offsets Act 2014* requirements.

This proposed approach conflicts with the following City Plan 2016 assessment benchmarks:

- Environmental significance overlay code Overall outcomes 2(d)(ii), (h)
- Environmental significance overlay code Performance and Acceptable outcome 10

As such, the applicant is requested to:

- a. Prepare and submit amended plans which reduce the development footprint to retain a significantly higher portion of medium priority vegetation. All bushfire management measures should also be located outside of these additionally retained areas.

- b. Where all attempts have been made to avoid and minimise damage to MPV, any significant residual impact is required to be offset in accordance with the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014*, at a ratio of 3:1 (area) in accordance with **SC6.9 City Plan policy – Environmental offsets**.

14. Fauna management plan

The applicant has submitted a Koala management plan, prepared by Saunders Havill Group dated 06/08/2024, however no other fauna has been addressed. To comply with Performance outcome PO22 of the Environmental significance overlay code, the applicant is requested to submit a Fauna management plan prepared in accordance with SC6.8 City Plan policy – Environmental management plans.

15. Rehabilitation and covenant management plan

The applicant has proposed to dedicate a 20m wide area along the southern boundary of the subject site as a bushland reserve. To comply with PO23 and PO26 of the Environmental significance overlay code the applicant is requested to submit a Rehabilitation management plan prepared in accordance with the *South East Queensland Ecological Restoration Framework* and SC6.8 City Plan policy – Environmental management plans. Any additional areas that are proposed to be dedicated, after amendments to the submitted plans are made, are also requested to be rehabilitated.

16. Vegetation management plan

The applicant is proposing to remove a significant portion of vegetation on the subject site to facilitate the development. To comply with Performance outcome PO1 of the Vegetation management code, the applicant is requested to prepare and submit a Vegetation management plan, prepared in accordance with SC6.8 City Plan policy – Environmental management plans.

Bushfire Assessment

17. Amended Bushfire management plan

The applicant is requested to submit an amended Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) that is in accordance with the City Plan Policy – SC6.3 Bushfire Management Plans. The submitted BMP being Bushfire mitigation report FM 6743 for Keylin at 54 George Alexander Way, Coomera by Eldon Bottcher Architect Pty Ltd dated 09/08/2024, is requested to be amended as follows:

- a. Review the calculations for Method 2. An FDI of 40 was used which is the FDI appropriate for Method 1. The Bushfire Resilient Communities Technical Reference Guide- Section 7.3 Item 2 states that Method 2 of AS 3959-2018 subject to the adoption of site-specific values of FFDI. Whilst Section 5.4.1.1 states the FFDI value of 40, adopted in Method 1 should not be used as it fails to consider regional differences in weather severity that might not be expected for the 5% AEP fire weather event. It is requested the bushfire management plan calculations are based off one methodology only, either Method 1 or Method 2 without combining the two. The bushfire management radiant heat flux calculations are requested to be updated reflecting the use of one method only.
- b. The applicant is requested to reduce the building footprint for proposed Building 1 and proposed Building 3 to achieve an acceptable bushfire risk by ensuring that the buildings are exposed to a radiant heat flux no greater than 29kw/m2.

18. Bushfire overlay code response

The applicant is requested to prepare a response to the bushfire hazard overlay code as an appendix to the Bushfire management plan identifying how overlay code outcomes have been achieved.

Water and Waste Assessment

19. Sewer and Water Network Capacity

A sewer and water capacity assessment is required to confirm if any augmentations to Council's potable water and sewer network are required as a result of the proposed development.

To ensure that all approval conditions are achievable and final in accordance with the *Planning Act*, and the *City Plan*, Water and Waste requests the following information be submitted to Council:

- a. A potable water supply network capacity assessment for the proposed development. The capacity of the existing system (considering other existing development approvals) must be assessed, and any required augmentation works shall be identified as a result of the development's additional water usage. The assessment must adhere to the *SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code* and the *Water Supply and Sewerage Infrastructure Plan*.

Furthermore, the proposed water reticulation layout results in a long dead-end section of main located on Talpa Street which may result in poor outcomes with respect to water quality and supply contingency. The applicant is requested to further investigate the option of 'looping' the Talpa Street water main with a subsequent connection to the existing network located within George Alexander Way for circulation, and supply contingency.

- b. A sewer network capacity assessment for the proposed development. The capacity of the existing system (considering other existing development approvals) must be assessed, and any required augmentation works shall be identified as a result of the development's additional sewer demand. The assessment must adhere to the *SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code* and the *Water Supply and Sewerage Infrastructure Plan*.

