

Date: 21 August 2025
Contact: Kyra Reid
Location: City Development
Telephone: 5582 8730
Your reference: 11694
Our reference: ROL/2024/116

Norfolk Estates Pty Ltd
C/- Saunders Havill Group
9 Thomas St
BOWEN HILLS QLD 4006

Dear Sir/Madam

Information Request

I refer to the development application lodged by:
Norfolk Estates Pty Ltd C/- Saunders Havill Group

in relation to development of land/premises described as:
Lot 183 RP156422, Lot 185 RP173727, Lot 186 RP173728, Lot 56 RP162858, Lot 57 SP214370,
Lot 58 SP191940, Lot 184 RP173727 – 176 Baileys Mountain Road, UPPER 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.

Council's Project Team

The assessment of this application will be undertaken by the following Council project team.

Assessment Manager Kyra Reid Planner (07) 5582 8730 kreid@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Planning Coordinator Adam Morris Coordinator Planning Assessment - North (07) 5667 3856 asmorris@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Subdivision Engineer Robert Choi Senior Civil Engineer 07 5582 8093 rchoi@goldcoast.qld.gov.au
Landscape and Open Space Ryan Smith Landscape Planner (07) 5582 8151 rsmithy@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Environmental and Bushfire Assessment Peter Joy Senior Environmental Assessment Officer (07) 5582 8649 pjoy@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Transport Network Brett Bass / Dale Baudach Transportnetworkadvice@goldcoast.qld.gov.au
Transport Planning Melinda Plank Transport Engineer (07) 5582 9364 mplank@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Civil Engineering Soorya Thomas Civil Engineer (07) 5582 9089 sthomas@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	

INFORMATION REQUEST

Preamble

The applicant is advised that non-trunk conditions to address external network impacts are recommended to be imposed. These conditions are attached in Appendix A of this Information Request for reference. Acknowledging that this differs from advice previously provided to the applicant, City officers are willing to facilitate a meeting between the applicant and the asset custodian (Transport Asset Planning and Management) to discuss this outcome if requested by the applicant.

Planning Assessment

1. Small lots / plan of development

The applicant is requested to address Performance outcome PO14 of the Reconfiguring a lot code with regard to small lots. It is necessary to demonstrate that a Dwelling house can be accommodated that meets the requirements of the Small lot housing (infill focus) code.

City officers note the previous plan of development has been removed. It is considered that, once a development layout / footprint has been better refined, a similar document will be required to be provided for the amended development layout. While this cannot be endorsed through a development permit for a Reconfiguring a lot, it could be endorsed by a pre-referral response for building work. This can be workshopped with the applicant closer to a response to this Information Request being provided.

2. Supporting document

The applicant is requested to provide one plan showing all services to ensure no conflicts. The plan is to include water and sewer connections, stormwater drainage pipes, gully pits, manholes, wheelie bin pads, driveways and street trees. The plan is to include measurements showing distances between infrastructure to outline compliance with the relevant benchmarks.

3. Recreational linkages

In addition to Subdivision Engineering and Recreational Planning items herein, the applicant is requested to consider Schedule 12A of the Planning Regulation with particular regard to connectivity, footpaths, parks and other areas of open space. The applicant should note (considering the preamble above) that an external footpath network (i.e., along Baileys Mountain Road) may be necessary to address particular assessment benchmarks (prescribed by both the City Plan and Planning Regulation). The applicant is required to demonstrate that the development results in a well-connected and functional outcome that supports the intent of the Emerging community zone.

Environmental and Bushfire Assessment

4. Lots 645 & 646

The applicant is requested to confirm the width and type of vegetation management required within the conservation area bordering proposed Lots 645 & 646 - as shown on the Amended plans drawing. Any bushfire mitigation should be undertaken within the proposed lots.

5. Rehabilitation

The submitted BMP has determined the Site to be Low-Threat (BAL-LOW) and stated that rehabilitation should not increase the bushfire threat from Low (Fireline intensity of $<4,000\text{kW/m}$ radiant heat).

