Ms. Sue Wilkinson
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Assessment Team
City of Gold Coast
PO Box 5042
GCMC, Queensland 9729

Tuesday, 2 August 2022

Dear Sue,

Re: Response to Information Request for MCU/2021/144 @ 2 Karingal Drive, Pimpama

Devalign is in receipt of Council's Information Request dated 7 May 2021. Accordingly, we formally submit the following information to enable Council Officers to finalise your assessment of the proposal.

1. Written Response to the Council Information Request (see page 2 onwards);
2. Attachment A – Concept Plan of Development (Revised);
3. Attachment B – Technical Engineering Response;
4. Attachment C – Letter of Advice of Watercourse Determination; and
5. Attachment D – Virtual Development Flythrough.

We are confident that the information that has been prepared and submitted will enable Council to favourably consider the development proposal.

If you have any questions relating to the submitted materials, please feel free to contact me to discuss this matter further, either by phone (0402-482-955) or email shane@devalign.com.au.

Many thanks for your time,

Shane Murrihy

Shane Murrihy
Senior Town Planner and Development Manager

Written Response to the Council Information Request

The following table details the response to the contents of Council's Information Request.

Information Request Item	Comments
TOWN PLANNING **1. Setbacks** *Acceptable outcome AO1 of the Medium density residential zone code requires a front setback of 4.0 metres. Officers consider that the proposed 900mm setback to Karingal Drive does not comply with Performance outcome PO1 of the zone code as it does not provide adequate setback to support landscaping and contribute to the streetscape character. Setbacks are addressed further below by the Principal Architect / Urban Designer and Landscape Assessment.* *The applicant is requested to increase the setback as requested by Landscape Assessment to the Karingal Drive road frontage to demonstrate compliance with PO1.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), specifically Plan Reference 'JPD-P24-KDP-101', which shows a 4.0m road boundary setback to Karingal Drive.
2. Density *Performance outcome PO5 of the Medium density residential zone code stipulates a density not exceeding one dwelling per 400m^2. While the surrounding developments include a range of lot sizes and densities, Officers do not support the proposed development footprint and number of units, given the constraints on the subject site and issues raised below in this Information Request. The applicant is therefore requested to reduce the proposed development footprint, number of units and overall density to respond to site constraints and the issues raised in this Information Request, in addition to any issues raised by the State in relation to mapped koala habitat.*	In discussions with the proponent and upon examining the extensive variety of medium-density residential projects in direct proximity to the site, it is clear that the revised development proposal satisfactorily addresses the detail contained in this RFI item. Further, we point to the Letter of Advice of Watercourse Determination (Attachment C), which provides additional information regarding the Queensland State Government's position on the role and function of the central waterway corridor.
3. Communal open space *The applicant is advised that studies / media rooms are counted as bedrooms for the purposes of calculating communal open space. The applicant is requested to calculate communal open space for the proposed development (as amended in response to this Information Request) at a rate of 45m^2 for each dwelling of three or more bedrooms in accordance with Acceptable outcome AO10.2 of the Multiple accommodation code.* *Furthermore, the proposed communal open space is scattered in small pockets throughout the development. The applicant is requested to demonstrate compliance with Acceptable outcome AO10.3 by providing at least 50% of the communal open space requirement in one parcel with a maximum length to breadth ratio of 2.5:1. Alternatively, to demonstrate compliance with Performance outcome PO10 it is recommended the development be reconfigured to provide larger, more consolidated areas of communal open space within the northern and southern portions of the development.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), which accommodates a revised design for the areas of communal open space. We consider that the relatively modest changes that have been made to the design philosophy for the communal open space satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item.
4. Retaining walls	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment

Information Request Item	Comments
The applicant's 'Civil Engineering Report' by Burchills Engineering Solutions provides a brief overview of proposed bulk earthworks and a single Bulk Earthworks Layout Plan. This does not provide adequate detail to demonstrate compliance with Acceptable outcome AO9 and Performance outcome PO9 of the General development provisions code and City Plan Policy – Land development guidelines. *The applicant is requested to provide cross sections through the subject site that clearly illustrate the heights of proposed retaining wall heights and/or batters, and the interfaces with roadways, open space, the waterway corridor and adjacent lots, to demonstrate compliance with the above City Plan provisions. In addition, the applicant is requested to provide a retaining wall plan showing the location and heights of retaining walls. Concerns relating to retaining walls are discussed further below under Landscape Assessment and Open Space Assessment.*	B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
5. Plans *The 'Site Layout' plan by Brian Johnson Plan Design / Building Civil Group combines too much information on a single plan and, as a result, is not clearly legible. The applicant is requested to provide an amended set of plans to address issues raised in this Information Request and illustrate the proposal more clearly. It is requested that amended site plans be provided to address the following:* • *Site Plans showing key areas proposed – i.e. ground floor building footprint and private open space, communal open space, conservation open space, internal roads and driveway access points, easements, waterway, stormwater management areas, acoustic barrier, etc. The site plans should include a single site plan of the entire site, plus larger scale plans of the northern and southern parts of the proposed development, as requested below by the Principal Architect / Urban Designer.* • *Building Typology Plan illustrating the mix of unit types on the site.* • *The plans should include amendments required by this Information Request and be at a standard scale and fully dimensioned, including unit numbers, setbacks and areas (in m2).* • *Plans are to include date and version number.* *Associated with the above-mentioned Site Plans and Building Typology Plan, the applicant is requested to provide a separate sheet with planning tables to identify:* • *Range of unit sizes proposed;* • *Range of private 'lots' for each unit type;* • *Density;* • *Breakdown of areas - Private open space, communal open space, landscaping, conservation, stormwater detention, roads, etc.* • *Car parking for residents and visitors;*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), which includes a more detailed set of plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. Further, it is noted that the amended set of plans incorporates an extensive variety of built form products that appropriately responds to the site's constraints (specifically the abutting railway) and opportunities (specifically the central corridor).

Information Request Item	Comments
• *Bicycle parking;* • *Other relevant information for the proposal.* *<u>Advice Note:</u> The applicant is advised that studies / media rooms are counted as bedrooms for the purposes of calculating City Plan requirements, such as communal open space, and infrastructure charges for the proposed development.*	
PRINCIPAL ARCHITECT/URBAN DESIGNER **6. Site plan, site elevations, plans** *The applicant is requested to make the following amendments to the proposal plans:* • *The applicant is requested to submit larger scaled site plans for the North dwellings and South dwellings showing the dwelling footprints and include additional information indicating dimensions showing the separation distances between dwellings and setbacks.* • *The applicant is requested to submit larger scale site elevations of the dwelling clusters as viewed from the internal roads – for example, views of dwellings 1-7, 8-15, 18-22, 23-26, 33- 42, 50-56, 57-61, 64-71. These site elevations should also include any level changes and retaining walls.* • *As per the landscape assessment comments, the proposal does not incorporate sufficient front setbacks to the internal roads that allow for important landscaping and feature trees to balance the built form and achieve an appropriate residential landscape character and neighbourhood amenity. The applicant is requested to amend the proposal plans to increase front setbacks to the internal roads to accommodate landscaping and feature trees.* • *The applicant is requested to submit amended architectural plans clearly indicating walls and windows for each dwelling, showing the roof outlines and indicating the dwelling number on each of the plans for ease of reference.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), which includes a more detailed set of plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item.
7. Dwelling designs and amenity *The proposed dwelling types have a stark and austere appearance due to the limited degree of modulation and articulation and colour in the compositions. The proposal in its current form does not achieve a high quality, attractive architectural outcome under Overall outcome OO(2)(b)(viii) of the Medium density residential zone code or Performance outcomes PO3 and PO4 of the Multiple accommodation code. In order to achieve the desired high quality design and appearance, the applicant is requested to address the following:* *a) Incorporate a wider variety of textured wall cladding in the composition of each facade, particularly to the side and rear elevations where they are visible from Karingal Drive, the railway line, and Imelda Way.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), which includes a more detailed set of plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. Further, it is noted that the amended set of plans incorporates an extensive variety of built form products that appropriately responds to the site's constraints (specifically the abutting railway) and opportunities (specifically the central environmental corridor), with further, more precise design information able to be provided if required as a relevant and reasonable condition of approval.

