

Our Reference: RAL/2025/5915  
 CS Portal Reference: N/A  
 Contact Officer: Sophie Spencer  
 Contact: (07) 4688 6808  
 Email: [development@tr.qld.gov.au](mailto:development@tr.qld.gov.au)

**INFORMATION REQUEST**  
*Planning Act 2016 Section 68(1)*  
*Development Assessment Rules Part 3*

CPLK Property Pty Ltd  
 C/- Property Projects Australia  
 PO Box 3686  
 TOOWOOMBA QLD 4350

Email: [james@propertyprojectsaustralia.com.au](mailto:james@propertyprojectsaustralia.com.au), [blake@propertyprojectsaustralia.com.au](mailto:blake@propertyprojectsaustralia.com.au),  
[alistair@propertyprojectsaustralia.com.au](mailto:alistair@propertyprojectsaustralia.com.au)

10 September 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**Development Application for:** Reconfiguring a Lot - Reconfigure 2 into 50 Lots  
**Location:** 2A & 2B Rifle Range Road, MOUNT LOFTY QLD 4350  
**Property Description:** Lot 1 RP177105, Lot 2 RP177105  
**Relevant Planning Scheme:** *Toowoomba Regional Planning Scheme 2012*

Upon review of the abovementioned Development Application and supporting information, Council requires further information which demonstrates compliance with the Planning Scheme. Please provide the information requested below:-

**1. SUBDIVISION LAYOUT & CONNECTIVITY**

<b>Issue: Road Connectivity</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	<p>A connection to Windemere Terrace is supported, however a pedestrian link is not the first preference and a road connection ought to be provided. Development is required to provide a high level of connectivity and permeability, and consider connections to surrounding streets, under the Reconfiguring a Lot Code Overall Outcome (2)(l) and Table 9.4.5:2 PO1, PO2, PO3, PO4(a) and PO6. A road connection provides a benefit for the development and the surrounding community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A road provides better casual surveillance of active transport users,</li> <li>• It is considered likely a connection would be used by cars as well as pedestrians/cyclists. A road allows a more direct and efficient route to proposed lots on Road 03 from Mackenzie Street,</li> <li>• The southern subdivision created a road stub from Windemere Terrace, anticipating a future road connection,</li> <li>• The road connection would provide an alternative evacuation route in the event of bushfire, in the direction away from the likely threat. It is noted the Bushfire Hazard Overlay Code requires through roads (i.e. no cul-de-sac),</li> <li>• A road would remove the cul-de-sac head, and allow more regular shaped lots along Road 03.</li> </ul>

The existing slope of the land for proposed Road 03 up to the Windemere Terrace stub is approximately 12%, compliant with both general road gradient and maximum 12.5% for bushfire hazard areas. As such, it is unclear why a road connection is not proposed.

**Information Required:**

The applicant is requested to provide a road connection to Windemere Terrace from Road 03 including longitudinal sections demonstrating gradient compliant with the benchmarks of the *Toowoomba Regional Planning Scheme 2012*.

Please note, that the 1 in 4 batter (25% grade) shown for the proposed pedestrian link to Windemere Terrace is not convenient for active transport users, and any pedestrian link is requested to have a more suitable gradient.

**2. INCONSISTENCIES IN MATERIAL**

**Issue:**

Figures 12 and 13 of the Ecological Assessment Report identifies the trees to be retained and removed.

The Ecological Assessment Report indicates on page 62 that potential clearing for firebreak cannot be avoided in regulated vegetation, with Figure 17 (snip below) showing the maximum extent of clearing. This clearing would occur within Council's Environmental Significance Overlay, and has not been shown in Figures 12 and 13.

Furthermore, the potential firebreak clearing is inconsistent with the Bushfire Assessment Report that states no firebreak is required, and only that bushfire management zones (BMZs) are recommended within Lots 42-50.

