Your reference
Our reference 3406/2025/PDA:NM
Contact Officer Nikki Morrison
Telephone (07) 3810 6635

**Ipswich City Council**

1 Nicholas Street
PO Box 191
IPSWICH QLD 4305

**Phone** (07) 3810 6666
**Fax** (07) 3810 6731
**Email** council@ipswich.qld.gov.au

**Ipswich.qld.gov.au**

Stockland Development Pty Ltd and AW Bidco 6 Pty Limited
erichards@thereforgroup.com.au
CC: pdadevelopmentassessment@edq.qld.gov.au
CC: medqdelegations@edq.qld.gov.au

8 December 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: MEDQ Delegate Further Information Request
Application No: 3406/2025/PDA
Proposal:
- Context Plan (to supersede Context Plan subject of 10397/2023/MAPDA)
- Reconfiguring a Lot – One (1) Lot into Three Hundred and Ten (310) Lots {consisting of 301 Residential lots, One (1) Future Multiple Residential Lot, One (1) Balance Lot, Four (4) Drainage Reserve/Stormwater Management Lots, One (1) Neighbourhood Recreation Park lot, One (1) District Recreation Park Lot, One (1) Open Space (Conservation Area) lot}; and
- Associated Plan of Development (POD) for a House {over Three Hundred and One (301) Residential Lots}; and Display Village, Temporary Sales Office and related Advertising Devices

Property Location: 817-843 Ripley Road, SOUTH RIPLEY QLD 4306

I refer to the above referenced development application and your response dated 11 November 2025 to the MEDQ Delegate's information request dated 3 July 2025.

Upon preliminary review of the submitted information in respect to the application, a number of items were not appropriately addressed. As such, further information as detail below is required to satisfactorily assess this application.

Please note that issues which can be resolved through conditions have not been included in the below.

## A. CONTEXT PLAN COMPONENT

| 1. | Proposed Context Plan |
|---|---|
| No further information required subject to Item 3 being addressed. | |

| 2. | Stormwater Quality |
|---|---|
| No further information required subject to Items 8 and 14 being addressed. | |

## B. RECONFIGURE A LOT COMPONENT

### Planning

| 3. | Density |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| *(a)* | *It is noted that the proposal achieves an overall density of 22.56dw/ha, however the applicant is requested to clarify what density is being achieved for each of the following areas:*<br>· *Low-medium density residential*<br>· *Low-medium density residential – slope affected*<br><br>*Proposed densities must comply with the proposed context plan.* |
| *(b)* | *Proposed Lot 8002 is identified as being for multiple residential. As identified on the POD, this site can have a density of up to 65dw/ha. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to demonstrate that the proposed site is appropriate for multiple residential up to this density taking into consideration the following:*<br><br>· *The site is generally identified as slope affected on the context plan;*<br>· *Significant battering is shown throughout the site, as per the submitted earthworks plans;*<br>· *Appropriate access must be achieved for the proposed density.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | <u>Proposed Lot 8002</u><br><br>While the submitted example is acknowledged, it does not address the site specific concerns raised under Item 3(b) above. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to address these concerns. |

| 4. | Proposed Layout |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The applicant is requested to provide an amended layout which addresses the following:* |
| *(a)* | *<u>Access</u>*<br><br>*(i) It is noted that the Response to Not Properly Made Notice dates 23 May 2025 indicates that the initial access to development will be from the north via the Lacebark development. However, the submitted plans include this road connection within Stage 4. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to submit amended plans which accurately reflect the proposed staging.*<br>*(ii) The applicant is requested to identify the emergency secondary access track on the proposed plans.* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *Address items raised under Item 6 – Open Space and Item 7 - Traffic Impact Assessment.* |
| *(b)* | *Bushfire offset area*<br><br>*(i) The proposed bushfire offset area as identified on the submitted Open Space Plan is not accurately reflected within the proposed subdivision drawings which is shown in a similar manor to road reserve. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to amend the plans to accurately reflect the intended use of this area.*<br>*The applicant is requested to amend the plans to address the interface concerns raised under Item 5(f) – Plan of Development and Item 16 – Conservation Interface below.* |
| *(c)* | *Conservation/Environmental Protection Zone*<br><br>*(i) The applicant is requested to provide pedestrian connectivity along the Environmental Protection Zone, in lieu of an esplanade road.*<br>*(ii) The applicant is requested to nominate a delivery stage for this lot.*<br>*(iii) The applicant is requested to clarify why the Bushfire offset area is not included with the conservation lot.* |
| *(d)* | *There are several blocks which exceed 130m length, which is inconsistent with PDA Guideline No. 1 – Residential 30 and PDA Guideline 5: Neighbourhood Planning and Design. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to ensure that no blocks exceed 130m without providing a 10m wide pedestrian link to assist with walkability.* |
| *(e)* | *In accordance with PDA Guideline 1: Residential 30, no more than eight (8) narrow lot frontages (being lot frontages under 15m) are to be provided in a row. The applicant is requested to amend the proposal plans accordingly.* |
| *(f)* | *The applicant is advised that parking within laneways is not supported and fails to meet the PDA Guideline 6. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to amend the plans to ensure all laneways are in accordance with the PDA Guideline requirements.* |
| *(g)* | *Nominate the radius of the cul de sac as to achieve minimum 9m radius at the invert.* |
| *(h)* | *Retaining wall heights*<br><br>*(i) The proposal includes significant retaining walls along a number of road reserves and open space. The applicant is requested to review the earthworks to limit the extent of external facing retaining walls.*<br>*(ii) The legend includes walls +3m. The applicant is requested to clarify the extent of retaining propose for these walls.*<br><br>*Please refer to Item 10 - Concept Civil Engineering Plans for further information.* |
| *(i)* | *Reflect any changes resulting from the response to all other matters raised in this information request.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| | The applicant is requested to address the following: |
| (a) | Staging plan<br><br>(i) The information request response makes reference to a staging plan, however does not appear to be included in the submitted plans. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to provide a staging plan.<br>(ii) It is noted that the response seeks flexibility in the order of stages beyond Stage 1A, however open space is included within individual stages. The applicant is requested to clearly identify the intended timing of open space delivery and ensure there are |