Information Request Item	Comments
b) Incorporate a wider variety of roof forms to enhance the composition and reduce the boxy built form. *c) Incorporate a variety of roof colours, garage door finishes and feature screen types to ensure there is appropriate differentiation between dwellings and to achieve a vibrant composition.* *d) The dwelling facades to Karingal Drive, the railway line, and Imelda Way are recommended to have active facades with windows and balconies that engage with the streetscape for activation and passive surveillance. The dwelling type T5R and T5L show large areas of screening to windows on all elevations. The proposal should consider the use of sliding batten screens to balconies in the front elevation, and a mix of horizontal batten screens and window boxes.* e) *Dwellings are recommended to incorporate subtropical design with roof overhangs and window boxes to provide solar and weather protection for openings.*	
8. Material and colour palette and screen details *The applicant is requested to submit a Materials and colour palette for each dwelling type. In the Materials and colour schedule please ensure each material is coded and corresponds to the elevations and legend for clarity. For any feature elements, such as decorative screens or batten screens, please specify the batten size, and nominal spacing.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), which includes a more detailed set of plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. If required, more precise design information is able to be provided as a relevant and reasonable condition of approval.
SOCIAL PLANNING **9. Amenity protection** *Officers are unable to determine whether the proposed Multiple dwellings will have any adverse amenity impacts. As such the applicant is requested to provide the following further information:* *a) AO10.2 of the Multiple accommodation code provides rates for communal open space. It is acknowledged that the proposed development intends to provide 3,174m² of green open space throughout the subject. However, the applicant has not provided sufficient information to demonstrate the intent for these areas. As such, the applicant is requested to demonstrate how compliance with AO10.2 has been achieved through a recreational capacity analysis.* *b) The General development provisions code provides clear direction in relation to the amenity expectations of a proposed development. A development must be designed to maintain the expected amenity for the area. The applicant is requested to provide details on how the proposal will mitigate any adverse amenity impacts to future residents.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A), which includes a more detailed set of plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. We submit that the areas of communal open space may be improved in the form of *passive* recreation facilities (i.e. benches, seating, barbecue areas, turfed areas) and *active* recreation facilities (i.e. walking paths).
TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT **10. Servicing**	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment

Information Request Item	Comments
To comply with Acceptable outcomes AO5, AO6.1 and AO6.2 of the Transport Code as proposed, the applicant is requested to provide long sections demonstrating that the circulation roads will be suitably graded for a MRV pursuant with the requirements given in section 3.3.3 of AS2890.2: 2018. In this regard the maximum permitted grade and change in grade is 1 in 6.5 (15.4%) and 1 in 16 (6.25%) in 7m of travel respectively. Any change in grade of 1 in 50 (2%) or less may take place instantaneously. Alternatively, the applicant may propose a solution which can be reasonably tested against the requirements of Performance outcomes PO5 and PO6.	B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
11. Bicycle parking supply *Review of the proposed dwelling floor plans shows limited space to accommodate resident and visitor bicycle parking as proposed. To comply with Acceptable outcome PO10 of the Transport Code, the applicant is therefore requested to identify areas of a suitable size within each proposed dwelling which can accommodate bicycle parking generally in accordance with the minimum dimensions given in AS2890.3:2015.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
12. Pedestrian access *The provision of a 1.0 metre wide footpath behind dwelling garages, as shown on the submitted site plan drawing, is not considered to be separated from vehicle movements and is therefore not supported. To comply with Acceptable outcome AO11.3 of the Transport Code, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings showing at least one (1) continuous pedestrian pathway from the Karingal Drive and Imelda Way frontages which is separated from vehicle movements.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
13. Ingress and egress *To assist in demonstrating compliance with Acceptable outcome AO19 of the Transport code, the applicant is requested to confirm if any gates are proposed at either or both vehicular access points within the site. Should this be the case, the applicant is requested to set these back to ensure queuing is accommodated entirely within the site and a turnaround area suitable for a B99 vehicle is provided before the gate locations, within the site.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
14. Car parking design *To comply with Acceptable outcome AO25.1 of the Transport code, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings making the following changes:* *a) Pursuant to section 2.5.3(e)(iv) of AS2890.1:2004, provide a driveway long section and check grade changes using the method in Appendix C where there is any departure from the requirements specified in section 2.5.3. Additionally, the applicant is to ensure that the driveway grade behind garages and visitor car parking spaces does not exceed 1 in 16 (6.25%).* *b) Pursuant to section 3.2.4(b) of AS2890.1:2004, provide a pedestrian sight triangle on the departure side of the*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
vehicle crossings to Karingal Drive and Imelda Way within the boundaries of the site. Additionally, include a notation which reads "Pedestrian sight triangle to be kept clear of obstructions to visibility. Landscaping up to 500mm in height is permitted within this area." c) *Pursuant to section 4.9(a) of AS2890.1:2004, provide type 1 road humps spaced at a minimum of 30m on the long straight aisle running parallel to the railway line. Alternatively, the applicant may propose a solution which can be reasonably tested against the requirements of PO25.*	
15. Tandem car parking *To comply with Acceptable outcome AO26.3 of the Transport code, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings increasing the length of all proposed tandem garages to a minimum of 11 metres.* *Alternatively, the applicant may propose a solution which can be reasonably tested against the requirements of PO26.* *Advice note - Karingal Drive road upgrade* *As mentioned during the pre-lodgement meeting, if the application is recommended for approval, a condition will be imposed to achieve compliance with AO15.1 of the Transport code, requiring the upgrade of Karingal Drive to a residential collector street along the full frontage of the site. This will include provision of a cul-de-sac and 1.5m wide footpath along the frontage of the site.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
HYDRAULIC ASSESSMENT **16. Revised hydraulic impact assessment report** *The applicant has submitted a hydraulic impact assessment report, being "2 Karingal Drive, Pimpama – Hydraulic Impact Assessment, Revision 00" dated 7 January 2021, prepared by Burchills Engineering Solutions. However, to respond to Council Officers' concerns, the applicant is requested to submit a revised report addressing the following (but not limited to) issues:* a) *The report shows an increase of flood level from 10-15mm within an external property which is not acceptable to Council. Therefore, the applicant is requested to redesign the development to achieve no adverse hydraulic impact external to the site. Alternatively, the applicant is requested to submit consent letters from affected property owners accepting such impacts into their properties.* b) *Remove the proposed on-line detention basin from the waterways to be dedicated as a drainage reserve.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
17. Revised stormwater management plan *The applicant has submitted a stormwater management report, being "2 Karingal Drive, Pimpama – Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan, Revision 00" dated 7 January 2021, prepared by Burchills Engineering Solutions. However, to respond to Council Officers' concerns, the applicant is requested to submit a*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
