BRISBANE
Level 12, 126 Margaret Street,
Brisbane, QLD 4000
t. 07 3217 5800

GOLD COAST
Level 4, Central Tower One,
56 Scarborough Street,
Southport, QLD 4215
t. 07 3101 4157

HPC Ref: 25641
Council Ref: ROL/2026/37

11 August 2026

Sent via: email

City of Gold Coast
PO Box 5042
GCMC, QLD 9729
mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au

Attention: Jozef Ewing

Dear Jozef,

Information Request response under Part 3(13) of the *Development Assessment Rules*: Reconfiguring a lot (1 into 18 Lots) on land at 98 Glenmore Drive, Bonogin, properly described as Lot 1 on RP218875

This Information Request was issued by the City of Gold Coast Council as assessment manager on 26 April 2026. This correspondence is accompanied by supporting documents and additional information as demonstrated below.

Attachment	Report
A	Reconfiguring a lot plan, prepared by Legend Consultants
B	Bulk Earthworks and Civil services Plan, prepared by Legend Consultants
C	Engineering Infrastructure Report, prepared by Legend Consultants
D	Site Based Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by Legend Consultants
E	Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Legend consultants
F	Bushfire Management Plan, prepared by QLD Bushfire Risk Assessments
G	Site and Soil Wastewater Evaluation Report, prepared by Country Wide Water
H	Statement of Landscape Intent, prepared by Dune Street
I	Ecological response, prepared by Ultimate Planning Solutions
J	SARA Ecological response, prepared by Ultimate Planning Solutions

Preamble

In response to the Information request issued by Council as Assessment Manager on 26 April 2026, the proposed development has been amended to include a Community Title Scheme (CTS) involving proposed Lots 7-17 and the internal road and proprietary stormwater assets. The proposed change allows for an interconnected stormwater management regime whereby proposed Lots 7-10 and 17 will drain to a new shared asset detention take located under the cul-de-sac head, before discharging to the existing waterway within the site. The proposed change also includes amendments to the internal road entrance, including new visitor intercom area prior to approaching the gated access. The change results in previously proposed Council assets to be privately owned and managed by the future body corporate.

Information Request Response

Planning Assessment

1. Proposed Lot 900

Officers request clarification regarding proposed Lot 900, which encompasses the existing natural waterway and proposed bio-retention basin. Is this Lot proposed to be dedicated to Council?

Response:

In response to Item 1, proposed Lot 900 has been removed and all lots remain private or part of the abovementioned community title scheme.

Civil Engineering

2. Stormwater Management Plan accuracy

Healthy Waters Code PO7

The submitted Stormwater Management Plan states that the site contains no influencing localised external catchments. This is inconsistent with site topography, which indicates inflow from the western catchment.

The applicant is requested to:

a. Review and revise the Stormwater Management Plan to accurately reflect external catchment inflows; and update supporting plans and calculations accordingly.

Response:

In response to Item 2, The external catchments have been clarified in the revised Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan - LC25079-0002-SWMP-A Section 4.5, and the SMP Plans in the Appendices. A site meeting was also held with City Officers on 3 June 2026 to further clarify that there is no influencing external catchment to the site.

Please refer to the revised Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by Legend Consultants within **Attachment D.**

3. Stormwater Pits and Pipes Alignment

General Development Provisions Code PO10 and PO11

The proposed pits and pipes alignment is in open space, which is not supported. The applicant is requested to revise the stormwater layout such that:

a. Stormwater infrastructure is located within inter-allotment drainage alignments; and

b. Appropriate public easements are provided over the inter-allotment system in accordance with Council requirements.

Response:

In response to Item 3, there is no longer open space or Inter-allotment drainage.

4. External Catchments & Overland Flow

General Development Provisions Code PO10 and Healthy Waters Code PO5 (Stormwater quantity).

The submitted Stormwater Management Plan states that no external catchments influence the site. However, review of the plans and contours indicates that external overland flow enters the site, particularly affecting Lot 8 and the western boundary.

Council requires development to not obstruct overland flow paths or external catchments.

The applicant is requested to provide a revised Stormwater Management Plan that:

a. Accurately delineates all catchments, including external contributing catchments.

b. Clearly identifies flow paths and directions across the site for all events (minor and major);

c. Demonstrates how external flows are:

   i. Safely conveyed through the site; and

   ii. Discharged to a lawful point of discharge;

Response:

In response to Item 4, the external catchments has been clarified in the revised CSMP LC25079-0002-SWMP-A Section 4.5 and the SMP Plans in the Appendices. A site meeting was also held with council officers 3 June 2026 to further clarify that there is no influencing external catchment to the site.