*Advice Note: The extent of necessary clearing for firebreak that is exempt under Schedule 6 of the Planning Regulation 2017 is informed by Approved Bushfire Management Plans. The submitted Bushfire Management Plan states no firebreak is required, therefore there would be no necessary firebreak clearing for this development for the purposes of Schedule 6.*

2.1



**Figure 17  
Assessable  
Clearing Extent  
(Category B)**

Project: Ecological Assessment Report, Rifle Range Road  
Client: CPLK Property Pty Ltd  
Project No.: J001771

Created by SkyHaven Date: 23/07/2025  
Approved by Will Gibson Date: 23/07/2025

0 10 20 Metres

**Legend**

- Category A or B containing endangered vegetation
- Category A or B that is of least concern
- Category C or D that is of least concern
- non-sensitive
- Existing Exempt Vegetation
- Clearing (10m boundary)
- Assessable Clearing for Firebreaks (1.5 x tree height)
- Assessable Clearing for Firebreaks (1.5 x tree height)

The content of this document includes third party data. Range Environmental Consultants does not guarantee the accuracy of such data.  
Source: Geospatial data sourced from Geospatial Data Infrastructure (GDGI). Aerial imagery sourced from Geospatial Data Infrastructure (GDGI).

**range**  
environmental consultants

	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Provide amended reporting confirming the extent of clearing, including any removal of trees for firebreak purposes. Trees shown to be removed and retained on Figures 12 and 13 must correlate with other application material.</p>
2.2	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The Ecological Assessment Report section 4.2 states 103 native trees were surveyed on-site and within the road reserve within the Council mapped Environmental Significance Overlay, which does not correlate to the figures of the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 13 shows a total of 53 native trees within the Environmental Significance Overlay (35 shown to be retained and 18 to be removed).</li> <li>• Figures 12 and 13 show a total of 119 native trees within both of Council's road reserves and mapped Environmental Significance Overlay (37 of which are to be retained and the remainder 82 to be removed).</li> <li>• Figure 12 shows 64 native trees in the Mackenzie Street road reserve and 2 native trees in the road stub from the road stub from Windemere Terrace.</li> </ul> <p>The development's impact on trees under Council's jurisdiction (the number of Council controlled trees / street trees and number of trees affected by the Ecological Significance Overlay) is required to be confirmed.</p> <p>Furthermore, a description of the Council controlled trees in the road reserve (species and condition) will be required to remove trees under PSP No 8.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>(a) Confirm the number of Council controlled trees in the road reserve and the number of trees under Council's Ecological Significance Overlay, and identify the number of trees to be removed and those to be retained. Provided amended reporting where necessary; and</p> <p>(b) Highlight which trees in Appendix F Results of On-site Tree Survey are Council controlled trees / street trees and those affected by the Environmental Significance Overlay.</p>
2.3	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The plan 'Preliminary Lot Layout – Option 2' prepared by Kehoe Myers shows a hatched area as mapped koala habitat that does not correspond with the SARA DAMS mapping of Core Koala Habitat Area or the consultant's site-specific Vegetation Communities (see Figures 3 and 8 of Ecological Assessment Report). It is unclear what this hatching represents.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Clarify what the hatched koala habitat on the plan 'Preliminary Lot Layout – Option 2' represents, and provide an amended plan if necessary.</p>
2.4	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The Bushfire Hazard Overlay Map in the Bushfire Management Plan, Appendix 2 does not relate to the site.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Provide an amended Bushfire Management Plan with a corrected figure in Appendix 2.</p>

### 3. ECOLOGY & BUSHFIRE

3.1	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>Under s5.3.2(5) of the Planning Scheme, the Ecological Significance Overlay Code only relates to that part of the development affected by the overlay, that is, the site's northern corner. Notwithstanding this, the development proposes clearing within the mapped overlay and replanting within the proposed covenant area. Furthermore, any vegetation protection covenants required by SARA would likely be entered into with Council. Therefore, Council has an interest in the effectiveness of the vegetation protection covenants, in response to the Ecological Significance Overlay Code PO1 and PO4.</p> <p>Vegetation covenants are proposed for a number of future lots (42-47 and 50) to retain and enhance native vegetation and for replanting within Koala Habitat Areas (KHA). The location of the covenant areas at the road frontage of the Lots and at the rear with the building envelopes</p>
-----	--