revised report addressing the following (but not limited to) issues: *a) The report has compared pre and post-development stormwater discharges for peak flow mitigation purposes incorporating external flow which is many times greater than that of the subject site. The applicant is advised that the above approach is not acceptable to Council. Pre- and post-development stormwater discharges of the development site only are to be compared to demonstrate no increase of peak flow rates due to the proposed development. Therefore, the applicant is requested to include comparison figures of the pre- and post-development stormwater runoff from the subject development site to demonstrate no increase of peak flow rates due to the proposed development for all events up to and including 1% AEP storms.* *b) The applicant has proposed an on-line stormwater detention basin within a waterway that conveys stormwater runoff from a large external catchment (approximately 142 hectares). The applicant is advised that Council is not supportive of an on-line stormwater detention system due to the on-going maintenance and liability issues. Therefore, the applicant is requested to remove the proposed on-line stormwater detention basin from the waterway.* *c) Two stormwater detention basins have been proposed under timber decks. Council Officers have concerns regarding the ongoing maintenance and functionality of such detention basins. Therefore, the applicant is requested to redesign the development relocating the basins or removing the decks from over the basins.* *d) The applicant is requested to include a stormwater drainage layout plan identifying all minor (pipe) and major (overland) stormwater drainage systems for the proposed development.* *e) The applicant is requested to demonstrate that the proposed area for the stormwater treatment and detention basin(s) are adequate with respect to their design and construction in accordance with the City Plan policy – Land development guidelines and the Queensland Urban Drainage Manual. In particular, demonstrate that maintenance access to the basin perimeter and to inlet and silt collection zones, batters, setbacks from private property, inlet/outlet details, sediment fore bay, aprons in front of headwalls (to prevent under- scouring) etc. are designed in accordance with the City Plan policy – Land development guidelines and with reference to the Water by Design document.*	
18. Erosion and sediment control plan *The applicant is requested to submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) prepared in accordance with the City Plan policy – Land development guidelines, and the Best Practice*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
Erosion & Sediment Control (IECA Australasia, November 2008) and consistent with the State Planning Policy (SPP 2017). The plan must, in particular (without limitation): *a) Ensure that all reasonable and practicable measures are implemented to minimise short and long-term erosion and adverse effects of sediment transport. Also, ensure that the proposed control measures will achieve 80% hydraulic effectiveness as required by the SPP (Refer to SPP 2017, Appendix 2, Table A).* *b) Be prepared by a suitably qualified professional (Certified Practitioner in Erosion and Sediment Control or Registered Professional Engineer Queensland with experience and training in erosion and sediment control).* *c) Relate to each phase of works (including clearing, earthworks, civil construction, services installation, and landscaping/rehabilitation) and detail the type, location, sequence and timing of measures and action to effectively minimise erosion, manage flows and capture sediment.* *d) Include the results of all soil investigations undertaken for the site and on which the ESCP is based.* *e) Be consistent with current best practice standards, taking into account all environmental constraints including erosion hazard, season, climate, soil and proximity to waterways.* *f) Include monitoring requirements, and clearly outline the need to adjust or maintain erosion and sediment control and site management practices to achieve the above requirements.* *g) Contingency measures in case of failure to achieve the water quality objectives.*	
19. Modelling files *Submit all XP-RAFTS, TUFLOW and MUSIC modelling files to Council for review and record purposes.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT **20. Works within a waterway and ecological rehabilitation** *Reflecting the consistent position stated by Council officers in previous discussions prior to submission of this development application, the location of a detention basin within a mapped waterway is not supported in accordance with:* • *Overall outcome (2)(e) of the Environmental significance overlay code; and* • *Performance outcome PO5 of the Environmental significance overlay code* *The waterway must be reprofiled and restored only for ecological purposes. As such, the applicant is requested to prepare and submit amended plans and reports:* *a) Removing reference to detention infrastructure within the waterway mapped on the subject site and ensuring the*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) and the Letter of Advice of Watercourse Determination (Attachment C), which includes a more detailed set of plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item and from SARA. It is noted that with the internal waterway being formally defined by the State Government as a 'drainage feature', Burchills Engineering Solutions' detailed response (Attachment B) has confirmed that the hydraulic and hydrological technical obligations for the site and the broader development are able to be achieved.