5. Bio-Retention Basin Location (Inline Waterway)

Healthy Waters Code PO3 and LDG Section 4.5.14.5

The proposed bio-retention basin is located inline with a natural waterway / overland flow path, which is not supported.

Council requires stormwater treatment systems to be located offline from waterways.

The applicant is requested to relocate the bio-retention basin offline from the natural waterway; or where relocation is not feasible, provide detailed justification demonstrating:

a. Adequate bypass of high flows;

b. Protection of the treatment system from major events;

c. No adverse impacts to waterway stability or function.

Response:

In response to Item 5, this is no longer applicable as the bio basin is no longer proposed. Individual lots will utilise rainwater tanks with level spreader outlets where they cannot connect to the system in the new road. The new road and the balance lots are treated via a buried system below the cul-de-sac head with a community title scheme for the maintenance of the road and associated stormwater system.

6. Stormwater Quantity & Detention Strategy

Healthy Waters Code PO5

The proposal relies on on-lot detention systems for each lot, which is not supported.

The applicant is requested to provide a revised stormwater quantity strategy that:

a. Removes reliance on individual lot detention systems;

b. Provides a centralised detention solution; and

c. Demonstrates that post-development peak flows:

   i. Do not exceed pre-development peak flows for relevant AEP events

Response:

In response to Item 6, the proposed development is a rural residential development where rainwater tanks and level spreaders are standard practice. This is the proposed system where lots cannot connect to the system in the new road. The new road and the balance lots are treated via a buried system below the cul-de-sac head.

7. MUSIC Modelling Assumptions

Healthy Waters Code PO3 and MUSIC Guidelines (Section 4.7)

The MUSIC model utilises "buffer" nodes, which are only appropriate for distributed (sheet) flow conditions.

Based on the layout:

a. Flow appears concentrated within drainage systems

b. Use of buffers likely overestimates treatment performance

Please provide a revised MUSIC model files;

a. Removal of buffers where flows are concentrated;

b. Appropriate representation of bypass flows where treatment is not achieved;

Response:

In response to Item 7, the MUSIC and DRAINS modelling files have been provided for council's reference. The system utilises rainwater tanks for quantity management and a quality treatment system below the cul-de-sac head for road areas.

8. Inter-Allotment Drainage & Easements

General Development Provisions Code PO10 & PO11

Stormwater infrastructure is proposed outside defined inter-allotment drainage alignments without clear provision of drainage easements.

Revise the stormwater layout to locate drainage infrastructure within inter-allotment drainage alignments.

Provide drainage easements where flows pass through private property; demonstrate a lawful point of discharge is available for all lots.

Response:

In response to Item 8, only lot 16 has an easement for major event flows from the cul-de-sac end and through the existing waterway. The easement is only for body corporate maintenance access and to ensure the flow path can be kept clear.

9. Road 1 Safety (Vehicles & Pedestrians)

General Development Provisions Code PO10 and QUDM safety principles (VxD / flow velocity-depth criteria - Table 7.3.6

Road 1 appears to function as part of the major flow path, creating a potential hazard to vehicles and pedestrians and conflict between drainage and transport function.

The applicant is requested to demonstrate that:

a. Major flow paths within Road 1 comply with acceptable VxD safety criteria;

b. Flow depths and velocities do not pose a hazard;

c. Appropriate mitigation measures are provided (e.g. diversion, basin interception, grading).

Response:

In response to Item 9, there is no influencing external catchment to the development and only lots 7, 8, 9 and 10 drain to the proposed road in major events. The piped stormwater system in Road 1 has been designed to accommodate major flows so that they are captured and treated by the system buried below the cul-de-sac

head. As such, major flows do not remain at surface on the proposed road and are not a hazard for vehicles and pedestrians.

10. Retaining Wall Height (Approx. 7m)

PO9 – General development provisions code

The proposal includes a retaining structure of approximately 7m in height, which raises concerns in relation to visual amenity, public safety (including potential fall hazard and structural failure risk), and ongoing maintenance liability.

The applicant is requested to submit a revised design that either:

a. reduces reliance on high single-tier retaining structures through regrading and earthworks optimisation; or

b. provides detailed engineering justification addressing:

   i. structural feasibility and constructability;

   ii. geotechnical and structural stability considerations; and

   iii. integration with overland flow paths, stormwater conveyance, and drainage performance.

