**BRISBANE** | SUNSHINE COAST | CENTRAL QLD
JFP HOUSE - 76 ERNEST STREET, SOUTH BRISBANE
PO BOX 3634, SOUTH BRISBANE QLD 4101
JFP URBAN CONSULTANTS PTY LTD ABN 79 050 414 045

29 July 2026
Job Ref:B4942P-A1-DA1

Att: Rachel Ritchie
Planning Assessment and Technical Services
Economic Development Queensland
GPO Box 2202
BRISBANE QLD 4001
Via email: rachel.ritchie@edq.qld.gov.au

**RE: RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST - 673 SILVERWOOD DRIVE, FLAGSTONE**
**APPLICANT: THE TRUSTEE FOR CHANG FAMILY TRUST T/A ORIS ACCESSORIES PTY LTD**
**EDQ REF: DEV-2026-FLA-4642**

Dear Rachel,

We refer to EDQ's Information Request, dated 17 April 2026, regarding the abovementioned application.

In accordance with the provisions of the *Economic Development Act 2012*, we hereby provide all of the information requested. In support of our response, please find enclosed the following documents for assessment: -

| | |
|---|---|
| **Attachment A.** | Amended Preliminary Civil Plans, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants; |
| **Attachment B.** | Amended Landscape Concept Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants; |
| **Attachment C.** | Amended Plan of Development, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants; |
| **Attachment D.** | Geotechnical Report, prepared by Qualtest Laboratory Pty Ltd; |
| **Attachment E.** | Amended Site-based Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants; |
| **Attachment F.** | Logan Water Network Analysis Correspondence; |
| **Attachment G.** | Amended Acoustic Report, prepared by Decibell Consulting. |

In response to EDQ's request, and as further detailed below, we note that the proposed development has been amended as follows: -

- The development layout has been revised to address EDQ's requests, including amendments to the road network, pedestrian connections, retaining walls, parks, and stormwater infrastructure;
- The Plan of Development and engineering drawings have been updated to reflect the revised development layout;
- An updated Stormwater Management Plan, including a flood study, have been prepared in response to EDQ's requests;
- Consultation has been undertaken with TMR's Rail Planning Team, with the project staging amended accordingly; and
- Additional technical information has been provided regarding retaining walls, noise categories and other matters requested by EDQ.

In accordance with the provisions of the *Economic Development Act 2012*, we confirm that the above changes do not: -

- result in a substantially different development;
- seek approval for prohibited development;
- require the application to be referred to any additional referral agencies; or
- change the type of development approval sought.

Our responses to EDQ's outstanding issues are as follows: -

*ENGINEERING*

1 *Floodplain management - Restricted development within the high flood risk area*

*Remove earthworks from the high flood hazard area in and around the tributary of Flagstone Creek. As per the Logan City Council's Flood Portal, and therefore relevant for State Planning Policy requirements, the subject tributary of Flagstone Creek is subject to high flood hazard, where the study also recommended for no or limited development opportunity. According to the Logan City Council Flood Portal (TLPI No. 1/2024), given the location of the tributary within a high flood risk area (see extract below), the applicant is permitted to fill up to 20 m³, as per PO/AO22 of the Logan City Plan flood overlay code. Once the above requirements have been addressed and demonstrated that the tributary can be filled with compensatory flood storage, the following requirements (in the items below) need to be addressed.*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. A flood impact assessment has been undertaken, and the results demonstrate that filling eliminates the high flood hazard conditions without creating adverse flood impacts. The runoff from the external catchment "EXT" will be conveyed via internal drainage network (pipe and road). The proposal provides a satisfactory outcome against Logan City Council's Flood Hazard Overlay Code. This strategy was presented to EDQ officers in a meeting held on the 3/6/2026, where the EDQ team were agreeable to this approach, pending details of the flood impact assessment. Refer to Section 4 of the Site-based Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for details of the flood impact assessment.