| | |
|---|---|
| | residential lots attached to the delivery of these open space stages. |
| (b) | Block lengths<br><br>It is unclear how the 'Design Framework' plan demonstrates key pedestrian routes as justification for the excessive block lengths. Noting that the District Recreation Park will be a key attracter, the applicant is requested to clearly outline how the proposed layout facilitates pedestrian connectivity to the east/west in order to justify the proposed increased block lengths. |
| (c) | On Street Parking<br><br>The response makes reference to the developments ability to accommodate on street parking, however an on-street parking analysis for the revised layout has not been provided. The applicant is requested to provide an on-street parking analysis prepared in accordance with PDA Practice Note 11 – Parking Analysis. |

| 5. | Plan of Development |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The applicant is requested to submit an amended Plan of Development (POD) that addresses the following in accordance with PDA Guideline 1: Residential 30 and PDA Practice Note 10: Plans of Development:* |
| *(a)* | *Indicate the lot dimensions and areas.* |
| *(b)* | *Indicate land slope, stairs, retaining wall locations and infrastructure items (eg. sewerage, water, stormwater, electricity/telecoms, street lighting, PMT's etc.) and associated easement/s and amend POD notes as required (i.e. General Controls – Note 5).* |
| *(c)* | *Lot types*<br><br>*(i) There are a number of 'Terrace Allotments (front loaded)' located throughout the development that do not appear to function as a terrace allotment (i.e. wider than 7.5m, not attached). Examples of these proposed lots include 2132,2131 2166, 2167, 2201, 2242. The applicant is requested to amend the POD to ensure categorisation of lot types accurately reflect what is being proposed.*<br>*(ii) 'Laneway Terrace Allotments' identified under Additional Specific Controls is inconsistent with the lot terminology used within the POD table. The applicant is requested to amend the POD to ensure there is consistency across the document.*<br>*(iii) The applicant proposes an 'Urban Loft' lot type, however this is not described in the PDA Guideline1 – Residential 30. The applicant is requested to provide further information on the intent of this lot type and update the POD requirements as needed to facilitate an appropriate outcome (i.e. should a minimum of two storeys be mandatory noting the lot size?) while taking into consideration the matters raised throughout this Information Request.* |
| *(d)* | *Split level lots*<br><br>*Based on the submitted earthworks plans, there are a number of split level lots proposed. It is noted that some of these (i.e. proposed Lots 228-2233) are identified on the POD as 'potential split level', however others are not identified (i.e. proposed Lots 2062-206). It is unclear how these lots are proposed to be developed in the event that they are not developed as split level (noting the use of 'potential'). Further, the POD does not include any specific provisions to guide development of these lots. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to address the following:* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *(i) Identify all lots required for split level construction;*<br>*(ii) Unless an appropriate alternative to construction is proposed, mandate the requirement for split level construction; and*<br>*(iii) Amend the POD to include specific design requirement for these lots.* |
| *(e)* | *The applicant is requested to clearly identify the primary frontage for all lots with secondary frontages, taking into consideration the items raised in items (f) and (g) below.* |
| *(f)* | *The applicant is requested to provide an amended POD which includes design requirement provisions for lots adjoining open space and pedestrian walkways (if proposed). In particular, the design outcomes sought should ensure that passive surveillance/overlooking of the open space is achieved. The maximum fence height should be 1.2m, consistent with PDA Guideline No. 1 – Residential 30.* |
| *(g)* | *The applicant is requested to amend the POD to ensure that 'Front Loaded Terrace Lots' address the adjoining pathway adjacent to Road 1/Neighbourhood Park as the primary frontage. It would be beneficial to identify the park edge as the primary frontage to assist.*<br><br>*This must include at a minimum the inclusion of front doors, building articulation, letter box, pedestrian access and front fencing requirements.* |
| *(h)* | *For terrace lots, the applicant is requested to provide a break in the built form (through removal of the built to boundary wall) to facilitate groupings of between four and six lots as per PDA Guideline 1 – Residential 30.* |
| *(i)* | *PDA Guideline No. 1 – Residential 30 provides for double garages on lots greater than 12.5m. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to either amend the POD to restrict double garages on lots under 12.5m (excluding rear loaded terrace lots) or alternatively provide additional design criteria which will assist in ensuring double garages will not dominate the streetscape.* |
| *(j)* | *The applicant is requested to amend on site parking requirements to be consistent with PDA Guideline 7: Low Rise Buildings.* |
| *(k)* | *The applicant is requested to provide detailed concept house plans for lots less than 250m² in area; typical house plans for lots between 250m² and 450m²; and typical house plans for Lots 6382-6390 in accordance with PDA Practice Note 10 – Plan of Development and PDA Guideline 7 – Low Rise Building.* |
| *(l)* | *The applicant is requested to amend site cover requirements to be consistent with PDA Guideline 1 – Residential 30.* |
| *(m)* | *The applicant is requested to amend the built to boundary wall length and locations to be consistent with PDA Guideline 7: Low Rise Buildings.* |
| *(n)* | *<u>General POD Requirements</u>*<br><br>*The applicant is requested to address the following:*<br><br>*(i) General Controls – Note 7: amend to clearly identity where 3 storey development is supported.*<br>*(ii) Clarify what a roof top terrace is and where this is applicable.*<br>*(iii) General Controls – Note 19: clarify why this is not applicable to Urban Lofts. This raises concerns with the potential built form outcome of these lots.*<br>*(iv) General Controls – Note 22: clearly identify what lots are affected by this requirement.*<br>*(v) Notes relating to fencing: amend fencing to be consistent with PDA Guideline 1 – Residential 30, particularly in relation to fencing for corner lots and fencing interfacing with park/open space.* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *(vi) Replace references to 'submitted for approval' to 'submitted for compliance assessment'.*<br>*(vii) Apply footnote 1 of the POD Table to non BTB side setbacks*<br>*(viii) Review the POD and remove any non-applicable items to avoid any unnecessary confusion to the end user. For example, Urban Lofts - Note 5 refers to access from secondary frontages and laneways, however the POD includes all driveway locations from the primary frontage and Urban Lofts – Note 10 relates to terrace lots.* |
| *(o)* | *<u>Display Village</u>*<br><br>*The applicant is requested to make the following amendments to the 'Display Village (Indicative)' POD:*<br><br>*(i) Clarify why the Neighbourhood Park is included within the display village boundary.*<br>*(ii) In regards to the potential road closure of part of Road 01 for up to 10 years, the applicant is requested to address how future orderly development can be facilitated for lots to the west and Lot 8001.*<br>*(iii) Include design provisions for the sales office, including maximum GFA.*<br>*(iv) The POD makes reference to a Billboard Sign which is to be limited to the nominated areas along the main entry, however the POD does not nominate this. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to remove references to the Billboard Sign, noting the MEDQ Delegate would be unlikely to support a Billboard Sign as part of a POD (a separate application for advertising devices would be required).*<br>*(v) Note 4 states entry statements are to be limited to nominated areas along the main entry road. The applicant is requested to clarify what is meant by entry statements and clearly identify the nominated areas on the POD.* |
| *(p)* | *Amend the submitted Plan of Development drawings to reflect any changes resulting from the response to all other matters raised in this information request.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| | The applicant is requested to address the below: |
| (a) | Amend the POD to provide the requested details as per item 5(b). This ensures consistency across documents and makes it clear to future lot owners, builders, designers etc where key infrastructure is located, requirements for stairs etc.<br><br>It is noted that an electrical engineer has been engaged and a response to the electrical POD items will be provided in due course. The applicant is requested to provide this information, noting that complete responses to information requests are required. |
| (b) | <u>Urban Lofts</u><br><br>The applicant is requested to provide built examples of these lot typologies, particularly where adjoining terrace product as proposed.<br><br>Consideration should be given to proposed retaining and interface with adjoining lots. It is expected that the POD will be amended to provide further design requirements for these lot typologies, particularly as it relates to wall treatments facing adjoining terrace lots. |
| (c) | <u>Garden Home Allotments</u><br><br>It is noted that only two storey examples of Garden Home Allotments are provided, however the POD does not mandate two storey development. The applicant is requested to either demonstrate how this lot type can be developed as a single storey or alternatively mandate 2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | storey construction.<br><br>Should parking me limited to a single space as shown on the examples, development should be limited to two bedrooms. It is noted that the 'Product Mix and Typologies' document provides low quality resolution floor plans, however it appears as though the examples note only two bedroom developments. |
| (d) | Display Village<br><br>The amended POD has removed POD references to the display village. The applicant is requested to include POD provisions for the display village, taking into consideration the concerns raised in the original Information Request. |
| (e) | The applicant is requested to review the POD to remove irreverent references and ensure there are no inconsistencies between general notes and lot specific notes (such as private open space). |