Preference is for design solutions that avoid a single large retaining wall system. Where such a structure is unavoidable, only reinforced cast-in-situ concrete retaining walls will be considered acceptable. Any wall of this height must also incorporate appropriate public safety measures, including protective barriers/handrails and adequate setback from publicly accessible areas.

In relation to the additional smaller and stepped retaining structures shown on Drawing LC25079.C151, these are indicated as concrete sleeper walls. Council does not support the use of concrete sleeper retaining walls exceeding 1.0m in height, as they are not considered to achieve the 100-year design life requirement under Council's Asset Management Plan (AMP) for major retaining assets.

The applicant is also requested to confirm whether these small retaining structures are intended to be transferred to Council as future public assets. Noting Council's preference is for gravity-based retaining systems that reduce long-term maintenance burden and improve durability performance.

Response:

In response to Item 10, the proposed retaining wall along the north side of the proposed road will remain in private ownership. The wall is designed and certified by structural RPEQ and has been assessed by the geotechnical engineers for a minimum factor of safety of 1.5.

11. Roadside Hazard Assessment

The applicant must submit a roadside hazard assessment in accordance with the relevant requirements of *Austroads Guide to Road Design – Part 6: Roadside Design, Safety and Barriers*, and demonstrate that any required safety treatments and mitigation measures have been designed and installed, including, where warranted, safety barriers, guardrails, end treatments, and other roadside protection measures.

Response:

In response to Item 11, a guardrail is proposed along the top of the proposed 7m high retaining wall along the north side of the road and along the south boundary of proposed Lot 17. The guardrail is adjacent to the road reserve boundary and back from the kerb line. It does not pose a road safety hazard and provides a safety barrier in the event a vehicle traverses the verge towards the high retaining wall. The guardrail also acts as a pedestrian barrier. A footpath is not proposed in this area so pedestrian movement near the high retaining is not encouraged.

12. Strategic Framework

3.7 Living with Nature

3.7.4 Element Nature Conservation

3.7.4.1 – Specific Outcomes

The Ecological assessment for 98 Glenmore Drive submitted by Ultimate Planning Solutions, February 2026 identified numerous foraging sites (chewed orts) for the Glossy Black Cockatoo (GBC) (Calyptorhynchus lathami lathami) – which has the following conservation status:

- Vulnerable – Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)
- Vulnerable – Queensland Nature Conservation Act 1992
- Priority species (L1) – City Plan 2016

Six foraging sites for the Glossy Black Cockatoo were identified in the southeastern part of the site of which three are contained within the covenant area – two of which in the outer edge of the covenant area.

The Ecological site assessment is considered a relevant matter under an Impact Assessment application.

The applicant is requested to prepare and submit an amended plan of development and environmental covenant areas by including 5 of the 6 foraging sites in the southeast of the site into the covenant areas:

a. A minimum 30m buffer is to be provided GBC feed trees (forage site).

b. Lot 12 is to be part deleted and could be part amalgamated into Lot 11.

c. The covenant area in Lot 13 is to be extended to capture the forage site record.

Note: City Officers are available to workshop this issue.

Response:

In response to Item 12, this issue has been workshopped with City Officers where the following design measures have been incorporated:

- Removal of Lot 12
- Expansion of the environmental protection areas to incorporate:
  - An additional GBC forage site and 15m buffer
  - An expansion of the minor waterway buffer adjacent Lots 17 and 18 by 15m
  - An expansion of the minimum waterway buffer in the southeast to 65m
  - Increase in area from 5.43ha to 5.58ha

Please refer to the GCCC Information Request Response, prepared by Ultimate Planning Solutions, dated July 2026 located within **Attachment I.**

13. Stormwater treatment

PO5 - Environmental significance overlay code.

The proposal includes bio-retention basins inline with a natural waterway / overland flow path. Information request item 4 states that this is not supported, that stormwater treatment systems are to be located offline from waterways.

If in addressing item 4, Council accepts the retention of the inline basins, the applicant is requested to demonstrate that the proposed location of inline stormwater basins in two existing small farm dams provide a superior ecological outcome than restoring the primary order waterway and locating the stormwater infrastructure external to this mapped waterway. Determination of a superior ecological outcome for the stormwater infrastructure location should consider the following:

a. Extent of the impact on mapped vegetation and koala habitat area for both online and offline options

b. Catchment area of the primary order waterway and ephemeral status of the channel

c. Extent of the existing channel area degradation and potential for rehabilitation with both the online and offline options

d. Design integration of the proposed basins for the online proposal

Note: Should the applicant not demonstrate a superior ecological outcome for the online stormwater infrastructure, then offline stormwater infrastructure is requested.