Advice Note: The applicant should liaise with Water and Waste to obtain the current model for potable water (please contact Uttam Saha, Coordinator Network Planning on telephone (07) 5582 8929) and sewer systems (please contact Swapan Sikder, Senior Planning/Modelling Engineer on telephone (07) 5582 8764;

20. Water meter location

Council acknowledges that the applicant has provided a *Concept Combined Services Layout Plan* dated 08-08-2024 by Arcadis, which depicts the proposed location of the water meter for Lot 1. However, the water meter must also be demonstrated on the architectural plans as the architectural plans will constitute the approved drawings.

Any required new water meter(s) must be located in accordance with SEQ Water Service Providers Large Meter Arrangement drawing set.

Council's relevant internal referrals all need to be aware of the proposed location(s) and satisfied that all other internal requirements are met, and the water meters fit into the design concept.

- a. Council requests the applicant to seek advice and confirmation from a hydraulic consultant on the size of the required potable water and (if applicable) fire meters required for the proposal. Once the size of the water meters is determined, the location of the water meters can be incorporated into the design plans. Note: if advice is not obtained regarding the required meter size, then the application may require a Minor Change should the layout of the design not provide sufficient room for the meter assembly.
- b. Provide amended plan showing the location for any above ground on lot water meters, based on advice from a hydraulic consultant. This information must be on an architectural plan and be in a compliant location.
- c. Refer to the SEQ Large Meter Arrangement Drawings – <https://www.seqcode.com.au/seq-water-supply-code>

Please Note: Providing this information on an engineering drawing is not sufficient as the architectural drawing set will constitute the approved drawings rather than the engineering drawing. Therefore, this information must be demonstrated on the architectural drawing set.

21. Sewer reticulation schematic plan

With reference to the *Concept Combined Services Layout Plan* dated 08-08-2024 by Arcadis, it remains unclear to Council if the proposed gravity extension is achievable.

- a. Provide a sewer reticulation schematic plan for the proposal that:
 - i. Demonstrates how each lot is to be connected to Council's sewer network (Including Lot 2);
 - ii. Provides sewer connection points consistent with the sewer network capacity assessment reporting as requested by Council.
 - iii. Provides a conceptual longitudinal section confirming that the proposed gravity sewer main extension has sufficient cover and fall in compliance with the SEQ WS&S D&C Code.
 - iv. Avoids sewer mains within private properties where possible/practical.
 - i. Any proposed or existing sewer mains within private properties require the inclusion of an easement, including dimensions with the sewer main / infrastructure located centrally within the easement in compliance with the SEQ WS&S D&C Code.

22. RCV Swept Path

Council acknowledges the RCV swept path diagrams provided by the applicant, however, to confirm overall feasibility of waste servicing, the applicant is requested to provide amended Swept Paths for the design Waste Collection Vehicle complying with AS2890.2 and certified by an appropriately qualified RPEQ that a Waste Collection Vehicle (WCV) can adequately manoeuvre unimpeded through the development to the bin storage/servicing point as outlined below:

- i. Swept path analysis is to be generated by AutoTurn, AutoTrack or similar.
- ii. Plans must demonstrate vehicle specifications in accordance with the 'City Plan Policy – Solid Waste Management' including the wall-to-wall turning radius as nominated in Appendix C of SC6.15 City plan policy – solid waste management code.
- iii. Manoeuvring clearances in accordance with AS2890.2 must be clearly depicted on drawings and demonstrate no obstructions exist for all waste servicing manoeuvres.
- iv. Reversing movements on-site are to be kept to a minimum and access to the development from the road is to comply with AS2890.2.

Landscape Assessment

23. Frontage landscaping

Pursuant to Acceptable outcome AO4.1/Performance outcome PO4 of the General development

provisions code, the development is required to provide landscape work within the site that protects and enhances the character of the local area. The application material is considered to require amendments to comply with this requirement. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to provide an amended Statement of Landscape Intent (SLI) and architectural drawings which complies with the following:

- a. Tree planting is requested to be proposed within the frontage setback areas of the development; this is requested to be at a rate of one tree per dwelling for the townhouse dwellings and at 6 metre centres along the Talpa St frontage of buildings 2 & 3 as well as along the George Alexander Way frontage of building 1.
- b. The applicant is to demonstrate a minimum building separation distance of 3m from frontage tree planting.
- c. Tree planting is requested to be located within garden beds with a minimum surface area of 6m² and a minimum dimension of 1.5m.
- d. Tree planting is requested to be positioned a minimum 3m away from buildings (including rooflines) and a minimum 500mm away from property boundaries, hardstand and planter walls.
- e. Replace proposed turf within the frontage setback area with garden planting which has higher value in meeting the relevant assessment benchmarks.
- f. Nominate planter boxes to support garden planting along the frontage of buildings 2 & 3 as the presence of the basement appears to prevent planting otherwise being provided.