The pre-clearing vegetation within the proposed conservation corridor is mapped as RE12.3.11 (Open Forest on alluvial plains) with evidence of species from RE12.3.1(a) (Complex to simple notophyll vine forest – low flammable rainforest). The proposed rehabilitation of the conservation corridors by Saunders Havill is generally with species from RE12.3.1(a) and *Lophostemon confertus*.

Koalas have been recorded onsite within the mapped RE12.3.11, which includes a preferred koala feed tree *Eucalyptus tereticornis* (Forest red gum). Environmental Assessment's Information request has requested the inclusion of some canopy trees from RE12.11.3 including the following species and densities

- *Eucalyptus tereticornis* – Forest red gum - smooth bark eucalypt) – $1/250\text{m}^2$
- *Eucalyptus siderophloia* – Northern grey ironbark – moderate bark hazard $1/500\text{m}^2$
- *Corymbia intermedia* – Pink bloodwood – moderate to high bark hazard - $1/700\text{m}^2$

The applicant is requested to review the proposed inclusion and density of canopy trees from RE12.3.11 in the Rehabilitation management plan and advise of any required additional bushfire mitigation measures or changes to planting densities.

Note that the proposed canopy tree density is $75/10,000\text{m}^2$ which is approximately $1/10$ of the RE12.3.11 – effectively a conservative approach for inclusion of eucalyptus spp and bushfire mitigation.

6. Geomorphic /Bank Stability Assessment

The Geomorphic/bank stability assessment by Hydrobiology identified 2 Options to mitigate risks to the development within Reach 1 and Reach 2. The 2 options provided were:

- Reduce encroachment and constriction by increasing setbacks and limiting infilling of the existing streambank
- Install rip rap ($D_{50} > 0.256\text{m}$) in the channel bed, toe and bank where setbacks are not achievable
- Or provide a combination of both options (where applicable).

The assessment report did not map the sections of the waterways that would require armouring under the current development footprint. This information is required to integrate into a rehabilitation management plan for the Yaun Creek conservation corridors.

In accordance with Strategic Framework 3.7.3.1(2), 3.7.3.1(5), 3.7.4.1(1), 3.7.4.1(5) and Performance outcome PO5 of the Environmental significance overlay code, the applicant is requested to provide the following further detail to determine appropriate site bank stability measures:

- a. Map (conceptually) the sections of Reach 1 and Reach 2 that are required for armouring (rip rap)
- b. Where Reach 1 or Reach 2 requires extensive sections of armouring, review and assess the plan of development design for a potential balance of ecological outcomes (setbacks) and armouring.
- c. Where changes are made to the existing development – provide an amended (conceptual) map of required armouring for site waterways
- d. Ensure that the geomorphic/bank stability assessment uses the pre- and post-development velocities obtained from the hydraulic impact assessment for different AEP events for the analysis. Additionally, the hydraulic impact assessment should incorporate suitable roughness coefficient (Manning's n) values for Reaches 1 to 4, in accordance with the geomorphic assessment.
- e. Where significant areas of rock armouring are proposed, ecological outcomes are requested to be considered in the design. This can include mimicking natural features such as the use of different rock sizes and appropriately sized and placed logs to provide a greater range of micro habitats for instream organisms and riparian fauna.

7. Lot 406 & Lot 409

The proposed location of Lot 406 jutting into the conservation corridor creates unnecessary edge to area effects including the requirement for additional setbacks for vegetation management, greater weed incursion and edge effects on fauna habitat.

The applicant is requested to remove proposed Lot 406 in accordance with Strategic Framework 3.7.3.1(2), 3.7.3.1(5), 3.7.4.1(1), 3.7.4.1(5) and PO5, PO23, PO24 and PO26 of the Environmental significance overlay code.

The applicant is requested to relocate the driveway of Lot 409 to the southern boundary of existing Lot 407 (there is no loss of lot or lot area) – effectively shuffling the driveway and lots to create a driveway buffer between Lot 407 and the conservation boundary.