	<p>in the centre does not appear to functionally maintain a connected, continuous koala movement corridor across the development and into the wider landscape.</p> <p>To demonstrate compliance against the Ecological Significance Overlay Code PO1 and PO4 and Reconfiguring a Lot Code PO3, Council requires further information to regarding how the layout of streets, lots and infrastructure responds appropriately to environmental features of the site or locality by maintaining important wildlife corridors and habitat areas.</p> <p>Council considers that greater areas of vegetation retained within protection covenants will maintain and enhance the existing corridors. Additionally, larger lots are preferable within the KHA areas to minimise clearing and habitat disturbance.</p> <p>The application is required to be referred to SARA for assessment of State Code 25: Development in South-East Queensland Koala Habitat Areas. Further information on Koala Habitat Areas can be found at:  <a href="https://environment.des.qld.gov.au/wildlife/animals/living-with/koalas/mapping/legislation-policy">https://environment.des.qld.gov.au/wildlife/animals/living-with/koalas/mapping/legislation-policy</a>.</p> <p>It is noted that SARA's jurisdiction and Referral Response in relation to KHA will have a bearing on this matter.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Provide an amended Ecological Assessment Report (Section 5) providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Further information to regarding how the layout of streets, lots and infrastructure responds appropriately to environmental features of the site or locality by maintaining important wildlife corridors and habitat areas;</li> <li>(b) Explanation of why envelopes were placed centrally, and whether this maximises or fragments corridor connectivity;</li> <li>(c) Alternatives considered—e.g. realignment of envelopes to cluster development and preserve larger continuous vegetated areas and justification of how the proposed covenant locations maximise corridor retention, compared with alternative configurations; and</li> <li>(d) A site layout plan showing the relationship between building envelopes, covenant areas, potential movement paths and corridor functionality and evidence that covenant areas align with these movement paths, not just fragmented patches at lot frontages and rears.</li> </ul>
3.2	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The majority of the site is affected by the Bushfire Hazard Overlay, and is subject to the Bushfire Hazard Overlay Code. Council has a number of concerns with the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 3.1 of the Bushfire Hazard Assessment shows the likely direction of bushfire attack is from the north-west and north-east. Roads 02 and 03 are cul-de-sacs. These are not through roads and does not comply with the Bushfire Hazard Overlay Code AO6.2. Both cul-de-sacs would require evacuation in the direction of a likely bushfire attack.</li> <li>• The Engineering Services Report and Road 01 longitudinal section shows the internal road will have a gradient up to 16%. This exceeds the maximum 12.5% required under the Bushfire Hazard Overlay Code AO6.4 to allow fire fighting equipment (urban fire truck). No longitudinal sections of Roads 02 and 03 have been provided to confirm a compliant gradient.</li> <li>• Section 5.7 of the Bushfire Hazard Assessment states that driveways for proposed lots 45, 46 and 47 will be designed to accommodate an urban fire truck given the length of the access. Earthworks for driveways are not shown on the Preliminary Earthworks Layout plan, and conceptual driveway plans are not provided. If the development is approved, the driveways must be constructed with the subdivision and the driveways must comply with AO6.4 (maximum grade 12.5%) to accommodate an urban fire truck.</li> </ul> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Provide an amended Bushfire Management Plan and development plans, including longitudinal sections of all roads, demonstrating through roads and gradient compliant with the Bushfire Hazard Overlay Code AO6.2 and AO6.4. Road 03 has opportunity to</li> </ul>

	connect with Windemere Terrace; and (b) Provide conceptual plans and longitudinal sections of driveways for proposed Lots 45, 46, and 47 demonstrating driveways that meet AO6.4 (maximum 12.5%).
3.3	<p><b>Issue: State Assessment of Regulated Vegetation</b></p> <p><i>Advice Only: The premises contains vegetation mapped in the State Assessment and Referral Agency (SARA) DAMS mapping as Koala Habitat Area and as regulated vegetation (Category B and C). The development application identified that referral to SARA is triggered for interference with the Koala Habitat Area and clearing Category B vegetation. There is no referral for clearing Category C vegetation. Clearing Category C vegetation is a matter outside the scope of the assessment of this development application, and is to be determined by the State whether this can occur.</i></p>