24. Services and landscaping

In order to ensure the success of the landscaping, conflicts between services and planting need to be resolved. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to comply with the following:

- a. Demonstrate no conflict between the requested tree planting and the proposed stormwater pipe within the frontage gardens of the townhouse dwellings.
- b. Provide further detail regarding the swale drain/stormwater pipe along the western edge of building 1, ensuring it is designed to facilitate dense tree and shrub planting along that interface.

25. Retaining wall height

Pursuant to Acceptable outcome AO9/Performance outcome PO9 of the General development provisions code, the applicant is requested to demonstrate that the proposed retaining walls facing the adjoining property to the north will not create a negative visual impact.

Details of retaining wall type and finish must be provided in addition to landscape embellishments.

26. Public open space

The applicant is requested to nominate the dedication of the bushland reserve adjacent the path to Council as public open space. All relevant application material is requested to be updated to reflect this.

Architecture Assessment

27. Building appearances – Medium rise apartments

City officers are generally supportive of the medium rise apartment building appearances; however, officers are concerned that the building 1 (south elevation) and building 2 (west elevation) facades present austere facades due to large extents of sheer walls. In addition, City officers are concerned that the submitted documentation is not sufficient to enable accurate assessment of the proposed apartment buildings.

In order to demonstrate compliance with Performance outcome PO3 of the Multiple accommodation code, the applicant is requested to provide the following:

- a. Provide greater articulation to achieve sufficient visual interest for the identified elevations when viewed from the broader neighbourhood or internally within the site.
- b. Provide elevations for all apartment building facades.
- c. Provide additional 3D high quality perspectives of the apartment buildings and townhouses to demonstrate the appearance from the internal street and when viewed from the surrounding area.

28. Building appearances – Townhouses

City officers are concerned that the submitted documentation provides insufficient information to demonstrate how the townhouses achieve sufficient visual interest and differentiation between dwellings. The proposed buildings include walls in singular alignment with repetitive material selections which result in an austere appearance. In order to demonstrate compliance with Performance outcome PO3 and Performance outcome PO11 of the Multiple accommodation code, the following is requested.

- a. Provide further variation in the building form, including variation in materials colours and finishes to support greater differentiation. City officers note this may be achieved through subtle variations while maintaining a cohesive visual appearance.
- b. Provide larger scaled elevations for the proposed townhouses, including front, rear and side elevations.
- c. Provide further information on proposed materials. City officers note material identification as 'lightweight cladding' as insufficient for proper assessment.
- d. Provide additional 3D perspectives of the proposed townhouses.

Subdivision Engineering

29. Footpaths on both sides of Talpa Street within the subject site

The proposed development shows proposed footpath on one side of Talpa Street. This is inconsistent with Section 10.2 of the Traffic Impact Assessment and Engineering Service drawings which indicate proposed footpaths on both sides of Talpa Street within the subject site. Hence, the applicant is requested to submit amended architectural drawings which show the proposed footpaths on both sides of Talpa Street. It is noted that both footpaths are required to be a minimum width of 2m.

30. Signed traffic impact assessment report

The submitted Transport Engineering Assessment Report is not signed by a RPEQ. As such, the applicant is requested to submit an amended Traffic Impact Assessment report signed by an RPEQ specialising in traffic engineering.

31. Amended reconfiguring a lot plan

The proposed Reconfiguring a Lot Plan shows the proposed lot boundary as dash-dotted lines. No dimensions of any lot or the proposed access easement area are shown.

As such, the applicant is requested to provide an amended plan of showing proposed lot boundary should be solid lines, full dimensions of proposed access easement (e.g. area, widths and lengths) and area of proposed Lot 2 excluding proposed access easement area.

Hydraulic and Water Quality Assessment

32. Stormwater drainage

The proposed residential dwellings will increase hardstand area over the subject site and will alter existing stormwater overland flow arrangement. The Stormwater Management Plan proposes to direct flows from the eastern lot under the road to be treated by the adjoining development site. This will only be accepted where individual Torrens Title lots are to be developed. Where a strata/community title development is proposed, all treatment and detention storage is to be provided on this eastern lot and then discharge to the Talpa Street drainage system. More information is required as to what is proposed at this location as individual lots are not indicated.

Furthermore, the upstream overland flow has been captured and directed through the basement via 3 x 450 mm pipes. It is unclear whether this includes any redundancy and what would happen to flows with a partial blockage of pit or pipes.