2 *Floodplain management - Flood impact/Overland flow assessment*

*Submit a flood impact/overland flow assessment report prepared by an RPEQ specialised in flood hydraulics. For better understanding and proper assessment of the application, the applicant is requested to provide the following information:*

a. *Flood modelling including cumulative filling within the Flagstone Creek corridor and demonstrate no impact to surrounding properties.*
b. *Section 3.2 of the report indicated that a small external catchment from the rail corridor will be conveyed through the site. Identify the size, extent of the catchment, and the required stormwater infrastructure to cater for the upstream catchment.*

*This is required to ensure that the development has adequately considered the external flow and the proposed development features to demonstrate no hydraulic impacts.*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. In response, these matters are addressed in the amended Site-based Stormwater Management Plan as follows:

a. Refer to Section 4 of the Site-based Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants for the requested flood modelling.

b. The size and extent of the external catchment from the rail corridor is identified as "EXT" on catchment plans in Appendix D of the SBSMP. The catchment size of "EXT" is 3.26ha in size. The preliminary pipe size for conveying the minor flow is 750mm diameter RCP at 0.15% minimum grade (Section 3.2.2.1). The final pipe size and grade subject to detail design. Overland flow in a major design storm will travel via the road network. Road capacity calculations in Section 3.5 of the enclosed Site-based Stormwater Management Plan includes flow from this external catchment. The results show compliance with the QUDM (2016).

Refer to the enclosed Site-based Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for details further details.

3 *Stormwater Management Plan - Stormwater Quantity*

*Submit a revised stormwater management plan to address the following aspects:*

*a. Figure 7 has identified three lawful point of discharges; however, the corresponding contributing catchments are not clear. Provide revised plan showing the contributing sub-catchment for each LPD. This is required to understand the extent of the contributing catchment/s for each LPD.*

*b. Provide a 1% AEP assessment to demonstrate that Bloomfield Esplanade has adequate capacity to cater for the increased runoff. Compliance with the requirements of QUDM is to be demonstrated.. The assessment and further peak flow mitigation measure is required to ensure that the flood overland flow safety at the downstream existing road systems are not compromised.*

*c. Demonstrate that the proposed "Type 3 – conventional" bioretention design including the flood immunity of the weir and outlet pipes complies with Logan City Plan requirements. The details of the bioretention basin should satisfy the relevant EDQ and Logan City Council standards.*

*d. Submit a preliminary geotechnical and earthworks stability assessment addressing retaining walls and batters adjoining the stormwater basin, including confirmation of long term stability and erosion resistance. The design of the proposed retaining walls are to comply with the requirements of Logan Planning Scheme Policy, Schedule 6, Section 3.3.6.2.*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. In response, it is noted:

a) Previous Figure 7 has now been re-numbered to Figure 4 and updated to highlight the contributing catchments to each LPD in separate colours.

b) Refer to Section 3.4.3 of the enclosed Site-based Stormwater Management Plan for 1% AEP water level assessment in Bloomfield Esplanade. The results demonstrate it has adequate capacity to cater for the increased runoff whilst complying with the requirements of the QUDM (2016).

c) All basin components, including filter media, outlet pipes and weir are located above Flagstone Creek 1% AEP flood levels which is approximately 33m AHD. Refer to Appendix J for the preliminary engineering design plans for the basin. It has been undertaken generally in accordance with relevant EDQ, LCC and QUDM (2016) standards.

d) Refer to the separate Geotechnical Report prepared by Qualtest Laboratory Pty Ltd (Appendix D) that addresses this item.

Based on Water Network Analysis and Correspondence with Logan Water (refer Appendix F), the DN200 water main along Mountain Ridge Road will not be required to accommodate the proposed development network connection. Spare capacity has been identified on the existing reticulation network.

Refer to the enclosed Site-based Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for details further details.