#### 4. COUNCIL CONTROLLED STREET TREES

	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>Insufficient information has been provided about the ability to achieve street tree planting along Mackenzie Street. The development proposes residential lots with direct access to Mackenzie Street. Street trees are required as part of frontage works on Mackenzie Street under the Reconfiguring a Lot Code.</p>
4.1	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Demonstrate the ability to achieve street tree planting space consistent with Planning Scheme Policy No 2 (PSP No 2) along the development side of Mackenzie Street. Provide a cross-section of Mackenzie Street showing street tree planting space compliant with PSP No 2 free of conflict with the proposed road pavement widening and other services.</p>
4.2	<p><b>Issue: Stormwater Impact on Jubilee Park</b></p> <p><i>Advice Only: The development proposes to discharge stormwater into a gully in Council's Bushland Park (Jubilee Park). There is a waterfall and trail at this location. Further to Item 6.4 below (stormwater), there is concern that the lack of stormwater quantity and quality treatment will interfere with the reasonable enjoyment of the Bushland Park and cause nuisance. It is recommended stormwater quality treatment is provided on site to mitigate the impacts of the development. For example, a bioretention basin provided at the location of the current dam would be a logical location as this captures the majority of the development and would not result in tree clearing. The applicant would need to demonstrate how this achieves the stormwater quality objectives.</i></p>

#### 5. FUTURE DWELLING HOUSES & POTENTIAL RETAINING STRUCTURES

	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The Rural Residential Zone Code AO6.1 (Table 6.6.7:1) requires onsite wastewater disposal for new Dwelling Houses. This does not anticipate the proposed development which would provide sewer new lots. As such, under the Table of Assessment for the Rural Residential Zone (Table 5.5:18), if the development were approved, each new Dwelling House that occurs the Rural Residential Zone would trigger a Code Assessable (Limited) application.</p> <p>A Preliminary Approval for Material Change of Use including Variation Request could overcome this conflict, however this has not been included in the application.</p>
5.1	<p>The purpose of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> includes establishing an effective and efficient development assessment system. The subsequent Dwelling House applications would be triggered due to an administrative reason and is not warranted. A development that will necessitate a number of unnecessary development application would be an unnecessary administrative burden to Council. The applicant should propose a method to address this.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Describe how unnecessary development applications will not be triggered, should the development be approved.</p> <p><i>Note: Schedule 2 of the Planning Regulation 2017 lists the Rural Residential Zone under 'Other Zones' and not 'Residential Zones', and therefore is not exempt under Schedule 6, Part 2, Section 2.</i></p>

<b>5.2</b>	<b>Issue: Potential for High Retaining Structures</b>
	<p>The application material shows earthworks to form the roads, MacKenzie Street verge along with minor works associated with drainage. The site has a steep slope averaging a 12% gradient. The lots are larger which could accommodate a house design responsive to the topography with no retaining walls, compliant with the Reconfiguring a Lot Code PO3.</p> <p>However, typically Dwelling Houses are constructed on slab which have the potential to create very high retaining walls. For example, proposed Lot 30 has a slope falling 7.5m across the lot (from 647.50 to 640m AHD). High retaining walls would result in a poor amenity outcome. Furthermore, excavation or filling incidental to building is not operational work, and therefore not able to be regulated by Council.</p>
	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Provide confirmation how the development will ensure high retaining walls are not part of future Dwelling Houses on the proposed lots.</p>