Information Request Item	Comments
site plan / plan of development reflects the Rehabilitation management plan proposal; *b) Providing 10 metre wide buffers which are shown to be measured from the top of the high bank, not the centreline of the waterway; and* *c) Ecologically rehabilitating the area located between the detention basin, the property boundary and the rehabilitation zone of the northern bank of the waterway.*	
21. Tenure of the waterway buffer *Whilst a Rehabilitation management plan has been submitted for the waterway, appropriate formalised protection has not been proposed. Statutory protections are required in accordance with:* • *Overall outcome (2)(g) of the Environmental significance overlay code; and* • *Performance outcomes PO23 and PO25 of the Environmental significance overlay code* *The minor extent of this waterway means that it is most appropriately protected under a private covenant. As such, the applicant is requested to:* *a) Submit amended plans indicating that the entire waterway corridor including associated buffers and additional rehabilitation requested in the previous information request item are designated as conservation and to be retained as private covenant; and* *b) Prepare and submit a Covenant management plan prepared in accordance with City Plan Policy Schedule 6.8 – Environmental management plans.*	In discussions with the proponent, we support the proposal for the 'drainage feature' to be maintained in private ownership. As part of the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project, we submit that a covenant management plan will be prepared and submitted for Council's assessment, which is able to be enshrined within relevant and reasonable conditions of approval.
OPEN SPACE ASSESSMENT **22. Submit a Statement of Landscape Intent** *The applicant is requested to submit a Statement of Landscape Intent (SLI) to address all areas of public road reserve fronting the subject site. The SLI is to be prepared in accordance with the following City Plan policies:* • *SC6.11 – Land Development Guidelines; and* • *SC6.12 – Landscape Work.* *Advice note:* *The waterway running through the subject site will be requested to be protected through an Environmental Covenant and as such will not be dedicated as public open space.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. As part of the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project, we submit that a Detailed Landscape Plan is able to be prepared and submitted for Council's assessment, which is able to be enshrined within relevant and reasonable conditions of approval.
23. Interface with adjacent public open space *The subject site abuts public open space being Karingal Drive Park. The Bulk Earthworks Plan, dated 18 December 2020, prepared by Burchills Engineering, shows areas of cut and fill near the property boundary abutting this park.* *a) The applicant is requested to demonstrate no impacts to the adjacent public open space through the provision of cross-sections at the interface of the subject site and*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. It is noted that Burchills Engineering Solutions' detailed response (Attachment B) has confirmed that the design and interfaces for earthworks are able to be sensitively managed, which is able to be demonstrated