*Advice Note:*

*There are a number of POD amendments which have not been made, primarily in relation to on-site parking, clusters of terraces, site cover, setbacks, fencing etc. These items will be addressed through plan mark-ups. Please note that utilising previous examples is not sufficient justification. Consideration must be given to the outcomes achieved, site specific requirements and the 'reset' undertaken with the introduction of the Improvement Plan which seeks consistency with the guidelines.*

| 6. | Open Space |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *Whilst it is acknowledged that the submitted design is conceptual, it lacks adequate detail to demonstrate if embellishments can be delivered as intended within the open space network. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to demonstrate that the open space areas can be embellished to the required Desired Standard of Service for park types under Ipswich Planning Scheme LGIP 2016 and EDQ Guideline No. 12 including land area, grades and sections. For clarity, the following cross referencing of park types is provided:* |

| *EDQ Guideline No. 12 Park Types* | | *Ipswich Planning Scheme LGIP 2016 Park Types* |
|---|---|---|
| *Linear park* | = | *Local Linear Park* |
| *Major Linear park* | = | *Citywide Linear Park* |
| *Local Recreation Park* | | *No equivalent (Scaled down Local Recreation Park)* |
| *Neighbourhood Recreation Park* | = | *Local Recreation Park* |
| *District Recreation Park* | = | *District Recreation Park* |
| *Major Recreation Park* | = | *Citywide Recreation Park* |
| *District Sports Park* | = | *Local Sports Park* |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Major Sports Park* | = | *Citywide Sports Park* | |
| *(a)* | *The applicant is requested to provide additional information that demonstrates compliance with the required Desired Standards of Service for the relevant park types from both the Ipswich Planning Scheme LGIP 2016 and EDQ Guideline No. 12. The MEDQ Delegate's particular concerns that need addressing/further information provided are outlined below:*<br><br>(i) *Terminology and documentation to reflect EDQ park types and DCOP numbers for clarity of requirements.*<br>(ii) *Dimensions grades, and flood levels required on Park concept and sections to confirm compliance to EDQ Guideline 12 and ICC Desired Standards of Service.*<br>(iii) *Waterway riparian corridor to comply with Ipswich Waterway Health Strategy riparian offsets and defined linear park from top of bank to both sides of waterway (excluding District and Neighbourhood Recreation Park areas adjacent to one side of waterway).*<br>(iv) *Address the matters raised under (b)-(d).* | | | | |
| *(b)* | *<u>Neighbourhood Recreation Park</u>*<br><br>*The applicant is requested to address the following with regards to the proposed Neighbourhood Recreation Park:*<br><br>(i) *Demonstrate the wide vegetation adjacent to residential area to the west will not compromise CPTED and casual surveillance of both pathway and park.*<br>(ii) *Demonstrate half courts (and rebound walls if applicable) are minimum of 50m from residents.*<br>(iii) *Vehicle deterrents (bollards) to all street frontages, and fencing is required to ensure safety of balls and children in and around playgrounds, kick-about, rebound wall and half courts, (to reduce risk from children and balls from entering streets, drains/watercourses, and especially on the down slope of these areas).*<br>(iv) *Demonstrate Kickabout area meets EDQ requirements of 50m x 30m.*<br>(v) *BBQs are not approved for Neighbourhood Recreation Parks and are to be removed.*<br>(vi) *A maximum grade for turf areas of 1:6 is required, and maximum 1:33 for kickabout area.*<br>(vii) *Q100 immunity of all elements and park, (Comments in DSS table for Local recreation park state all park sits below Q100).*<br>(viii) *Confirm <20% land area is 1:10 or more* | | | | |
| *(c)* | *<u>District Recreation Park (DCOP POS006)</u>*<br><br>*The applicant is requested to address the following with regards to the proposed District Recreation Park:*<br><br>*(i) The proposed park encompasses Stream Order 3, and waterway should be excluded from the park area (notated as 25% of park area), as well as the whole detention and biobasin land. Land required for the principle purposes of drainage are to be dedicated as separate lot/s for drainage. The area to south of the waterway is linear park and not district park, as it cannot function as a district park with the large waterway dissecting the area. After excluding these areas, functional land area of district park should be approximate 3ha to ensure District Park facilities and function can be accommodated within the lot (current proposal of less than 2ha of functional land does not meet requirements for a district park from the required 5ha requirement).* | | | | |