## 6. STORMWATER

<b>6.1</b>	<b>Issue:</b>
	<p>The Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) Report and the Preliminary Services Layout drawing submitted does not satisfactory demonstrate that stormwater flows along Rifle Range Road from the external upstream catchment E1 will be received and directed around the subdivision in accordance with Council standards. The proposed stormwater solution at the junction of proposed Road 1 with Rifle Range Road is to construct a concrete invert drain across the intersection to discharge into an existing open channel. The existing open channel appears to direct stormwater into Lot 2A Rifle Range Road. Directing upstream stormwater runoff into proposed Lot 42 will not be allowed.</p> <p>Also, no details are provided of what the stormwater flow rates are at the intersection for the different rainfall events, to determine whether an invert drain across the road will be a suitable solution in terms of safety to road users, what the invert channel profile should be to provide the required stormwater conveyance capacity, what the velocity and depth*velocity product are, the flow depths etc. Consider a pit and pipe solution for this location.</p> <p>The current development proposal includes receiving all stormwater runoff from upstream and adjacent catchments into the subdivision along the Rifle Range unformed road reserve. It is unknown whether this runoff will enter proposed Lots 42 to 47 as sheet flow since runoff from Rifle Range Road will most likely be concentrated flow when it reached the unformed part of the road reserve.</p>
	<p>The sub-catchment delineation provided in the SWMP is insufficient to determine what the stormwater runoff is that will be entering the subdivision along Rifle Range Road reserve. Catchment E2 is also larger than shown in the SWMP report near the south-western corner of the catchment and needs to be extended to the high point along Rifle Range Road. Similarly, catchment E2 needs to be extended south-eastwards at Martindale Court.</p> <p>Directing stormwater from upstream catchments through proposed Lots 42 to 47, around building envelopes and then conveying the same in an open channel in the proposed Lots does not comply with Council standards. Overland flow paths must be designed for a 1% AEP storm event. However, creating an overland flow path through proposed Lots 42 to 50 needs consideration of flow restrictions and the likelihood of flow diversions due to fencing on Lot boundaries. In this instance Council require the Designer to demonstrate what the stormwater flow parameters are for the open channel during a Probably Maximum Flood (PMF) event.</p> <p>Council's preferred stormwater solution includes collecting stormwater flows from Rifle Range Road and adjacent upstream catchments in an open channel within and along Rifle Range Road reserve. The channel must convey all upstream stormwater around the subdivision and discharge the same into a detention basin on the lowest part of the development, near the existing dam.</p>
	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p>

	<p>Amend the upstream catchment boundaries as explained in the above issue description. Also break the catchments into suitably sized smaller sub-catchments which is more appropriate for the scale of development.</p> <p>Undertake further modelling and design work to demonstrate how stormwater flows in the kerb and channel along Rifle Range Road will be received at the intersection with proposed Road 1. Provide a design for the invert drain and include the stormwater flow parameters requested above or alternatively change the proposed solution to a pit and pipe system.</p> <p>Consider designing an open channel along the Rifle Range Road boundary to convey upstream stormwater in an overland flow path external to proposed Lots 42 to 47. The channel should discharge to a new detention basin on the lowest parts of the development site, adjacent to the existing dam.</p>
6.2	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The Preliminary Services Layout drawing number C2223180 indicate the DN450 RCP stormwater pipe along Mackenzie Street are to be removed (demolished) and it appears that a new stormwater pipe is proposed under the proposed kerb and channel.</p> <p>Also, the linework used for the proposed stormwater does not correspond to the linework legend and the proposed stormwater pipe network drafting near the intersection of Mackenzie Street and proposed Road 1 appears to be incomplete and incorrect.</p> <p>It is unclear what the proposed stormwater solution is for Mackenzie Street. Provide further information to demonstrate why it is necessary to remove the existing stormwater pipe and replace it with a new pipe under the kerb and channel.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Correct the stormwater linework on drawing number C2223180 and demonstrate why the existing DN450 RCP stormwater pipe is proposed to be replaced with a new pipeline.</p>
6.3	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The SWMP report indicated the existing catchment E2 to have a fraction impervious of 0.3 and the post-development catchment D1 has a fraction impervious of 0.22. Both appears to be low considering QUDM provides a range of 0.45 to 0.85 for urban residential. No details have been provided to demonstrate how these amounts were calculated.</p> <p>The catchment delineation used and the level of details in the DRAINS model is in our opinion oversimplified for a development of this scale. For example, separate catchments should be used for urban areas and bushland or adjacent grass fields areas. The time of concentration for catchments with stormwater pit and pipe system is different to that of large grass of bushland areas.</p> <p>The SWMP report indicate that post-development runoff increases are relatively small for the 12ha development site. Council is of the opinion that a more detailed sub-catchment delineation and DRAINS model will result in the stormwater runoff increase to be larger than what the current model demonstrates.</p> <p>Also, the existing dam appears to be not included in the pre-development DRAINS model.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Demonstrate how the fraction impervious values were determined for the pre- and post-development catchments.</p> <p>Create sub-catchments for similar areas, i.e. urban development areas vs undeveloped greenfield areas with time of concentration and fraction impervious calculated separately for each sub-catchment. Change the DRAINS model and provide a copy to Council for review.</p>
6.4	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The SWMP report indicates that the proposed lawful point of discharge is the existing gully in</p>