Information Request Item	Comments
adjacent public open space. Any batters or retaining walls at the interface are requested to be shown on the amended plans including heights and grades of retaining structures.	within the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project.
LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT **24. Frontage landscaping** *It is noted that the submitted application material states that compliance is achieved with the Acceptable outcome AO1 of the Medium density residential zone code for frontage setbacks. However, the plans indicate pergola structures approximately 1.0 metre away from the boundary with Karingal Drive. It is considered that the proposed frontage setbacks and frontage landscaping to Karingal Drive are insufficient to comply with Performance outcome PO1 of the zone code, and PO4 of the General development provisions code. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to provide amended plans demonstrating compliance with the following:* *a) Provide a garden width of minimum 1.5 metres to the Karingal Drive frontage to accommodate tree planting at a rate of one tree per dwelling (roughly 6m centres), which is necessary to provide a quality landscaping outcome;* *b) Ensure any retaining walls are located on the internal side of the requested 1.5m width frontage garden so as to ensure the planting is not sandwiched between the fence and retaining wall, to ensure the garden is located at the same level as the street and to enable the landscaping to screen and soften the proposed retaining wall;* *c) Provide greater building setbacks to the Karingal Drive frontage; specifically, provide a minimum 3m separation from the tree planting locations to the nearest part of the buildings (including pergola structures); and* *d) Provide details regarding the proposed frontage fencing, ensuring it is set back on the internal side of the requested 1.5m frontage garden, and is designed to be visually appealing.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item as a concept. As part of the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project, we submit that a Detailed Landscape Plan is able to be prepared and submitted for Council's assessment, which is able to be enshrined within relevant and reasonable conditions of approval.
25. Internal streetscape *The proposed building setbacks to the internal driveway and the building separation along the internal driveway do not allow for regular tree planting along it, resulting in areas where the development will appear dominated by hardstand and built form. The applicant is requested to provide amended plans demonstrating regular areas for tree planting along the internal driveway, with building setbacks of a minimum 3 metres to tree planting locations.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item as a concept. As part of the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project, we submit that a Detailed Landscape Plan is able to be prepared and submitted for Council's assessment, which is able to be enshrined within relevant and reasonable conditions of approval.
26. Retaining walls *It is noted that the submitted plans indicate the presence of retaining walls. In order to facilitate assessment against PO9/AO9 of the General development provisions code, the*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
applicant is requested to provide plans that identify the location, height, type, colours and finishes of the proposed retaining walls. It is requested that where they are proposed adjacent landscape planting areas, wall types are vertical, narrow types with discrete footings (e.g. concrete sleeper) as opposed to boulder walls which occupy significant space (displacing landscaping) and blockwork walls (which have a significant, continuous footing that displaces landscaping). It is also requested that walls which will be visible in the long term are dark coloured (e.g. charcoal) and textured (e.g. wood pattern or split face).	
27. Statement of Landscape Intent *The applicant has not submitted a Statement of Landscape Intent in support of the proposed development resulting in a non-compliance with Acceptable outcome AO4.1 of the General development provisions code. It is considered that insufficient detail has been provided about the proposed landscape work to facilitate assessment of the development against the Performance outcome PO4 requirement to 'provide landscape work that protects and enhances the character of the local area'. To demonstrate compliance with PO4, the applicant is requested to provide a Statement of Landscape Intent, prepared in accordance with SC6.10 – City Plan Policy – Landscape work.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. As part of the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project, we submit that a Detailed Landscape Plan is able to be prepared and submitted for Council's assessment, which is able to be enshrined within relevant and reasonable conditions of approval.
WATER AND WASTE **28. Solid Waste Servicing** *The applicant has not provided sufficient information pertaining to solid waste servicing, including where the bins for each dwelling are to be stored.* *The applicant is requested to provide the following information addressing all applicable performance outcomes detailed in the City Plan 'Solid waste management code'. Refer section 4 of the SC6.15 City Plan Policy – Solid waste management which outlines the information required to support the application. Information is to include:* • *A report outlining the proposed waste management measures, ensuring it addresses how all requirements of section 6 of the policy are demonstrated;* • *Expected weekly waste generation rates for the development, including the calculations used - Refer Appendix A of the policy;* • *Type, quantity and size of waste containers for general and recyclable waste;* • *Plans detailing the location, size (with scaled dimensions including clearances) and design of all storage point/s, servicing point/s, service vehicle access, clearance and manoeuvrability;* • *Demonstrate the location of bin-carting and waste-carting routes and approximate distances;* • *Swept path analysis as outlined below.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. Subject to receipt of Council support for the updated development scheme, we submit that a detailed Solid Waste Management Plan will be able to be prepared for Council approval within the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project.