*(ii) Clarify the park area meets required site grades (example <20% area is 1:10 or more, min 30% area is 1:20 or less).*

*(iii) Car parking is to be internal to ensure facilities can be accessed by the wider community and reduce antisocial and conflicts with adjoining residents. Car parking to accommodate service vehicles (eg refuse trucks and food caravans to concessionary stand area) and accessibility parking to connect to all major facilities.*

*(iv) Provide location of coach bus parking for the park (on-street can be an acceptable solution to remove large turnaround movements within the reduced park area).*

*(v) Demonstrate multiple large areas within the park are provided to facilitate various community events and sizes.*

*(vi) Demonstrate half courts (and rebound walls if applicable) are minimum of 50m from*

*residents.*

*(vii) Dedicated legible shared pathway connection from the 4m emergency access pathway (connection to Ripley Road) to Road 1 and Catalyst Road is required for connecting both internal and wider community.*


*(viii) Provide details of all the stair locations that inhibit direct accessible access to facilities. (all facilities require accessible access from both road footpath and car park areas)*




*(ix) Park embellishments to be outside the BAL 19 setback to ensure long term safety of assets.*

*(x) The applicant is requested to clarify how the BAL setback is calculated through the proposed district park and confirm it does not include riparian creek area that is required to be revegetated. Once confirmed, the applicant is requested to clarify what bushfire management requirements are required long term in the District Park area.*

*(xi) Confirm if the area to the north is required to be buffer from EPBC area of adjoining lot, noting items raised under Item 16 – Conservation Interface.*




*A maximum grade for turf areas of 1:6 is required, with active area max 1:33.*

*(d)* <u>*EDQ Linear Park (DCOP POS352) – Including Drainage Reserve*</u>

*The applicant is requested to address the following with regards to the proposed Linear Parks:*

*(i) Emergency Access pathway from Ripley Road to Road 9 (and any proposed pedestrian pathway crossing) to be Q10 immune.*

*(ii) Any waterway crossing to be Q10 immune.*

*(iii) All embellishment infrastructure to be offset from riparian corridor and minimum 10m from top of bank (excluding emergency access crossing).*

*(iv) Linear park to be provided to both sides of the waterway.*

*(v) Ensure 2.2m wide pathways connections are provided along the full extent of waterways and connected to the pathway network of the development. Linear pathway and road footpath can be combined where beneficial for both functions (width to represent the wider pathway width of the 2 areas).*

*(vi) Confirm that the catalyst road off-road bikeway and footpath accommodate the linear park pathway requirements.*




*(vii) Provide details of Catalyst Road to ensure riparian corridor (Stream order 3) and linear park can be accommodated.*

*(viii)Bins and bike racks are not approved for Linear Parks and are to be removed.*

*(ix) Majority of linear park to be revegetated. Large areas of Turf generally not supported within linear park.*

*(x) Confirm if linear park edge near Stage 1, and the area adjoining the northern EPBC area are required to be bushfire offset areas (see extract mark-up below).*



Outstanding Matters

(a) <u>District Recreation Park (DCOP POS006)</u>

The applicant is requested to address the following:

(i) Provide bus parking to the District Recreation Park. It is noted that the proposed location on catalyst road is not an appropriate solution to service the park.

(ii) As a result of addressing (i), ensure that the roads are capable of accommodating Coach bus manoeuvring and parking on-street.
*Note: 2 potential routes are outlined below, however may be affected by topography. Compliant DDA access required from bus park to park facilities must be demonstrated.*





*Note: this will likely remove some proposed on-street car parks.*

(iii) Provide Q10 immunity of waterway crossing (Ripley Road to Road 11)


(iv) On-street car parking to be part of road reserve

## Engineering

| 7. | Traffic Impact Assessment |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The applicant submitted a report titled Providence West ROL 2, 817 Ripley Road Traffic Impact Assessment by SLR Consulting, (620.30351.02004 Rev 2.0) dated 20 May 2025 in support of the proposed development. The assessment undertaken in the report does not satisfactorily address the traffic and transport aspects of the proposed development. The applicant is requested to submit a revised version of this report addressing:* |
| *<u>General</u>* | |
| *(a)* | *The main access to the development is from the future east west Arterial Road (DCOP) which aligns along the southern boundary of the development. The timing of delivery of this road is currently unknown. Accordingly, the only access to the development is through Road 07 from Providence Lacebark (ref. 2342/2024/MAPDA/B - under construction). Road 07 being a neighbourhood access street is not designed to cater for the traffic from 302 dwellings and the later on addition of another 262 dwellings. The same applied for Road 01 in Lacebark to which the traffic from the proposed development will contribute to.*<br><br>*Accordingly, the applicant is requested to review the TIA to include the above factors as well to assist in determining the impact of the proposed development on the existing road network.* |
| *(b)* | *Catalyst Road design is referenced in the Road Hierarchy Layout Plan of the set of Civil Functional Drawings. Provide the latest version of this drawing.* |
| *(c)* | *Bus stops have been indicated on Road 01, however it is anticipated that new roads within the development may also be required to accommodate a future bus service. The developer is requested to seek written advice from Translink on future bus routes in the precinct and modify the internal road network if required.* |
| *(d)* | *It is acknowledged that there is a previous approval over this site, however due to the significant changes proposed the applicant is requested to update the road hierarchy terminology and cross sections to match those contained within PDA Guideline 6 - Street and Movement Network.* |