	<p>Jubilee Park and that the natural gully has sufficient capacity to accept the increased runoff and that there is no downstream neighbouring property which will be affected. No details have been provided of the gully condition and carrying capacity. Council is concerned that the additional runoff which appears to be underestimated could result in scour and damage to the mountain bike and walking tracks in Jubilee Park.</p> <p>Council prefers that a detention basin is provided at the lowest part of the development to mitigate the increase in stormwater quantity to avoid scour and erosion of the mountain bike and walking tracks in Jubilee Park.</p>
	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p>
	<p>Provide the details of the natural gully, as well as calculations and modelling results to demonstrate that the exiting mountain bike and walking tracks will be unaffected by the additional runoff.</p> <p>Consider including a detention basin in the lowest part of the development site to attenuate the additional runoff expected from the proposed development. Demonstrate that the post-development peak flows do not exceed pre-developed peak flows from the site for storm events with an ARI of 1 year, up to and including 100 years. Provide a DRAINS model that includes a routing analysis for the detention basin and include hydrographs in the revised SWMP report to show that the post-development runoff will not exceed pre-developed peak flows.</p>
	<p><b>Issue:</b></p>
<p>6.5</p>	<p>The SWMP report proposes that the Developer provide Council with a monetary contribution towards providing a stormwater quality solution elsewhere, in lieu of providing a bioretention basin on the development site.</p> <p>Council might accept monetary contributions if it is possible and more appropriate to provide a bioretention basin elsewhere for the same 'larger' catchment. In this case the development discharge to an important natural gully in Jubilee Park and there are no other alternative sites to treat stormwater prior to discharge to the waterway.</p> <p>Council will therefore not accept the monetary contribution for stormwater quality but will require the Developer to design and construct a bioretention basin in the existing dam location.</p>
	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p>
	<p>Change the proposed development to include a bioretention basin in the existing dam location. Calculations for the bioretention basin area and filter media area must be undertaken for the entire upstream catchment.</p> <p>Due to the slope of the site and the need to attenuate all flows from 0.5 EY to 1% AEP, the Designer is requested to consider a detention and bioretention basin alongside each other with high flow bypass channels, sediment forebays etc as per Water by Design guidelines.</p>

## 7. WATER SUPPLY

	<p><b>Issue:</b></p>
	<p>The Engineering Infrastructure Report does not include results of a water network analysis which address pressure, fire flows and other requirements as defined in WSA and TRC standards.</p>
<p>7.1</p>	<p>There is approximately 65m fall across the development site and no Pressure Reducing Values (PRV) have been proposed. Council's standards require a maximum residual pressure of 65m. Consideration must be given to the existing residual pressures at the proposed connection points to Council's water reticulation.</p>
	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p>

	<p>Demonstrate that the proposed internal water supply reticulation is compliant with TRC's minimum and maximum allowable pressure requirements. Arrange for a pressure and flow test to be undertaken at each of the connection points and undertake hydraulic modelling to determine whether a new pressure zone is required.</p> <p>If a new PRV and pressure zone is required, modelling might be required to demonstrate suitable pipe sizes internal to the development. It is recommended that Council's Water Infrastructure Services be contacted to discuss the implications of altering existing pressure zones and/or creating new zones.</p> <p>Also provide a preliminary design for any proposed PRV and provide evidence that the PRV is suitable sized with a night flow bypass. Detailed design can be finalised as part of an operational works application, but enough analysis and investigation are required as part of this RAL application to form the basis for detailed design.</p>
--	---