Information Request Item	Comments
29. Swept Paths – Insufficient information *Reference is made to the 'Traffic Engineering Report' by TTM Consulting and the two swept path drawings being "Swrpt Path Analysis – Refuge Vehicle Typical Route – Imelda Way Access 21GCT0060-01, Rev B" and "Swrpt Path Analysis – Refuge Vehicle Typical Route – Karingal Access Road 21GCT0060-01, Rev B".* *Both these drawings show a Brisbane City Council waste collection vehicle and are not certified by a Registered Professional Engineer Queensland (RPEQ).* *Furthermore, the 'Site Layout' plan states "HRV/Garbage truck manoeuvring min 1-5.m kerb to kerb as per J.J. Richards". This does not align with the aforementioned Swept Path plans. The applicant is requested to address the following:* *a) The applicant must provide amended swept path analysis plans that comply with AS2890.2 and are certified by an appropriately qualified RPEQ confirming that a Waste Collection Vehicle (WCV) can adequately manoeuvre unimpeded through the development to each waste collection point. It must be demonstrated that the wheelie bins for each lot can be collected without the driver of the WCV having to exit the vehicle. If the bins for a lot cannot be collected, a bin bay will need to be provided for the respective lots.* *b) It appears that a bin bay is more suitable for dwellings 1 and 2. This could be placed near the "COS TD" and would avoid the waste collection vehicle having to reverse after collection.* *c) The applicant is requested to update the plans accordingly:* • *Swept path analysis is to be generated by AutoTurn, AutoTrack or similar.* • *Plans must demonstrate vehicle specifications in accordance with the 'City Plan Policy – Solid Waste Management', including the kerb-to-kerb turning radius as nominated in Appendix C of SC6.15 City plan policy – solid waste management code.* • *Manoeuvring clearances in accordance with AS2890.2 must be clearly depicted on drawings and demonstrate no obstructions exist for all waste servicing manoeuvres.* • *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.*	Reference is drawn to the Revised Concept Plan of Development (Attachment A) which includes a detailed set of development plans that satisfactorily addresses the detail in this RFI item. Subject to receipt of Council support for the updated development scheme, we submit that a detailed Solid Waste Management Plan will be prepared for Council approval within the subsequent Operational Works phase of the project.
30. Survey Information – Sewerage Infrastructure *The applicant has provided a survey plan, being "Contour and Detail Survey over Lot 19 RP152380" depicting the existing sewerage infrastructure traversing the property boundaries.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
The 'Site Layout' plan shows some of the existing manholes and the existing sewerage easements, however there are concerns relating to this as outlined below: • *The large "detention basin" separating the two sides of the development and the smaller "detention basin under deck" (near dwelling 1 and 2) are proposed over existing sewerage infrastructure. There is also another 'detention basin under deck' near dwellings 47-49.* • *It is assumed that the applicant is proposing to cut earthworks for these detention basins and, as such, they will be reducing the existing cover over the existing sewer pipes and the existing manholes may require lowering / raising.* *a) The applicant is required to provide cross sections demonstrating the impacts that the proposed basins will have on the existing sewer infrastructure (manholes and pipes). This is required to ensure that the detention basins will not adversely impact Council's existing sewerage infrastructure.* *b) The existing sewerage infrastructure easement as shown on the 'Contour and Detail Survey over Lot 19 RP152380' must be superimposed onto the site plan and include a notation to the effect "Existing sewerage easement superimposed as per Survey Plan 'Contour and Detail Survey over Lot 19 RP152380' by Stewart McIntyre & Associates dated 19/05/2017".*	
31. Sewer servicing strategy *It is noted that the development proposes to connect to Council's existing sewerage network via a private gravity main internal to the site. Burchills report also stating there is a plan called "The Sewage Plan" by Brian Johnson Plan Design - This plan was not included.* *a) Provide the sewage plan mentioned in Burchills report* *b) Provide a sewer reticulation connection plan demonstrating how the proposal intends to connect to Council's existing infrastructure.* *c) It is noted that there is a water way traversing the middle of the site and essentially 'splitting' the development into a north and south side.* *i. Provide clarification as to how each side of the development intends to connect to Council's existing sewerage infrastructure.* *ii. If the proposal includes a sewer pipe traversing the waterway, this may require approval from Council's waterways assessment team as well as Plumbing and Drainage) – Submit confirmation to Water and Waste as part of the response to information request that Council does not object to this.* *d) The plans provided do not show the location of the proposed sewer property connection in relation to any*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
proposed structures, buildings, or footings. The applicant is required to provide amended detailed plans, drawn to scale, indicating all the items list below: *i. The location of the proposed sewer property connection and demonstrate that all proposed buildings, structures, footings and landscaping with extensive root systems are outside of the sewerage easements, and a minimum of 1m clear of the sewer connection up to and including its inspection opening (IO).* *e) It is unclear if the proposal will require raising / lowering of any existing sewer maintenance structures.* *i. Provide a plan showing which manholes require raising and lowering and state by how much (approximately).* *<u>Further Advice:</u>* *It should be noted that Water and Waste generally does not approve buildings or structures over or within the 6m easement for a 375mm trunk sewer as impacts this development site. Water and Waste suggest redesigning the development to ensure access is maintained to repair the trunk sewer in future should this be required without impact on proposed dwellings.* *Repair works may involve excavation to access the sewer main and this excavation typically requires the full easement width to be available.*	
32. Water meter location / easement & servicing strategy *As per the Prelodgement meeting minutes, the DA plans require showing the location of the developments master meter including easement with dimensions – This information has not been provided.* *It is noted that the development proposes to connect to Councils existing water network from Imelda Way. Burchills report also stating there is a plan called "The Water Main Plan" by Brian Johnson Plan Design - This plan was not included.* *Be advised that all water meters 50mm in diameter or larger require an above ground on lot water meter configuration and an associated easement in accordance with Council's Standard Water Meter Drawings (available on Council's website). Note: If a stacked arrangement is required, the potable water meter is typically mechanical and subsequently a longer easement/assembly is required. Please consider this when allocating space for the water meter(s). The size of the easement and space required for the water meter assembly is based on the size of the water meter(s) required.* *a) Provide the "water main plan" mentioned in Burchills report* *b) Provide a water connection plan demonstrating how the proposal the intends to connect to Council's existing infrastructure.*	Reference is drawn to the contents of the Technical Engineering Response (Attachment B) as provided by Burchills Engineering Solutions.

Information Request Item	Comments
c) It is noted that there is a water way traversing the middle of the site and essentially 'splitting' the development into a north and south side. *d) Provide clarification as to how each side of the development intends to connect to Council's existing water infrastructure.* *i. If the proposal includes a water pipe traversing the waterway, this may require approval from Council's waterways assessment team (as well as Plumbing and Drainage) – Submit confirmation to Water and Waste as part of the response to information request that Council does not object to this.* *e) 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 required easement size and location of the water meters can be incorporated into the design plans. Note: if advice is not obtained regarding the required meter size, and subsequently the required easement size based on the size of the meters, then the application may require a Minor Change should the layout of the design not provide sufficient room for the meter assembly.* *f) Provide a Ground Floor / Site Plan showing the location and dimensions of the easement for any above ground on lot water meters, based on advice from a hydraulic consultant. This information must be on a DA plan.* *g) Amended architectural plans displaying no buildings, structures, footings or landscaping within the proposed easement.*	