*TRAFFIC*

4 *Provide a minimum 3.0m wide shared path on the southern and eastern side of Road 1 Neighbourhood Collector, from Lot 137 onwards to Silverwood Drive. Also provide zebra crossing at the end of the separate cycle track to connect to the 3.0m wide shared path on the southern side of Road 1.*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. The Plan of Development and Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans have been revised to incorporate EDQ's requested amendments. A 3.0m wide shared path is now provided along the southern and eastern side of Road 1 (Neighbourhood Collector) from Lot 137 to Silverwood Drive. Please refer to the enclosed amended Plan of Development prepared by JFP Urban Consultants.

The revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans have also been updated to include a zebra crossing at the termination of the separated cycle track, providing a connection to the 3.0m wide shared path on the southern side of Road 1.

4 *Amend the POD to allow for a 23m wide road reserve on Road 1, from Lot 118 to 136. Road 1 from Lot 137 onwards to Silverwood Drive is to be 22m in accordance with PDA Guideline No.6*

Applicant Response:

The Plan of Development has been revised to incorporate the requested amendments. Road 1 has been amended to provide a 23m wide road reserve between Lots 118 and 136, with a 22m wide road reserve provided from Lot 137 through to Silverwood Drive. Please refer to the enclosed amended Plan of Development prepared by JFP Urban Consultants.

6 *Provide amended plans to provide a pedestrian connection from Cassowary Place to the south to the development site (Road 5).*

Applicant Response:

The Plan of Development has been amended to provide a pedestrian connection from Cassowary Place to the south, connecting to the proposed development via Road 5. Please refer to the enclosed amended Plan of Development prepared by JFP Urban Consultants for further details.

7 *Amend the Civil Engineering Services Report, Drawing CR02 to correctly state the widths of the Neighbourhood Collector with Cycle Track (23m road reserve), and 21.0m wide access street (21m road reserve).*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. The Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans have been revised to accurately reflect the EDQ standard cross-sections for the Neighbourhood Collector with Cycle Track (23m road reserve) and the Access Street (21m road reserve). The Plan of Development has also been updated to ensure consistency with the revised engineering documentation. Please refer to the enclosed revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan package and amended Plan of Development, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for further details.

*RETAINING WALLS*

8 *Provide an amended Landscaping Masterplan to:*

a. *Remove rock boulder retaining walls in the neighbourhood park. Logan City Council's preference for ongoing maintenance is that a batter be provided. Council highlights that prescribed safe gradients are 1:6 for mowing activities and 1:4 for landscaping maintenance;*

b. *Remove the concrete retaining wall along Road 3 and replace with a batter and remove the second footpath as this appears to not be required.*

Applicant Response:

Consultation has been undertaken with Logan City Council's Parks representative regarding the proposed park design. In response, the boulder retaining walls have been reduced to the greatest practicable extent, while maintaining opportunities for passive surveillance of the park and addressing EDQ's maintenance objectives. In addition, the concrete retaining wall along Road 3 has been removed and replaced with a batter. The meandering footpath through the park has also been removed in accordance with EDQ's request. The interface between the esplanade road and park is depicted in the updated landscape Section A shown below. Please refer to the enclosed revised Landscape Concept Plan package, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for further details.


9 *Provide further detail on the proposed concrete sleeper retaining wall between the park and the basins, including size, dimensions, materials, construction methods and maintenance requirements.*

Applicant Response:

The Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans have been revised to provide greater detail on the concrete sleeper retaining wall between the park and the basins. Please refer to the revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan package, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for further details.

10 *Remove Drawing CE22 if no terrace retaining wall proposed for this development.*

Applicant Response:

Drawing CE22 has been removed, as per EDQ's request. Please refer to the revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan package, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for further details.