8. Stormwater outlet – Lot 904 bio-retention and detention basin

The proposed stormwater basin within Lot 904 has a 64m long low flow outlet pipe that discharges directly into the Yaun Creek channel at elevation 29m. The potential future replacement of the low flow pipe would result in the removal of a significant area of rehabilitated riparian vegetation.

In accordance with Performance outcome PO5 of the Environmental significance overlay code, the applicant is requested to redesign the bio/detention basin to significantly reduce the length of the low flow outlet pipe.

9. Rehabilitation (PO26)

An onsite visit determined a mix of species from RE12.3.11, and RE12.3.1(a) within the proposed conservation corridor and a small patch of RE12.11.24 and RE12.11.5 on higher ground. The Rehabilitation management plan for Yaun Creek lists low flammable plants from RE12.3.1(a) to ensure the site remains low threat from a bushfire management perspective.

The planting list does not include species from RE12.3.11 which includes koala feed trees, of which the koala has been recorded onsite. City Officers recommend a mix of 90% RE12.3.1(a) and 10% RE12.3.11 along the waterway corridor

The applicant is requested to consult with the bushfire consultant to include canopy trees from RE12.3.11. Specifically, the following canopy trees are requested to be included within the planting lists:

- *Eucalyptus tereticornis* (Forest red gum) – 1/250m²
- *Eucalyptus siderophloia* (Northern grey ironbark) – 1/500m²
- *Corymbia intermedia* (Pink bloodwood) – 1/700m².

The applicant is requested to only include endemic species from RE12.3.1(a) and to remove all cultivar and non-endemic species.

Note: the Rehabilitation management plan should align with 'conceptual findings of the Geomorphic/Bank Stability Assessment – re required armouring of waterways.

10. Vertical hanging sewer – Yaun Creek conservation corridor.

The applicant is proposing to install a vertical hanging sewer across the Yaun Creek conservation area and channel for a length of over 46m in the northeast part of the site.

To comply with Performance outcome PO5 of the Environmental significance overlay code the applicant is requested to identify a suitable route for the sewer line that does not require a vertical hanging sewer pipe across the Yaun Creek conservation corridor and channel.

Subdivision Engineer

11. Proposed road upgrade for Courtney Drive

The supporting material provided has identified that Courtney Drive can be classified as a Rural Residential Access Road classification with a pavement width of 6.25m. This is not consistent with the zoning of the site (Emerging community) or the geometry conditioned for nearby applications.

The applicant is requested to submit an amended cross section for upgrading Courtney Drive to have a 7.5m wide pavement (comprising of 2 x 3.75m wide moving lanes), kerb & channel (at the subdivision side) and (minimum) 1m sealed shoulder treatment (at the opposite side of the subdivision side).

In addition, the proposed cross section for Courtney Drive adjacent to the waterway shows proposed edge restraint (Type ER2) (subdivision side only) due to mitigate additional overland flow ponding along Courtney Drive. However, the other side will be required to install barrier kerb & channel by others. The applicant is requested to clarify this outcome and proposed edge restraints. The applicant is requested to submit longitudinal section for Courtney Drive at the full frontage of the site and safety limit check of depth and velocity in accordance with Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM) requirements.

12. Typical section – Road 2

The layout of Road 2 has been amended as a result of the changed application. The provided cross sections show proposed 4.5m wide standard southern verge, proposed 6m wide pavement (comprising 3.75m wide pavement (subdivision side) and 2.25m wide pavement (adjoining Lot 182 on RP156422)) and proposed 4.5m wide temporary batter northern verge on 16.5m wide road.

Officers do not support proposed 2.25m wide moving lane and proposed temporary batter. Proposed 2.25m moving lane shall be widened to a 3.75m width and it should have (minimum)

1m flat verge between edge of the requested 3.75m wide pavement and proposed temporary table drain for vehicle safety and protection of pavement structure. If (minimum) 1m flat verge is not available between edge of the requested 3.75 m wide pavement and proposed table drainage system, then it can be a high risk of failure for pavement structure from lateral movement. The applicant is requested to submit amended cross section for Road 2 accordingly.

13. Typical section for Road 5 (Short Stub Road)

The applicant is required to submit amended Cross section for proposed Road 5 showing 2-way crossfalls and barrier kerb & channel (B1) on both sides in accordance with IPWEA Standard Drawing (RS-080).