| | |
|---|---|
| *(e)* | *The active transport, PDA Guideline 6 - Street and Movement Network specifies that neighbourhood connectors should have a 3.0m shared path in one verge and a 1.5m wide path in the other. This should be provided throughout the development.* |
| *(f)* | *Road 02 West (cross section D) is encroaching existing north south road reserve (see extract below). Amend the lot layout to contain the proposed road within the development boundary (the north south road to be continued in both direction by future developments).*   |
| *(g)* | *The applicant is requested to provide a shared path along the length of the waterway, consistent with the existing context plan.* |
| *(h)* | *Throughout the report there are a number of assumptions made about the delivery of major external road projects, for example the Southwest Trunk Road and associated intersections. Given there is currently no certainty for Council that this infrastructure will be delivered in accordance with the proposed timeframes, the applicant is requested to provide further information demonstrating how the proposed development can progress until such time the DCOP infrastructure is delivered.* |
| *(i)* | *Regarding background traffic, the 5% growth rate applied to the observed traffic is considered to be too low. There is significant development occurring in the surrounding network which needs to be catered for within the growth along Ripley Road. The applicant is requested to update assessments using a growth rate derived from the traffic modelling outputs.* |
| *(j)* | *The TIA should take into account other surrounding approved developments, including but not limited to: 741 Ripley Road, additional stages of the Scott DPI site and uses associated with the Secondary Urban Core East (although this will likely be catered for in a higher background growth rate).* |
| *(k)* | *Regarding the 4.0m path which will serve as the emergency access track, further details are required on the form of this connection relating to immunity, accessibility and how access will be restricted outside of emergencies. The Flood Assessment Report nominates immunity for the path for events up to and including 39%AEP, however, it must be upgraded to achieve immunity in 10%AEP events.* |
| *(l)* | *The proposed on street 90 degree parking bays for the local park are expected to have operational issues, the preferable outcome would be a parking facility accessed via the proposed internal roundabout.* |
| *(m)* | *In section 4.3 of the TIA it appears there is a typo. Within the 2039 Background section it states, "The background traffic was determined by using the 2031 Year ICC Model Volumes", it is assumed that this should instead be 2041. The applicant is requested to clarify and amend as required.* |
| *(n)* | *For the Ultimate Year Horizon 2046, there appears to be some confusion surrounding the data previously provided from the traffic model. There has not been a modelled scenario for 2046 without the Wensley Road interchange in place, and as such all 2046 volumes assume that the* |


| | |
|---|---|
| | *interchange has been provided. The applicant is requested to clarify and amend as required.* |
| *(o)* | *In figure 5 the interim layout does not match the approved layout. The applicant is requested to update accordingly.* |
| *(p)* | *Whilst the DOS for the Providence Parade/Ripley Road signals is within acceptable standards, there is excessive delay being demonstrated under the 2039 Background + Development scenario. The applicant is requested to review and amend the signal design to address this issue.* |
| *(q)* | *In identifying the timeline for delivering the formal secondary access to the development, review the considerations to address the following:*<br>· *The current justification is based on the theoretical capacity of connector roads and the proposed trip generations associated with the development alongside Lacebark which must be revised to base on network amenity, resiliency ad redundancy.*<br>· *Should the design be purely based on a capacity perspective of a non-fully developed catchment, the high volume of construction traffic must be considered.*<br>*Lacebark development will be fully developed prior to the first lots in this development being sealed. Accordingly, there is minimal development available prior to the catchment exceeding 300 lots.* |
| *DCOP* | |
| *(r)* | *In relation to the DCOP roads and intersections along the subject site frontage, the applicant is requested to address the following:*<br>*(i) Include written confirmation from relevant Certifier/s (RPEQ) that the configuration and alignment of all DCOP roads and intersections indicated on the proposal plans are consistent with the current planning and design of this infrastructure.*<br>*(ii) There are bridges/culverts across the DCOP roads as nominated in the DCOP Infrastructure maps which are not nominated in any of the plans. Include a functional layout for the interim and ultimate configuration for DCOP Bridges/Culverts[RC030A&B, RC029A&B, RC031A&B and RC033A&B] in accordance with the DCOP.*<br>*Provide details of the extent of construction of the trunk roads and intersections with respect to the proposed development staging.* |
| | *The applicant submitted a report titled Providence West ROL 2, 817 Ripley Road Traffic Impact Assessment by SLR Consulting, (620.30351.02004 Rev 2.0) dated 20 May 2025 in support of the proposed development. The assessment undertaken in the report does not satisfactorily address the traffic and transport aspects of the proposed development. The applicant is requested to submit a revised version of this report addressing:* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| | The applicant is requested to address the following: |
| (a) | Catalyst Road design is referenced in the Road Hierarchy Layout Plan of the set of Civil Functional Drawings. Provide the latest version of this drawing. This item is still outstanding. |
| Road Cross Sections | |
| (b) | Road 01 (Neighbourhood Connection connecting to South West Trunk Road) includes a 5.0m centre median and 5.0m carriageway either side of the median, which is supported, however it is unclear why Road Section A in the KN Group Civil Functional Plans has a 1.5m shoulder adjacent to the outer kerb in one direction, and a 1.2m wide shoulder adjacent to the median kerb in the other direction (refer image below). The applicant is requested to amend the cross section nominating 1.5m shoulder adjacent to the outer kerb for both directions of travel. |





(c) Road 02 (East West Neighbourhood Connector) proposes parking on both sides to the west of Road 07 (Section B in the KN Group Functional Plans), which is supported, however it is unclear as to why the parking lane on the southern side falls towards the main carriageway with a v drain. The ROL and civil drawings nominate barrier kerbs only at the interface of carriageway and verge. Therefore, the applicant is requested to amend the cross section as both parking lanes shall have standard cross fall and drain towards the verge, unless there is technical justification to adopt a nonstandard outcome.




(d) Road 02 (East West Neighbourhood Connector) proposes parking on one side only, between Road 01 and Road 07 (Section C in the KN Group Civil Functional Plans), but includes a 1.5m wide shoulder on the side without parking. The applicant is requested to review if the 1.5m shoulder is required for drainage purposes or if it could be reduced or removed.




(e) The applicant is requested to amend the shared path width in Road 07 to 3m to match with the connecting Neighbourhood Access Street in Lacebark Estate on the north.