In response to Item 13, Please refer to Item 6 above. The internal water is to remain in its existing state and functionality

14. Setback to Waterway

PO5 Environmental significance overlay code

The applicant is requested to increase the width of the environmental covenant area from 10m to 15m width from the primary waterway channel for Lots 17 & 18. A retaining wall external to the covenant area to facilitate this outcome is accepted for Lots 17 & 18.

The applicant is requested to increase the minor width of the environmental covenant area to 60m from the Major waterway mapping (Bonogin creek) and State wetland mapping. This impacts on the viability of Lot 12 which has been requested to be part deleted in Point 2 of this Information request

Response:

In response to Item 14, the setbacks have been adjusted on the plan of development LC25079-C001-G as well as the engineering plans.

15. Medium priority vegetation

PO10 Environmental significance overlay code

The applicant is requested to confirm the extent of Medium priority vegetation (area) that is to be removed for the purposes of calculating the MLES environmental offset.

Response:

In response to Item 15, the area of least concern MPV to be removed is 0.9967ha, calculated to be $249,502.91.

16. Rehabilitation of Environmental covenant area

PO23 and PO26 Environmental significance overlay code

The site has areas of weed infestation after cattle were removed from the property approximately 16 years ago. The applicant is proposing an environmental covenant area instead of public open space dedication which creates concern of ongoing weed management within the areas of environmental significance.

The applicant is requested to provide a Combined Covenant management plan and Rehabilitation management plan for the environmental covenant area. Rehabilitation is to include the following:

a. Rehabilitation of the covenant area is requested to be for a 4 year timeframe to allow for the management of threatening weeds by experienced assisted regeneration practitioners.

b. Landowners would be advised of the arrangement and an agreement would be required to allow for access for bush regenerators for the duration of the 4 years covenant management plan. A property notification will be added to the decision notice.

Note: Consideration would be given to allow for bonding after a minimum of 12 months rehabilitation.

Response:

In response to Item 16, please refer to the amended Rehabilitation Management Plan, prepared by Ultimate Planning Solutions, where the updated management plan responds to concerns raised by council regarding the rehabilitation timeframe by setting out practical rehabilitation actions, monitoring requirements and maintenance responsibilities to support the long term ecological function of the covenant area.

17. Amended Plans

PO3 and PO7 – Bushfire hazard overlay code

The applicant is requested to prepare and submit an amended Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) and Plan of development to provide the following setbacks (dimensions) from the environmental covenant boundary for within each lot.

a. 2m setback for land application areas.

b. 5m setback from the environmental covenant boundary to exclude non habitable uses such as swimming pools and sheds.

c. 29kW/m2 radiant heat flux (BAL-29) contour.

Response:

In response to Item 17, please refer to the amended Bushfire Management Plan, prepared by Queensland Bushfire Risk Assessments, located within **Attachment F.**

18. Amended Statement of Landscape Intent required

Lot 18 of the proposed development includes a three-tiered retaining wall up to 4.5 metres in height. The retaining wall is considered to create a negative amenity impact to the future Lot owners, adjoining Lots, and the street frontage (will be visible from the cul-de-sac). The retaining wall does not demonstrate the amenity outcomes required by PO1 of the Reconfiguring a lot code and PO9 of the General development provisions code. The applicant is requested to provide landscaping to screen the retaining walls to demonstrate amenity outcomes, including the screening of any retaining walls proposed to the street frontage resulting from changes to the development layout to address other Council information request items.

The Statement of Landscape Intent is requested to include additional detail to demonstrate the outcomes required by PO4 of the General development provisions code and the standards required for land to be dedicated as public open space in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan Policy– Land development guidelines and SC6.13 – Landscape works Policy.

Advice Note: Other Council information request items require changes to the development layout, including the Bio-retention Basin, which need to be considered when addressing this item.