14. Land dedication for road widening

The provided concept plan shows a proposed 0.5m wide strip of land to be dedicated at the frontage of proposed Lots 645 and 646. Proposed 0.5m wide strip of land dedication cannot achieve a minimum 4.5m wide verge measuring from invert of kerb line of Wright Court to new property boundary lines of proposed Lots 645 and 646.

The applicant is requested to submit an amended ROL plan showing full dimension of proposed land dedication area for road widening at the frontages of proposed Lots 645 and 646 to achieve (minimum) 4.5m wide verge measuring from the invert of existing kerb line to the new property boundaries of proposed Lots 645 and 646.

15. Pedestrian Network Plan

The applicant's response does not include proposed Pedestrian Network Plan. The applicant's response includes:

- Preliminary Roadworks Layout Plan Sheet 1 of 2 (drawing number: P020, issued: C, dated: 26/05/2025, prepared by OSKA);
- Preliminary Roadworks Layout Plan Sheet 2 of 2 (drawing number: P021, issued: C, dated: 26/05/2025, prepared by OSKA); and
- Preliminary Roadworks Typical Cross Sections (drawing number: P029, issued: C, dated: 26/06/25, prepared by OSKA).

These drawings have inconsistent information of proposed footpaths (i.e. widths). The applicant is requested to submit a Pedestrian Network Plan showing:

- Proposed lot and road layout;
- Proposed road numbers;
- Officers have no objection for proposed locations of all proposed footpaths shown on Preliminary Roadworks Layout Plans;
- Proposed 2m wide footpaths within the southern verge of Courtney Drive at the frontage of the site and all proposed public roads (except Road 5); and
- Proposed 1.5m wide footpath to Road 5.

To be read in conjunction with Recreational Planning Item (Recreation Linkage).

Landscape and Open Space

16. Retaining works – private lot

The latest drawings include a retaining works plan within the submitted Statement of Landscape Intent (SLI). However, officers note a discrepancy between this plan and the latest preliminary earthworks drawings regarding the design and location of retaining walls within the site. In addition to these discrepancies, the current design includes retaining walls up to 3 metres high within private lots directly fronting the road verge. These are considered to

negatively impact the visual amenity of the future public road interface. To adequately address Performance outcomes PO4 and PO9 of the General development provisions code, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings reflecting the following details relating to the retaining works within future private lots.

- a. Any proposed retaining wall directly fronting a current or future public road reserve is requested to be setback a minimum 600mm from the new front boundary and allow for screening shrub planting to be incorporated between the face of the retaining wall and the boundary.
(Officers note retaining walls are currently nominated along the future front boundary for proposed lots 101, 112, 126, 201-205, 214, 230, 313, 405, 414, 415, 505, 512, 513, 615, 620, 624, 633, 641 & 645).
- b. Retaining works within private land abutting a public road reserve are requested to be coloured (charcoal) concrete sleepers and made of textured materials (e.g. split-face) or reflect an alternative high-quality retaining wall design.
- c. Where retaining walls fronting a public road reserve are nominated within two tiers, cross-sections of the interface are requested to be included with amended drawings.
- d. The retaining wall plan within the SLI and preliminary earthworks drawings are requested to be reflective of each other and include details of the retaining wall materials.

17. Retaining works – public land

The latest subdivision configuration results in extensive retaining works abutting future Council land or within future Council land. This includes significant retaining works nominated along the interface of future public road reserve and the future conservation lot (proposed Lot 906). SC6.12 City Plan policy – Land development guidelines does not support retaining works within the public road verge and retaining works are not supported within the future conservation lot as the assets are considered to reflect an unreasonable financial/resource burden on Council relating to the future management of the asset. This is considered to reflect a non-compliance with Performance outcome PO8 of the Works for infrastructure code. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings reflecting the following:

- a. All proposed retaining walls (and associated footings) are requested to be wholly located outside the future conservation lot (proposed Lot 906) and located within private land.
- b. Any retaining walls within the public road reserve are requested to be removed and the design is requested to be amended to incorporate batters in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan policy – Land development guidelines.
- c. Any retaining walls within the nominated drainage reserve lots are requested to be removed and be replaced with batters. Any batters within future drainage reserve lots are requested to be no steeper than 1(V):3(H) to allow for tree and shrub planting as per SC6.13 City Plan policy – Landscape work.
- d. Any retaining walls within private lots adjoining the future conservation lot (Lot 906) are requested to be set back a minimum of 200mm from the conservation boundary, in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan policy – Land development guidelines.
- e. Amended preliminary earthworks plans and updated cross-sections are requested to reflect the revised retaining wall locations, setbacks, and design treatments.

18. Street tree planting

The submitted SLI includes indicative street tree planting within future road reserves. However, the absence of a vehicle cross-over (VXO) plan and unresolved service alignments may significantly reduce the number of viable street tree locations. To address Performance outcomes PO15 and PO18 of the Reconfiguring a lot code, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings including the following:

- a. All infrastructure services (including water, sewer, and stormwater) within the road reserve are requested to be located outside the area directly behind the back of kerb to preserve space for street tree planting.
- b. An amended plan nominating the VXO location for each lot is requested to ensure appropriate separation distances between crossovers and street trees.
- c. Street tree planting is requested to be nominated in accordance with SC6.12 and SC6.13 City Plan policies, ensuring compliance with spacing, species selection, and placement standards.
- d. An updated Statement of Landscape Intent (SLI) is requested to reflect the revised street tree planting locations, VXO layout, and service alignments within the road reserves.

19. Infrastructure within conservation lot

The submitted plans nominate infrastructure traversing the future conservation lot (proposed Lot 906) including a vertical hanging sewer pipe and extensive culverts to discharge water directly into Yaun Creek. In accordance with SC6.12 City Plan policy – Land development guidelines the applicant is requested to:

- a. Remove all infrastructure proposed within the conservation lot, except where essential for connection to a legal point of discharge.
- b. Where infrastructure is unavoidable, it is requested to be minimised in extent and designed to limit impacts on the conservation function of the lot.

Recreational Planning

20. Recreation linkage

In accordance with Acceptable outcome AO15 / Performance outcome PO15 of the Reconfiguring a lot code, the development is expected to establish a safe walkable and permeable street network that provides clear pedestrian and cycle access to parks and public transport (among other things). Performance outcome PO25 requires larger subdivisions to provide a public open space network that offers opportunities for residents to conveniently participate in passive recreational activities.

Noting that this is the only trunk park for the Courtney Drive precinct, it's imperative that strong pedestrian linkages are established to the greater Courtney Drive catchment and identified bus stops. Based on the current layout, Officers do not consider this has been achieved.

To support demonstrating compliance with Acceptable outcome AO25.3 for the provision of non-trunk recreational open space, Officers request the plans are amended to demonstrate a non-trunk recreational linkage that supports connection to the greater Courtney Drive catchment.

21. Staging

The Applicant is requested to submit amended plans demonstrating that the delivery of the recreational park will be provided as part of Stage 2 (not 3 as currently shown).

22. Location of southern padmount

The location of the southern padmount is shown within Lot 906 on the ROL plan however, on the SLI, it is shown within the park. The applicant is requested to submit amended plans showing a consistent location of the padmount within Lot 906.

23. Features within the trunk local recreation park

The following comments are provided:

- a. Officers acknowledge the bill of quantities submitted. As no nominal values were provided, Officers are seeking independent advice on the potential cost of the works associated with the park. Following this, Officers can confirm the level of embellishments supported within the park. In the first instance, the half basketball court is required to be

removed from the plans as it will not be captured within LGIP funding. Should the Applicant seek to retain this as part of the development of the park, this will be at the Applicant's expense.