(f) Based on the background traffic data and projected growth rates, the assumption within the TIA interim year assessment to 2036—that the Wensley Road connection to or across the Centenary Highway will not be in place—is supported. However, the TIA assumption that the South West Trunk Road (west of ROL 2) will be extended over the Centenary Highway (with or without an interchange) to Wensley Road by 2037 remains highly uncertain. Recent TMR planning for the Centenary Highway corridor does not confirm whether Wensley Road will be

| | |
|---|---|
| | connected over or under the Centenary Highway as part of future development works, and an overpass or underpass is not identified within the DCOP.<br><br>Given these uncertainties regarding the future provision of Wensley Road, the forecast traffic volumes and growth rates on the Ripley Road corridor and the South West Trunk Road—and the resulting network performance—are likely underestimated within the TIA. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to review and update the TIA to include a scenario where an overpass across the Centenary Highway connecting to Wensley Road does not occur. |
| (g) | Consistent with the rationale provided for the previous item regarding the low likelihood of an interchange at Wensley Road, the applicant is requested to revise the TIA for the 2046 Ultimate Scenario to reflect that the overpass and interchange to Centenary Highway at Wensley Road will not be constructed. |
| (h) | Item 7(p) from previous IR:<br><br>*Whilst the DOS for the Providence Parade/Ripley Road signals is within acceptable standards, there is excessive delay being demonstrated under the 2039 Background + Development scenario. The applicant is requested to review and amend the signal design to address this issue.*<br><br>The intersection of Ripley Road and Providence Parade has not been addressed within the TIA, which currently outlines the interim and ultimate intersection layouts identified as part of the Scott PDI development. It is noted that these layouts, as assessed in previous development applications (including the Scott PDI site), were based on the assumption of a full interchange on the Centenary Highway at Wensley Road. Additionally, earlier assessments of this intersection considered only limited development within the Ripley Road catchment south of Providence Parade.<br><br>The applicant is requested to review the intersection of Ripley Road and Providence Parade be incorporated into the SIDRA intersection assessments within the TIA, considering scenarios both with and without an overpass/interchange at Wensley Road. Under the scenario without an overpass or interchange, it is anticipated that modifications may be required to the previously identified ultimate layout for this intersection. Furthermore, upgrades to the interim intersection (currently under construction) may also be necessary to accommodate the forecast traffic volumes outlined in Section 4.5.1 of the TIA. |
| *Advice Note:*<br><br>*The proposed development currently relies solely on access via Lacebark until the DCOP roads, including the Ripley Road upgrade and associated supporting infrastructure, are delivered. This arrangement is not considered viable from a transport network planning perspective. Accordingly, any approval will be conditioned requiring the South West Trunk Road to be constructed and opened to traffic prior to plan sealing of the 101st lot to ensure connectivity from ROL2 Access Road 01 to Ripley Road.* | |

| 8. | Stormwater Management Plan |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The report titled Providence West ROL 2 Stormwater Quality Management Plan by DesignFlow 4540 Ver 01) dated 20 May 2025 is acknowledged. Whilst the SMP presents a site-based solution for stormwater management (quality and quantity), it has not demonstrated that the proposed* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *development will not result in detrimental impacts to upstream, downstream or surrounding properties or to road immunity within the catchment. The applicant is requested to submit a revised version of this report addressing:* |
| *Stormwater Quantity & Quality* | |
| *(a)* | *Nominate the lawful point of discharge for the development.* |
| *(b)* | *Providence West ROL 2 Waterway Strategy Report by DesignFlow (4540 Ver 01) dated 21 May 2025, does not include any details on the site specific proposal such as flows, depths/levels, velocities. The applicant is requested to update the report to include the specifics to demonstrate the proposed treatment achieves the intended outcomes including flood immunity for adjacent development and roads.* |
| *(c)* | *Stormwater Quality Management Plan prepared by DesignFlow (4540 Ver 01) dated 20 May 2025 proposes two bioretention facilities for the development. However, the report does not include details of flow volumes from the developed catchment or how the treatment facilities are sized to demonstrate the proposal is sufficient for the development. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to address the following:*<br>*(i) Provide details of inlet and outlet volumes demonstrating the outflows are limited to predeveloped flows.*<br>*(ii) Include further details on the typical cross sections, proposed footprint of the facilities, and how they integrate within the lot in terms of maintenance access, safety and landscaping outcomes.*<br>*(iii) Detention basin depths are to be limited to 1.2m in the 5% AEP design storm for public safety (QUDM section 5.12). Safety fencing around proposed detention basins would not be supported.*<br>*(iv) Indicate proposed finished surface levels, batter slope, Q20 & Q100 water depth, minimum freeboard, emergency spillway, inlet/outlet pits and/or pipes, etc.*<br><br>*Note: Batter slopes for detention basins are to be 1:6 in accordance with QUDM for safety. Isolated sections of batter slopes to absolute maximum 1:4 may be considered, subject to the batter being landscaped.* |
| *(d)* | *Bioretention Basins B1 & B2: the cross section labels on the layout and detailed sections differ in the section name (A/SK3 on plan and A/SK2 on the section). Please address.* |
| *(e)* | *Extend the 4m wide maintenance track to the bio retention basin for maintenance access. The design is to be supported with maintenance vehicle swept path diagrams.* |
| *(g)* | *Provide details, including stage-storage-discharge curves for all storm events up to and including the 1% AEP for all proposed basins and demonstrate that any expected basin overtopping will cause no worsening to flooding or safety hazard to surrounding properties or roads (particularly Ripley Road) in accordance with QUDM.* |
| *(h)* | *Basins B1 & B2 are proposed to have emergency spillways. Provide the following information in relation to the proposed spillways:*<br>*(i) The design storm event during which each of the proposed spillways will be activated;*<br>*The applicant is requested to submit sensitivity analysis, including calculations, for pipe/inlet blockage in accordance with Implementation Guideline 24 (IG24) and QUDM to identity any flood impacts and safety hazards to surrounding properties and Ripley Road. The submission must also include afflux impact maps detailing the impact in the event that the spillways are activated on surrounding, upstream and downstream properties and road.* |
| *(i)* | *In relation to the proposed development staging, provide details on how stormwater drainage (including stormwater mitigation devices) is to be delivered in a timely manner to treat the associated stormwater sub-catchments. Where stormwater infrastructure is to traverse land* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *under private ownership until the development of future stages, the infrastructure must be fully contained within a minimum 4m wide stormwater drainage easement.* |
| *(j)* | *In relation to the proposed stormwater drainage, the applicant is requested to provide the following:*<br>*(i) Concept stormwater longitudinal sections with hydraulic grade line; and*<br>*Preliminary design (including typical cross sections and minor/major water surface levels/velocity/hazard) of all proposed overland flow paths to demonstrate that the proposed corridor is of sufficient width to locate the required overland flow path as well as any proposed driveways and/or pedestrian pathways.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | Owing to significant cleared area to the north and east of Bio basin B2, it is requested that Basin B2 to be moved north to facilitate retention of Tree T045 - 1800 dsh *Eucalyptus tereticornis*. |