11 *Amend the Landscape Plan to remove the footpath leading down into the bio-retention basin to ensure consistency with the Civil Engineering Services Report, Bioretention Basin Layout Plan (Drawing CE27).*

Applicant Response:

As requested, the Landscape Concept Plan package has been revised to remove the meandering footpath leading to the bio-retention basin, ensuring consistency across the application documentation. Please refer to the enclosed revised Landscape Concept Plan package, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for further details.

12 *Amend the plans to ensure that retaining walls are located entirely within lot boundaries. EDQ requires retaining walls to be located entirely within lot boundaries to reduce issues with future maintenance.*

Applicant Response:

The Engineering drawings have been amended to ensure that all proposed retaining walls are located entirely within lot boundaries, in accordance with EDQ's request.

13 *Provide further detail about the location of the lots that will contain retaining walls (between lot boundaries) that are greater than 2.5m in height. EDQ's preference is for retaining walls of no greater than 2.5m in height. Where a height of greater than 2.5m is proposed, this should be a stepped wall and details should be provided about treatment of the retaining wall (eg: landscaping of the stepped wall).*

Applicant Response:

The proposed retaining walls have been revised to minimise wall heights where practicable. Details identifying retaining walls exceeding 2.5 m in height, including stepped wall treatments and associated landscaping, have been incorporated into the revised engineering documentation. Where walls exceed 2 metres in height, a stepped retaining wall solution is proposed. Please refer to the revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan package, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants, for further details.

*NOISE*

14 *Provide a Noise Level Category table sorting by Lot number. This table should be easily understandable (eg: for reading by a building company at the time of detailed design) to identify the correct Noise Level Category.*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. The Acoustic Report, prepared by Decibell Consulting, has been revised to include a Noise Level Category table sorted by lot number, providing straightforward identification of the applicable Noise Level Category for each lot. Please refer to the enclosed amended Acoustic Report for further details.

*RAILWAY CORRIDOR – SALISBURY TO BEAUDESERT PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT*

15 *Provide details of the outcomes of consultation with the Department of Transport and Main Roads' (TMR) Rail Planning team. The proposed development is located within the study area associated with the TMR's Salisbury to Beaudesert Passenger Rail project (S2B). The proposal plans show that proposed lots 710–749, the laneway, and the 10m new road (buffer) will be located within the project corridor. The applicant must contact TMR's Rail Planning team via RailPlanning@tmr.qld.gov.au to discuss the potential sharing of confidential information about the project and potential land use interfaces between the S2B project and the proposed development to ensure that the proposed development layout is one that can remain achievable as the planning for this project progresses.*

Applicant Response:

EDQ's comments are noted. The applicant has undertaken consultation with the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) Rail Planning Team regarding the proposed development's interface with the Salisbury to Beaudesert Passenger Rail (S2B) project.

TMR confirmed that planning for the S2B project remains at an early stage and that the corridor alignment and design are still subject to ongoing investigation and refinement. Given the current stage of the rail project, there is no statutory requirement to amend the proposed subdivision layout at this time.

Notwithstanding this, the applicant has reviewed the concept staging in response to the advice received. To provide greater flexibility while TMR's planning progresses, all lots adjoining the potential future rail corridor have been incorporated within Stage 7, being the final stage of the development. This approach defers development of the part of the site at the rail interface, allowing further time for the state to progress its potential requirements prior to those lots being developed.

In considering this further, we note that the proposed subdivision also incorporates a 10m-wide road reserve along the rail interface, providing an appropriate buffer between the future residential lots and the potential rail corridor, while maintaining flexibility for future transport planning.

---

This correspondence and attachments represent a response to all the information requested. In accordance with s83(B) of the *Economic Development Act 2012,* the applicant now awaits confirmation from EDQ on compliance with the information request.

We trust the above and enclosed information satisfactorily addresses EDQ's request. Please do not hesitate to contact the office should you have any queries.

Yours faithfully,

Isla Jenkins

Per,
SHANE TALTY
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR – TOWN PLANNING + URBAN DESIGN
JFP URBAN CONSULTANTS