- b. Retaining wall along the frontage of the park – given the height of the retaining wall proposed and that the site falls away behind it, a fence is to be proposed atop of it to support the safety of park users. Fencing is to be open style.
- c. Retaining walls within the park – Officers require further detail to understand the height of retaining walls within the park. Preference is for a single sandstone block/concrete which also doubles as an opportunity for seating.
- d. Setback of retaining walls from footpaths – The Applicant is requested to confirm the proposed setbacks from the retaining walls achieve a minimum setback of 0.5 metres.

24. Trunk recreational linkage

The Applicant has confirmed that to support a suitable drainage outcome, a boardwalk structure is required for part of the recreational linkage. Further to the original Information request item about potential offsets, the Applicant is advised that offsets are only applicable to the footpath, turf and landscaping within the linkage. No offsets are applicable for the boardwalk component (final outcome to be agreed on within an Operational works application) or the land.

Water and Waste

25. Water capacity assessment

The water network configuration near Lot 203 Bailey Mountain Road has been reconfigured. Please note that the newly constructed DI 200 mm main along Bailey Mountain Road now connects to the DI 300 mm main in Old Coach Road, as shown in the figure below (circled).

As such, the alignment of the WSSIP proposed 150 mm main (FPI_25067_PIPE_WSSIP19) along Bailey Mountain Road in the model does not match the actual field configuration. As a result, the proposed boundary valve (CP_41227PIPE_11100085373) in this assessment will not function as intended to form a looped water supply network through the development, linking the Courtney Drive and Bailey Mountain Road networks.

It is recommended that the model be updated in line with the GIS configuration shown in the figure below, and that the modelling be redone to determine the supply strategy for the seven development lots.

City officers will provide the applicant the shape files of the pipes, fittings, valves, and hydrants of the concerned area to facilitate the model update and subsequent analysis. Please note that the new main along Bailey Mountain Road is now a 200 mm main. The model is required to be updated to reflect this and maintain the same size all the way through Courtney Drive. An amended water capacity assessment is required based on the above.



26. Sewer reticulation plan & longitudinal section

Council acknowledges the Preliminary Services Plans (OSK6521-P040, P041 & P042) submitted with the application. However, upon review, the plans show a proposed DN150 PVC sewer main connecting to a manhole across Yaun Creek, with the sewer main crossing the waterway above ground. Please note that Council does not support sewer main crossing the creek. Council also has concerns regarding the constructability of the sewer main, as it would require disturbance of the waterway. Council advise the applicant to consider alternative options. Therefore:

- a. The applicant is requested to amend the preliminary services layout plan and longitudinal section to reflect an alternative option.

27. Circulation and street access design

Council acknowledges the RCV swept path diagrams prepared by Colliers as part of the application submission material, which still depicts multiple dead-end points in the road network where the CoGC RCV is required to undertake a 3-point turn. The applicant is therefore requested to address the following items:

- a. Provide a minimum 18m diameter cul-de-sac head to facilitate kerbside wheelie bin collection at all dead-end locations.
- b. Council acknowledges that the Colliers traffic response is signed by a RPEQ, however, as the swept paths will form part of the conditions, all RCV swept path diagrams must also be signed by an appropriately qualified RPEQ.

28. Additional information

The applicant is requested to provide justification as to why both water and sewer services are located within the same verge, and why sewer services have been duplicated along some sections of a verge within the same road.

Transport Planning

29. Transport code

Revisions to Colliers' IR Response (dated 3/07/2025) are required in order to demonstrate compliance with Performance outcome PO11, PO13 and PO16 of the Transport code, including:

- a. Colliers' IR Response identifies that Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD) is not achieved at the following proposed new intersection locations:

- Courtney Drive access to proposed Stage 6; and
- Proposed new public road intersection with Baileys Mountain Road.