| 9. | Flood Assessment |
|---|---|
| No further information required. | |

| 10. | Concept Civil Engineering Plans |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The concept civil engineering plans by KN Group (24-154-01 to 139, Rev A) dated 19 May 2025 submitted in support of the proposed development are acknowledged, however additional information and/or clarification is required with respect to the proposed civil works. The applicant is requested to review and amend these plans as necessary to address the following:* |
| *<u>General</u>* | |
| *(a)* | *Amend the road hierarchy table to reflect the elements and typology to comply with PDA Guideline 6 - Street and Movement Network.* |
| *(b)* | *Amend the typical cross sections to reflect the above change.* |
| *(c)* | *Revise lot numbering on all plans to be consistent with the lot numbering detailed on the proposed Plan of Subdivision.* |
| *(d)* | *As far as practicable, retaining walls must not be located along common boundaries of roads and proposed future public open space/conservation area.* |
| *(e)* | *Indicate easements where infrastructure is to be located within private property:*<br>*(i) Easements for roof and allotment drainage must be minimum 2m wide;*<br>*(ii) Easements for stormwater must be of sufficient width to capture and contain the runoff associated with a 1% AEP design event (with a minimum width of 3m);*<br>*Easements for combined sewer and roof and allotment drainage must be minimum 3m wide.* |
| *(f)* | *Indicate the service infrastructure connection point to each lot.* |
| *(g)* | *Indicate location of street lighting.* |
| *(h)* | *The swept paths in laneway 03 & 04 are going past the pavement and encroaching the nature strip. Review the swept paths to maintain wheels of the vehicle turning remain within the pavement.* |
| *(i)* | *Provide pram ramps in accordance with Council's standard drawing SR.18 Standard Kerb Ramp at all road intersections and where paths intersect.* |
| *<u>Earthworks</u>* | |
| *(h)* | *The cross section labels on the layout sheet and respective cross sections do not match (for eg: A/31 on the layout and A/11 on the cross sections). There is also a mismatch between the earthworks layout plan and sections as well. The applicant is requested to update all plans to ensure accuracy.* |
| *(i)* | *As far as practicable, revise earthworks to:* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *(i) Minimise external facing retaining walls;*<br>*(ii) Provide conceptual earthworks within proposed district park necessary to facilitate the future development and embellishment of this lot (including but not limited to sports fields, vehicle access and manoeuvring areas, etc.) to achieve the desired standard of service (refer to Item 6 – Open Space for further information);*<br>*(iii) Provide cross-sections in both axes at proposed drainage reserve and proposed district park;*<br>*Indicate existing and proposed surface levels, location/height of retaining walls and proposed batter slopes on all earthworks cross sections.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | The cross-section labels on the layout sheet and respective cross-sections do not match (for eg: A/31 on the layout and A/11 on the cross sections). The applicant is requested to update all plans to ensure accuracy and consistency. |

| 11. | Geotechnical Report |
|---|---|
| No further information required. | |

| 12. | Dispersive Soils Management Plan |
|---|---|
| No further information required. | |


| 13. | Water and Sewerage |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The applicant is requested to provide a Service Advice Notice (SAN) from Urban Utilities to demonstrate that the proposed development can be connected to the reticulated water and sewerage network.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | This item is still outstanding - The applicant is requested to provide a Service Advice Notice (SAN) from Urban Utilities to demonstrate that the proposed development can be connected to the reticulated water and sewerage network. |


| Environment |
|---|

| 14. | Vegetation Retention |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The Tree Retention and Removal Plan (TRRP) (Issue A no. 23-0573E/BF) prepared by Therefor Group dated 16 May 2025 is acknowledged. However, the plan does not provide details of the assessor such as the qualifications or experience, is inconsistent with the Concept Earthworks prepared by KN Group and will need to be amended to address the following:* |
| *(a)* | *In review of the TRRP impacts to trees and the Concept Earthworks prepared by KN Group, it appears trees are proposed for removal that are not impacted by concept earthworks and significant trees are identified for removal in the interface to Conservation Zone and within the waterway corridor.*<br><br>*The applicant is requested to review the concept earthworks and minimise tree impacts interfacing the Conservation Zone and within the future waterway corridor. To demonstrate this, the applicant is requested to engage a suitably qualified Arborist (AQF 5 or higher) to review the Tree Details and concept earthworks, provide mitigation strategies to reduce impacts to trees at the interfaces noted. Trees in these areas should be retained demonstrating* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *compliance with EDQ guidelines and the Ripley Valley Development Scheme (RVDS) Natural Values. Trees outlined below, at a minimum should be investigated for retention:*<br><br>*TR006, 045,058, 083,084, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139a, 139B, 140, 141, 185, 190, 202, 204, 359, 379, 380, 383, 385, 414, 415 and 530* |
| *(b)* | *Identify tree impacts from the proposed development external to the site. Clearing of vegetation for the development should be limited to the Lots subject to assessment.* |
| *(c)* | *The TRRP includes trees noted as inaccessible but also identified for removal. The applicant is requested to review the proposals impacts and provide, at minimum, basic assessment of all the trees impacted.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | The applicant is requested to amend the location B2 basin design to retain tree T045 in accordance with further request item 8(a). |