33. Proposed stormwater bio basins

Upon reviewing the design of the proposed bio basins, the applicant is requested to demonstrate the following items in line with the Healthy waters code, Land Development Guidelines (LDG) and best practice design in accordance with Healthy Land and Waters guidelines for bioretention basins.

- a. The proposed bioretention basins especially Basin 2 has an elongated shape and are positioned tightly between buildings and northern property boundary. Basin 1 only has access from one side. When considering the point below regarding level spreaders. This will be setback from the boundary this will further restrict access from these ends. The applicant is requested to demonstrate how suitable maintenance access will be provided for each bio basin. Subsequently, demonstrate how could machinery access the basins for maintenance activities such as vegetation management or filter media replacement? Alternatively relocate the bioretention basins to a more accessible location or use a SQIDEP approved devices(s).
- b. To provide adequately sized level spreader located within the site for avoiding the concentrated outlet flows discharging in developed conditions to the LPD1 towards the neighbouring property i.e, Lot 101 on SP312031.
- c. To demonstrate or provide a reference in the report, how the Council's pollutant load reduction targets for catchment D3 are achieved to meet water quality objectives.
- d. All bypass of the system is to be considered.
- e. Provide more plan and section details of the specific water quality devices at about a 1:20 scale. Provide sections through the bioretention layers if used together with levels. Ensure the underdrains can discharge via gravity to the level spreader.
- f. Based on the above, the applicant is requested to submit an updated stormwater management plan prepared by a qualified professional (RPEQ) in accordance with the QUDM and the LDG.

34. Stormwater quality

It is unclear whether the developed Talpa Street extension has been considered in the modelling for the existing basin to the north. More information is required to demonstrate what has been allowed

for. If not allowed, the applicant is requested to provide detail as to how the water quality and detention components will be addressed.

35. Request for modelling files

For verification and record keeping purposes, council requests the submission of any digital modelling files (e.g., MUSIC and DRAINS) developed in the preparation of the updated SMWP.

Operational Works Assessment

36. Separation distances

Demonstrate the vehicle crossings are appropriately separated to maintain on-street carparking spaces. Specifically, the applicant is required to provide the distance between each of the townhouse vehicle crossings. Please ensure this is a minimum of 7.0m separation at the kerb line in order to ensure there is an on-street carpark between the vehicle crossings.

37. Vehicle crossing design

Demonstrate the vehicle crossing avoids damage to utility services, pathways, kerbs, road pavement and seal and other city infrastructure. Specifically, the vehicle crossings shown in the engineering drawings provided by ARCADIS do not align with the internal driveways and the architectural plans. There is a stormwater gully pit located where the vehicle crossover to the Northern two townhouses driveway will be located and several of the VXOs are much larger than what would be supported. The applicant is requested to amend the design to be consistent with the architectural plans, with a 7.0m spacing between each VXO as per the item above.

Advice Note

The applicant is advised that should Council give further advice about the application (in accordance with s35 of the DA Rules) to resolve outstanding items not adequately addressed within the information request response, the applicant will be requested to complete a 'Notice to Stop the Current Period' for the above-mentioned application until the items within the further advice are adequately addressed. Alternatively, the applicant may choose to provide a reasonable extension to the Decision period, as advised by the Assessment manager. If the applicant does not stop the Current Period or provide a reasonable extension to the Decision period, Council officers will proceed with assessing and deciding the application based on the information provided in the information request response, which could result in an unfavourable recommendation by Council officers.

Notice to Stop the Current Period Form:

<https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/Applicanttemplate9.0-Noticeaboutstoppingthecurrentperiod.doc>

DA Rules extract:

s35.1 An assessment manager or concurrence agency for the application may, at any time before the application is decided, give further advice about the application to the applicant.

s35.2 Further advice may include advice about how the applicant may change the application.

Response format

As this application was lodged electronically, please direct all future correspondence regarding this application in the required PDF format i.e.:

- **Supporting documents** (separate the supporting documents into individual PDF appendices)
- **Plans** (combine as one single PDF)
- **Specialist reports** (separate each specialist report into individual PDF appendices)

Do not password protect the PDF.

The electronic response should be forwarded to mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au with the Assessment Manager Chelsea O'Connor copied into the email coconnor@goldcoast.qld.gov.au

Please note, all development applications are publicly viewable on the Council's City of Gold Coast's PD Online: cityofgoldcoast.com.au/pdonline

Contacting us

Should you wish to clarify any issues contained in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Planning Assessment on 07 5582 8866.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Morris', written in a cursive style.

Adam Morris
Supervisor (North)
For the Chief Executive Officer
Council of the City of Gold Coast