The applicant is requested to:

- Submit revised 'Concept Plans' (i.e. functional intersection layout and development layout drawings) to demonstrate relocation of the proposed intersections in order to achieve compliant SISD, in accordance with Austroads requirements.
 - A revised Traffic Engineering assessment shall be submitted to support the revised 'Concept Plan', demonstrating that compliant SISD is achieved. Of note – commentary provided in Colliers' response does not justify non-compliant sight distances (data from multiple surveys identifies 85th percentile speeds of (at least) 70km/h on Baileys Mountain Road; signage does not overcome physical sight distance deficiencies; vegetation clearing is already considered in the assessment; and provision of turning treatments does not alter sight distance requirements). Compliant SISD must be demonstrated, particularly considering that the proposed development is in a greenfield site.
Note: A functional layout drawing for the proposed new intersection in Baileys Mountain Road has not been submitted and is requested to be submitted in responding to this item.
- The 'Concept Layout – BAR turn and BAL treatments - Site Location 01' drawing for the proposed Courtney Drive access (to 'Stage 6') does not demonstrate compliance with Austroads standards, with specific regard to the minimum width for the eastbound lane (i.e. eastbound through lane width, plus pavement widening to facilitate vehicle passing). Please note:
 - The additional widening required for the eastbound lane to achieve compliance would result in a non-compliant verge width (NW side of Courtney Drive) for the proposed intersection location. Revised 'Concept Plans', for both the proposed intersection configuration and development layout, shall be submitted, demonstrating a revised intersection design that achieves compliance with Austroads and Council requirements (noting that 'urban', not 'rural' design standards must be applied).
 - This is likely to require altering the alignment of the intersection (relocation further to the SE i.e. take more land from the subject site) in order to achieve sufficient width for pavement and verge requirements.
 - Clearly identify the total number of lots / dwellings that have been adopted as the 'ultimate' traffic catchment for the design of the proposed new intersection in Baileys Mountain Road. While pages 2 and 13 of Colliers' IR Response identify a number of 'development' sites, current development proposals and approvals, the report doesn't identify which sites have been included in the 'ultimate' traffic catchment for the proposed intersection design. To be clear, the traffic 'catchment' (for design of the new intersection in Baileys Mountain Road) shall also include development yield for Lot 182RP156422.
 - The Traffic Engineering assessment shall be updated to include a table clearly identifying the specific lots, together with the associated number of dwellings for each lot, to clearly identify the total number of dwellings and adopted for the traffic 'catchment' that will use the proposed intersection.

- e. Clearly identify the 'blue' and 'red' trip volumes (in Figure 1 of Colliers' IR Response) as 'AM' and 'PM' volumes.
- f. Undertake revised turning warrants assessments, in addition to SIDRA Intersection assessments (where identified below), through to the 10-year design horizon, for the following intersections:
 - i. Proposed new intersection in Baileys Mountain Road (SIDRA assessment also required).
 - ii. Courtney Drive / Jenkins Court / Baileys Mountain Road intersection (revised SIDRA assessment also required).
 - iii. Proposed new intersection in Courtney Drive ('Stage 6' access).

with the following parameters applied:

- Growth rates consistent with Council's initial Information Request (i.e. for Baileys Mountain Road, use a compounding growth rate of 5.5% p.a., to 2037), rather than growth based on LGIP population estimates and growth, as adopted in Colliers' IR Response.
- Revised traffic 'catchment', as identified in part c.
- With specific regard to the Courtney Drive 'Stage 6' access - revised through traffic volumes on Courtney Drive, incorporating 'development' traffic for both the subject development proposal and any development approvals / current development applications in the Courtney Drive Precinct).
- Intersection layouts adopted for SIDRA assessments shall also be submitted as part of this request.

Note - configurations for the above intersections have not been endorsed as part of any other Council development applications / approvals.

- g. Submit revised 'functional layout' drawings to demonstrate any changes required to intersection designs / configurations, for the locations identified in part f. Functional layout drawings shall be fully dimensioned to demonstrate compliance with all relevant (Austroads and Council) standards.

Note – a functional layout drawing has not been submitted for the proposed new intersection with Baileys Mountain Road and shall be submitted in response to this item; non-compliances with respect to the proposed intersection configuration for the Courtney Drive 'Stage 6' access have been identified in part b, herein.