| 15. | Waterway |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *The material submitted in support of the proposed development footprint identifies constraint of the floodplain and encroachment of the 25m buffer to the ToB of the waterway, realignment of sections of the waterway and online detention. The applicant has stated the impacts to the area are approved under 9820/2019/MAPDA/A. The applicant is advised that the proposed layout for areas external to Stage 1-5 were not approved owing to unresolved impacts from Stormwater Management (see approved plans for 9820/2019/MAPDA/A).*<br><br>*While it is acknowledged the proposed area allocated is more responsive to the local environment than previously indicated, the applicant is reshaping, confining and recreating the riparian corridor, creating a low flow and habitat pools.*<br><br>*Owing to the extent of the proposed constraint floodplain, earthworks batters within 25m from recreated and existing top of bank and changes to the waterway to facilitate the development footprint the applicant is requested to address the following items:*<br><br>*Note: The MEDQ delegate notes that while the catalyst east west road is not part of this application the road will form a southern bund further confining the waterway floodplain. Owing to this the applicant is requested to demonstrate the appropriateness of the proposed design in the post fully developed case in addressing the below items.* |
| *(a)* | *Figure 12 of the Waterway Report prepared by Design Flow is acknowledged. The applicant is requested to amend the design to demonstrate the proposed riparian corridor widths and stream order 3 buffer is maintained to linear park and WSUD asset infrastructure that is a minimum 25m from recreated top of Q5 bank or 25m from the current top of high bank of the waterway.* |
| *(b)* | *The applicant is requested to submit an amended Concept Functional Waterway Design and reporting inclusive of green infrastructure, complex fauna habitat features and facilitate a largely fully vegetation outcome consistent with the mapped regional ecosystems for the site and vegetated riparian corridor intent. To demonstrate this, the applicant is requested to address item (e) below, the other items of this information request relating to the waterway design and provide an assessment and appropriately scaled plans showing post development expected velocities, bed shear and shear stress, identify the areas/ extent of rock protection, location of complex habitat (terrestrial and aquatic) features. The design should be responsive* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *to the local environment soil conditions and existing vegetation.* |
| *(c)* | *It is advised to maintain the current low flow via the Ripley Road dam. The MEDQ delegate acknowledges that the dam will need reshaping to address the Ripley Road widening. This will minimise earthworks to the one area.* |
| *(d)* | *Given the site topography and sensitive receiving environment, the applicant is advised that the piped stormwater solution to outlets within the riparian corridor must demonstrate velocities of no more than 2m/s at the end of the concrete apron in all key storm events.* |
| *(e)* | *The applicant is requested to redesign the waterway functional layout to address retention of vegetation proximate to the earthworks interface as per Item 14 – Vegetation Retention, remove indicative proposed pathways and earthworks that impact on vegetation or constrain the waterway (locate them on the periphery adjacent to roads), locate the emergency access to avoid impacts to the ephemeral sedge and reduce extent of culvert length in accordance with Item 7 – Traffic Impact Assessment. The images below identify key areas of council concern for the waterway impingement.*   |

| | |
|---|---|
| |  |
| *(f)* | *The applicant is requested to submit a Fauna Movement Infrastructure Plan that demonstrates how the development will maintain fauna (terrestrial and aquatic) movement in the post developed scenario.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | It appears a road access from Ripley Road into the waterway is shown on the Stormwater Conceptual Overall Layout Plan prepared by DesignFlow dated 27 October 2025, however, this conflicts with the RAL plans and the civil functionals. The applicant is requested to amend the drawings to match with the latest version of civil functional layout plans. |

| 16. | Conservation Interface |
|---|---|
| No further information required. | |

| 17. | Bushfire |
|---|---|
| No further information required. | |

| State Interests |
|---|

| 18. | State Road Network |
|---|---|
| *Original Information Request Item (3 July 2025)* | |
| | *Prepare a revised RPEQ certified TIA in accordance with DTMR's Guide to Traffic Impact Assessment. The TIA should address, but not be limited to, the following key aspects:* |
| *(a)* | *Traffic Distribution & Volumes: Clearly justify anticipated traffic distribution patterns and the likely traffic volumes travelling to and from the surrounding state-controlled road network.* |
| *(b)* | *Impact Assessment Area: Define the proposed development's impact assessment area in accordance with Section 6.4 of the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) Guide to Traffic Impact Assessment (GTIA). This includes all intersections where development traffic exceeds 5% of the base traffic for any movement.* |
| *(c)* | *Traffic Data & Growth Rates: Ensure the assessment is based on recent traffic count data. All proposed growth rates applied to state-controlled road corridors must be clearly justified.* |
| *(d)* | *Operational Performance & Delays: Where required, assess the operational performance of impacted intersections on the state-controlled road network, and calculate peak hour network delay impacts across the full extent of the identified Impact Assessment Area.* |
| *(e)* | *The TIA should consider the expected year of opening.* |
| *(f)* | *Mitigation Measures: If applicable, outline any proposed mitigation measures required to* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *address traffic impacts and achieve no net worsening on the state-controlled road network. All measures must be consistent with DTMR's Road Planning and Design Manual (2nd Edition).* |
| *(g)* | *Risk and Safety Assessment: Complete a risk assessment as outlined in Section 8 of the GTIA.* |
| Outstanding Matters | |
| (a) | A response to this item has not been received. Advice from EDQ and DTMR confirms that the above is outstanding and must be addressed. |

Pursuant to section 85 of the *Economic Development Act 2012*, in response to this Information Request, the applicant may give the requesting authority (in this case the MEDQ Delegate):

1. All of the information requested; or

2. Demonstration that the request has been complied with.

The information response should include a statement indicating which of the above options describes the response you are providing. To assist in the matter, Appendix 1 provides a checklist that you should complete and return with your response.

Response to this Information Request should be forwarded to:-

Chief Executive Officer
C/- MEDQ Delegate
Development Planning Branch
Ipswich City Council
PO Box 191
IPSWICH QLD 4305

The applicant is requested to ensure a complete response is provided to reduce the need for a subsequent further information request and facilitate a timely assessment of the application.


Pursuant to section 83 of the *Economic Development Act 2012*, the application will lapse in accordance with section 83A if the applicant fails to give the MEDQ Delegate any of the stated information within 6 months from the date the information request was made, or a further period agreed between the applicant and the requesting authority that made the information request.

Pursuant to section 83(4) of the *Economic Development Act 2012*, if the applicant does not comply with the information request within the above period, the MEDQ Delegate may refuse the application after giving the applicant at least 10 business days notice of its intention to do so.

Note: The applicant cannot commence notification of the application in accordance with section 84, until the MEDQ Delegate gives a notice pursuant to section 83B permitting notification to commence.

If you have any queries regarding this Information Request letter, please contact Nikki Morrison on 3810 6635 for planning related matters, Jemna Cheripuram on 3810 7469 for engineering related matters and Simone Orscheg on 3810 6112 for environment related matters.

Yours faithfully



Sandeep Nanjappa
ACTING DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT WEST MANAGER

3406/2025/PDA RESPONSE TO MEDQ DELEGATE INFORMATION REQUEST

Chief Executive Officer
C/- MEDQ Delegate
Development Planning Branch
Ipswich City Council
PO Box 191
IPSWICH QLD 4305

Date: _____

3406/2025/PDA

817-843 Ripley Road, SOUTH RIPLEY QLD 4306

Please find enclosed the applicant's response to the MEDQ Delegate Information Request, which contains:

☐ all information requested.

☐ demonstration that the request has been complied with.