The applicant is requested to amend the Statement of Landscape Intent to demonstrate the following:

a. The three-tiered retaining wall within Lot 18 is demonstrated to be adequately screened by landscaping. Screening shrubs are demonstrated along the entire length of each horizontal bench (between each tier) with appropriate evergreen species such as *Syzygium australe* 'Straight and Narrow), *Syzygium resilience*, or similar.

b. Demonstrate landscape treatments for all batters within the Bio-retention Basin and Drainage Reserve (Lot 900) in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan Policy - Land development guidelines, Section 4.5.24.3, Table 4.36.

c. Demonstrate landscape treatments for the Bio-retention Basin (filter media) in accordance with City Plan Policy SC6.12– Land development guidelines, Section 4.5.24.3.

d. Demonstrate the location for vehicle crossovers and vehicle access gates to the drainage reserve in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan Policy - Land development guidelines and standard drawing 05-016. Identify standard vehicle exclusion bollards along the road frontage interface of all public open space areas in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan Policy - Land development guidelines and standard drawing 05-716.

e. Demonstrate street tree layout planting in accordance with SC6.12 City Plan Policy - Land development guidelines – Standard drawing 05-103 – Street tree planting set out guidelines for roadworks.

f. Provide cross-section elevations over all interfaces demonstrating retaining wall setbacks, treatment of the streetscape interface (within private lots), and landscaping over the Drainage Reserve and Bio-retention Basin.

Response:

In response to Item 18, please refer to the amended Statement of Landscape Intent, prepared by Dune Street, located within **Attachment H** whilst the cross sections for the retaining walls are located within **Attachment B**.

19. Reconfiguring a lot code

Road access – PO3

Proposed Lots 11 and 12 will not have direct access to a public road, and will instead achieve vehicle access via an access strip and easement, respectively. The 'Concept Development Layout Plan' shows the access strip and easement being located side-by-side, rather than the easement (for Lot 12) being located within the access strip. Based on this arrangement, it appears that vehicle crossovers for Lots 11 and 12 would be located side-by-side (i.e. two vehicle crossings within a very short distance); however, proposed vehicle access arrangements for Lots 11 and 12 have not been identified on the 'Roadworks Layout Plan' (despite indicative vehicle crossing locations being identified for all other lots).

To assist in demonstrating compliance with PO3, the applicant is requested to demonstrate the proposed vehicle access arrangements for Lots 11 and 12 (i.e. the intended vehicle crossing locations from 'Road 1').

Response:

In response to Item 19, Please refer to Appendix A of the Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Legend Consultants, which includes the revised Development Plan. Lots 11 and12 have been amalgamated into a single lot and will be served by one driveway crossover to Road 1. As a result, the previously proposed access strip and easement arrangement is no longer required, and only one vehicle access point is proposed.

20. Reconfiguring a lot code

Road access – PO4

Lot 12 is proposed to be accessed via an easement. Submit an updated 'Concept Development Layout Plan', identifying relevant details with respect to the proposed easement, including:

a. Clearly identify the easement as part of Lot 11 (via a notation directly attached to the easement, rather than within the 'Legend' only).

b. Identify the purpose of the easement.

c. Identify the burdened / favoured lots with respect to the easement.

Response:

In response to Item 20, please refer to the response provided in Item 19.

21. Reconfiguring a lot code

Circulation and street access design – Strategic Outcomes 3.6.1(5) & 3.6.3(4), PO15

Transport code *Roads and freight – PO11*

a. <u>'Road 1' design</u>

The proposed design of 'Road 1' is inconsistent with Council's typical road cross-sections, per the Land development guidelines (the proposed 7.5m wide pavement, with kerb and channel, appears to be a combination of a 'Rural Residential Access Street' and a 'Rural Access Street' profile). To comply with AO15 of the ROL code and AO11 of the Transport code, 'Road 1' shall be designed to a 'Rural Residential Access Street' standard, comprising a 6m wide pavement, with 'rollover' kerb and channel. The following information shall be provided, in this regard:

i. All application material shall reflect a 'Rural Residential Access Street' profile for 'Road 1'.

ii. Drawings shall identify proposed longitudinal grades for 'Road 1', demonstrating compliance with the requirements of Council's *Land development guidelines*.

b. <u>Public footpath</u>

In the event of development approval being granted, construction of a 2m wide public footpath would be required along the site's frontage to Glenmore Drive. The existing public footpath is located on the opposite side of Glenmore Drive and terminates at Leyshon Drive; therefore, crossing points (kerb ramps) will be required to provide pedestrian connectivity between the existing and new footpaths. To comply with AO15 of the ROL code, identify a compliant location for kerb ramps, on both sides of Glenmore Drive, demonstrating compliant sight distance between drivers and pedestrians. The location of proposed kerb ramps shall be clearly identified on development drawings.