- h. With further regard to the 'functional layout' drawing for the Courtney Drive / Baileys Mountain Road intersection ('Concept Layout – Road Widening Details'), demonstrate that the proposed pavement widening on the SW corner of the intersection can be accommodated while maintaining a compliant verge width (4.5m, minimum). Cadastral boundaries shall be shown, along with critical dimensions, to assist in this demonstration.
- i. Submit updated swept paths (using the 'design service vehicle') based on any amendments made to intersection designs / configurations.
- j. Clearly identify all land requirements, for the purpose of road, on all 'functional layout' drawings. To be clear, land requirements shall be shown for all relevant components, including:
 - i. To accommodate the proposed new intersection in Baileys Mountain Road.
 - ii. To accommodate the proposed new public road (along the SE boundary of lot 183RP156422).

- iii. To accommodate Council's planned upgrades to Baileys Mountain Road.
- iv. To accommodate proposed changes to the Courtney Drive / Jenkins Court / Baileys Mountain Road intersection.
- v. To accommodate the proposed intersection in Courtney Drive for 'Stage 6'.

Land requirements for 'Council' works and 'development-related' works shall be clearly delineated on drawings (for example, colour-coded) to ensure that each land requirement, for each purpose, is clearly distinguished.

- k. Ensure that 'development layouts' and 'functional layout' drawings (for intersection / road works) are consistent.
- l. The Traffic Engineering response shall also ensure that consistency is achieved with regard to Traffic Engineering assessments / requirements for other development applications / approvals in the Courtney Drive Precinct.

Further Advice

1. Access to Courtney Drive

The applicant is requested to give consideration to other applications that are currently under assessment in proximity to the proposed development. Specifically, the applicant is requested to consider proposed access for Lot 11 Courtney Drive and demonstrate that the two access points from Courtney Drive meet the relevant standards.

Please note the following points are being resolved directly with the consulting Hydraulic Engineer:

- Afflux is to be limited to no more than 10 mm outside the property boundary. It is required to be demonstrated that the upgraded Courtney Drive achieves safety criteria in accordance with QUDM for pedestrian and /or vehicular crossing during major flood events.
- A letter of consent from the neighbouring landowner acknowledging and accepting any potential impacts to their property.

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, Kyra Reid, copied into the email kreid@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



Ali Davey

AI/Coordinator Planning Assessment (North)

For the Chief Executive Officer

Council of the City of Gold Coast

Appendix A: Recommended conditions (non-trunk)

1	Traffic Signals - Rangeview Road and Reserve Road a. Design and construct traffic signals at the intersection of Rangeview Road and Reserve Road at no cost to council. b. All works must be in accordance with Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4A: Unsignalised and Signalised Intersections, Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), City Planning Policy – Land Development Guidelines and Australian standards. c. Construct and maintain the intersection identified above at no cost to Council until the asset is accepted “off maintenance” in accordance with the procedures in City Plan Policy SC6.11– Land development guidelines, section 2 – Transport network standards, section 7 – Procedures, section 8.5 – As-constructed requirements, section 9 - Specifications and section 10 – Standard drawings.
2	Baileys Mountain Road and Old Coach Road intersection a. Design and construct a 600mm wide raised centre median, including signage and linemarking, on Old Coach Road at the intersection of Baileys Mountain Road and Old Coach Road that prohibits right turn movements into Baileys Mountain Road and prohibits right turn movements into Old Coach Road at no cost to council. b. Construct and maintain the intersection identified above at no cost to Council until the asset is accepted “off maintenance” in accordance with the procedures in City Plan Policy SC6.11– Land development guidelines, section 2 – Transport network standards, section 7 – Procedures, section 8.5 – As-constructed requirements, section 9 - Specifications and section 10 – Standard drawings.
3	Bus Stop Shelter a. Design and construct a Type 1A bus shelter on Reserve Road near Lawson Street (Stop ID 301357) in accordance with the Public Transport Infrastructure Manual, Department of Transport and Main Roads, June 2020, Chapter 5 – Bus stop infrastructure at no cost to council. b. Construct and maintain the shelter identified above at no cost to Council until the asset is accepted “off maintenance” in accordance with the procedures in City Plan Policy SC6.11– Land development guidelines, section 2 – Transport network standards, section 7 – Procedures, section 8.5 – As-constructed requirements, section 9 - Specifications and section 10 – Standard drawings.