## 8. WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE

	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>It has not been demonstrated that proposed Lots 48 to 50 will be able to drain to the proposed internal sewer in accordance with the Planning Scheme Policy. These Lots have between 10m to 13m fall away from the proposed sewer location, therefore a gravity connection in accordance with Council standards will not be possible.</p> <p>If an on-site wastewater treatment and effluent disposal system is proposed for these Lots, then indicate the same in an updated engineering report and provide an assessment of the site slope and soil types together with a proposed wastewater treatment and disposal system that is compliant to <i>AS 1547:2012 On-site domestic wastewater management</i>.</p>
8.1	<p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Demonstrate how proposed Lots 48 to 50 will connect to the proposed internal sewer network or alternatively provide an On-Site Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Report that include but are not limited to the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Site Plan detailing all proposed on-site effluent disposal systems and land application areas within each proposed Lot, include building envelopes and offsets from boundaries;</li> <li>• An assessment of the soil type;</li> <li>• Confirmation of the maximum number of persons to be on-site at any one time; and</li> <li>• An on-site wastewater treatment system design that complies with the requirements of the <i>Queensland Plumbing and Wastewater Code (QPWC)</i> and its referenced standards, including the separation distances from boundaries, structures and watercourses.</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively consider changes the proposed sewer network for proposed Lots 48 to 50 to connect to the same.</p>
8.2	<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>The Preliminary Services Layout drawing number C2223180 appears to show a proposed additional inlet MH with a new connection to the Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) wet-well. The existing inlet MH is 2.2m deep and is aligned in an opposite direction to the proposed sewer alignment.</p> <p>It is unclear how the proposed sewer will connect to the existing inlet MH. The constraint SPS site might require the proposed sewer to be located on the southern side of Coventry Court to be able to discharge to the existing inlet MH in accordance with WSA guidelines.</p> <p><b>Information Required:</b></p> <p>Provide a site layout plan for the SPS site which demonstrate how the proposed sewer will</p>

connect to the existing inlet MH.

## 9. ROADWORKS

9.1	<b>Issue:</b> The Preliminary Services Layout drawing number C2223180 shows that Mackenzie Street is to be widened with kerb and channel to be constructed on the development side of the road, in accordance with Council standards. However, the engineering reports does not mention the widening and the drawing does not show how much widening is required to comply with Council standards.
	<b>Information Required:</b> Update drawing number C223180 to detail how much road widening is required for Mackenzie Street and update the engineering report to reflect the same.

### Note on Alternative Solutions

Where an alternative solution to the Acceptable Outcome is proposed, justification demonstrating how the correlating Performance Outcome has been met must be provided. Requesting an alternative solution without demonstrating how the Performance Outcome has been satisfied, does not oblige Council to favourably consider the alternative solution.

### Options Available in Response to this Information Request

In accordance with section 13.2 of the *Development Assessment Rules*, you may respond to this request for information by providing Council with:

- 1) all of the information requested; or
- 2) part of the information requested; or
- 3) a notice stating that none of the information will be provided.

In your response, advise Council which option you are supplying. If you choose 2) or 3), you may also advise Council to proceed with its assessment of the application.

Provide one electronic copy of the response to Council, including any plans or supporting information.

In accordance with section 13.1 of the *Development Assessment Rules*, you must respond to this information request within **three months** of the date the information request was made, or a further period agreed between the applicant and Council. If there is no response to the information request within the period described, Council will proceed with the assessment of the application based on the information currently available.

Yours faithfully



Matthew Coleman  
Principal Planner, Planning Branch

CC CPL Pastoral Company Pty Ltd and CPLK Property Pty Ltd  
As Trustee  
PO Box 811  
TOOWOOMBA QLD 4350