Response:

In response to Item 21, please refer to the Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Legend Consultants where the internal road (now privatised) proposes a 7.5m pavement width, exceeding the minimum width described within the Street Design Manual where consisting of a road with less than 50 allotments. with regard to the public footpath, please refer to Attachment A within the Traffic Impact assessment which identify the proposed 2m wide public footpath along the Glenmore Drive frontage and kerb ramps on both sides of Glenmore Drive

22. Reconfiguring a lot code

Circulation and street access design – Strategic Outcomes 3.6.1(7), 3.6.1(8), 3.6.3(4), 3.6.4(4), 3.6.4(5) & PO16

Driveways and vehicle crossings code

Location – PO6

To demonstrate compliance with PO16 of the ROL code and AO6.1 of the Driveways and vehicle crossings code, submit a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), endorsed by an RPEQ. The TIA shall include demonstration that transport infrastructure proposed as part of the subdivision achieves compliance with the relevant design standards, including:

a. Sight distance – Glenmore Drive / 'Road 1' intersection: Glenmore Drive exhibits vertical and horizontal alignment changes in the vicinity of the proposed 'Road 1' intersection location (a bend in the road to the north, and a crest to the south). Undertake a sight distance assessment to demonstrate that the proposed location of the Glenmore Drive / 'Road 1' intersection achieves compliant Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD), in accordance with Austroads requirements. Austroads requires the 85th percentile speed to be determined at the proposed intersection location to assess sight distance.

Note - any changes required to the intersection location to achieve compliant SISD may have significant implications for the development proposal (including, but not limited to, lot layout and yield, environmental, bushfire and hydraulic outcomes, etc). The applicant is advised to address intersection sight distance as a matter of priority in order to progress assessment of the proposal.

b. Intersection spacing – Glenmore Drive / 'Road 1' intersection: the proposed 'Road 1' intersection with Glenmore Drive is situated in close proximity to the existing intersection of Glenmore Drive / Sehmish Court. As part of the TIA, address the location and design of the proposed new intersection, and in particular its separation from the Sehmish Court intersection, having regard to all relevant Austroads requirements and giving consideration to road function, 85th percentile speeds, sight distance, intersection form and safety outcomes.

c. Sight distance – 'direct' lot access (Glenmore Drive): a number of lots propose direct vehicle access from Glenmore Drive. Glenmore Drive exhibits both vertical and horizontal alignment changes; submit a sight distance assessment demonstrating that AS2890.1-compliant sight distance will be achieved for all lots proposed with direct access from Glenmore Drive. Of note, AS2890.1 requires 85th percentile speeds to be determined at the proposed access locations to assess sight distance.

d. Vehicle access locations – 'direct' lot access: indicative vehicle crossing locations are identified on the 'Roadworks Layout Plan'. Further information is required to demonstrate compliant vehicle access locations for the following lots:

    i. Lot 7: in the event of development approval being granted, access to Lot 7 would be required from proposed 'Road 1', rather than Glenmore Drive (as proposed) i.e. from the 'lower order' road. Demonstrate that a compliant vehicle access location for Lot 7 can be achieved from 'Road 1'.

    ii. Lot 18: vehicle access to Lot 18 is proposed on the inside of a 90-degree bend; it appears that AS2890.1-compliant sight distance cannot be achieved from this alignment of 'Road 1'. Demonstrate that a compliant vehicle access location can be achieved for Lot 18 from the 'east-west' alignment of 'Road 1'.

Response:

In response to Item 2, please refer to attachment C within the Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Legend Consultants, demonstrating the development achieves adequate visibility for safe vehicle movements to and from the internal road and Glenmore Drive facing allotments.

23. Transport code

Roads and freight – PO12

Corner truncations shown on the 'Concept Development Layout Plan' do not appear to align with the requirements of AO12.1 of the Transport code. Submit amended drawings demonstrating that all 'corner lots' created as part of the subdivision include corner truncations consistent with the requirements of AO12.1, and consistent with corner truncations provided for existing corner lots in the locality (3-chord truncations).

Response:

In response to Item 23, the proposed road is to be private, but corner truncation has been provided to ensure forward visibility.

In accordance with Part 3(s13) of the *Development Assessment Rules*, we have provided all of the information requested. Please consider the information request period finished and proceed with the assessment of the application.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the office on (07) 3217 5800 or 0413 909 802.

Yours sincerely,
HPC Planning
A.B.N. 93 670 815 022



Thomas Stubbs
Senior Town Planner
Thomas.s@hpcplanning.com.au