

16 April 2026

The Assessment Manager  
Toowoomba Regional Council  
PO Box 3021  
TOOWOOMBA QLD 4350

Attention: Mr Jayden Forbes-Mitchell

By Email: [Jayden.Forbes-Mitchell@tr.qld.gov.au](mailto:Jayden.Forbes-Mitchell@tr.qld.gov.au)

RECEIVED  
20/04/2026  
TOOWOOMBA  
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Dear Jayden

**RESPONSE TO FURTHER ADVICE – SECTION 68, PLANNING ACT 2016 & CHAPTER 1, PART 7, SECTION 35, DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT RULES – DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION - MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE - SERVICE STATION, CAR WASH AND 2 X FOOD AND DRINK OUTLETS - 7 MERINGANDAN-SHIRLEY ROAD, MERINGANDAN WEST – LOT 10 RP861102 AND PART LOT 11 SP247510**  
(Council Ref: MCUI/2025/1310)(Our Ref: 2024-512)

I act on behalf of the applicant, McNamara-Healey Holdings Pty Ltd, in respect of the above matter. I refer to Toowoomba Regional Council's (**Council**) Further Advice correspondence, dated 12 August 2025, in respect of a Development Application for Material Change of Use for a Service Station, Car Wash and 2 x Food and Drink Outlets on land at 7 Meringandan Shirley Road Meringandan West, being that land described as Lot 10 RP861102 and part Lot 11 SP247510.

The following advice provides a response to the matters raised in Council's Further Advice correspondence. For ease of comprehension, each item raised in the Information Request has been reproduced in bold print followed by the associated response.

## ISSUES AND RESPONSES

### 1. BOUNDS OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION AREA

#### 1.1. Issue:

**The application has been made over 'Part of Lot 11 SP247510' on DA Form 1 and the development site is similarly described as 'Part Lot 11 SP247510' throughout the submitted Planning Report. Council's Information Request identified that insufficient information had been provided to define the bounds of Lot 11 in which the application is being made over. Plan No. R010 (attached as Appendix A.1) was provided in response. While this plan satisfies Council's requirements with respect to Item 1.1 of the Information Request, this plan conflicts with the revised architectural drawings, which identifies a different Stage 1 site area (8,220m<sup>2</sup>) and shows a different configuration for the bounds of the Stage 1 area.**

**Information Required:**

**Provide an amended plan set that provides for a consistent total site area.**

**Response**

In response to the above item, please refer to the following two sets of revised development application plans which have been amended to have consistent site boundaries.

- Revised Development Plans – Various – Prepared by Verve Design Group and attached as **Appendix A**.
- Revised Engineering DA Plan Nos. 4\_25195\_DA\_ADG ADG Drawings\_260413 prepared by ADG Engineers and attached as **Appendix B**

**2. LAND USE AND ECONOMIC NEED**

**2.1. Aspect of Development:**

**As outlined in Council's Information Request, the proposed Service Station and Car Wash uses are inconsistent with the intent and regulatory framework established by the existing Variation Approval as well as the preceding zoning and regulatory framework for the premises under the Toowoomba Regional Planning Scheme 2012 (Emerging Community Zone).**

**The response to Information Request attempts to justify this inconsistency through the following arguments:**

- **The proposed development is supported by an Economic Needs Assessment that demonstrates an economic need for the Service Station use;**
- **The car wash is an associated and subservient use to the Service Station use and there are no competing facilities in the surrounding catchment; and**
- **Although the development will displace some of the uses previously justified through the variation approval, those uses will be developed as Stages 2 and 3 of the Local Centre in accordance with the Overall Lot Precinct Master Plan included with the application.**

**It is not considered that the application material has sufficiently addressed the land use inconsistency or matter of economic need. The following further issues are identified from a land use conflict and planning and economic need perspective:**

**Economic Need – Proposed Development**

**Council engaged Foresight Partners to undertake an independent peer review of the Economic Needs Assessment (ENA). The peer review identified several issues and inconsistencies within the demand and impact sections of the report which are central to its conclusions. Please refer to Council's development application portal, Development.i, to obtain a copy of the peer review.**

**Future Stages 2 and 3 – Demonstration of Economic and Planning Need**

**The Masterplan for future Stages 2 and 3 shows a centre with an area that greatly exceeds that anticipated in the variation approval. The inconsistency with the Planning Scheme and Variation Approval for the proposed development cannot be 'offset' by anticipated future development in Stages 2 and 3, particularly given uncertainty around whether this development may proceed, and/or be supported. Economic need must be established for an expanded centre ('Stages 2 and 3') as part of this application.**

**Further Advice:**

**Respond to the issues raised above and in the previous Information Request. The following is required:**

1. A revised demand assessment is required to demonstrate economic need for the proposal and an acceptable level of impacts on existing centres. Address the issues identified within the peer review, and in particular provide the further / amended material as outlined in the 'Conclusions and Recommendations' section of the peer review. Supplement this further information / amendments with a clear demonstration of planning need as it relates to the centres hierarchy in the Planning Scheme.
2. Where relying on future development in 'Stages 2 and 3' to justify the form of development and mix of uses proposed, an updated ENA is required that demonstrates both planning and economic need for the centre shown in the concept masterplan for 'Stages 2 and 3'.
3. Amend the mix of uses, form and function of the development to align more closely with the intended development outcomes for this site in accordance with the intent and regulatory framework established by the existing Variation Approval as well as the preceding zoning and regulatory framework for the premises under the Toowoomba Regional Planning Scheme 2012 (Emerging Community Zone).
4. In response to this item and to address related issues identified in this further advice letter, provide an amended site layout and/or mix of land uses that provides for an active local centre that addresses external road frontages and capitalises on the locational attributes of the site (elevated corner lot).

### **Response**

In response to the above item, Location IQ have prepared a response to the matters raised in the Peer Review undertaken on Council's behalf by Foresight Partners. The Location IQ response is attached as Appendix C.

### **3. INTERFACE WITH BALANCE OF SITE**

#### **3.1. Aspect of Development:**

*Item 4.2 of Council's Information Request identified issues with the proposed development's interface with the external road network and indicative future internal road network. The response to Council's Information Request and revised architectural plans have not addressed these issues.*

*These issues have been reproduced as follows:*

- *Minimal pedestrian connectivity is provided for between the proposed commercial uses and future residential development to the south-east. The extent of proposed acoustic barriers prohibits legible, safe and convenient pedestrian access to the site from the balance of Lot 11;*
- *The proposed use of retaining walls along the northern (Goombungee-Meringandan Road) frontage and design of the site layout compromises pedestrian access to and through the site from the north and east; and*
- *Land adjoining Meringandan Creek is identified as a future linear corridor. The development is required to provide for a more appropriate interface with land to the east.*

#### **Further Advice:**

*Provide an amended site layout that addresses the issues raised above. Pedestrian connectivity with the external and future internal road network must inform the design of the proposed development. Pedestrian access directly to Goombungee-Meringandan Road must be achieved.*

### **Response**

In response to the above item, I refer to Amended Proposed Site Plan Dwg No. 24160-DA02 Revision E prepared by Verve Design Group and attached as **Appendix A**. A series of amendments have been made to this plan to address the issues raised by Council. A summary of key issues and our response is as follows:

- The level of connectivity between the proposed development and residential uses to the south east must necessarily achieve a balance between providing practical and convenient access from adjoining residential allotments and achieving the required level of noise attenuation between the commercial uses and adjacent residential lots. A pedestrian pathway has been provided from the residential cul-de-sac to the south east. An opening has been provided in the acoustic barrier and this is now notated on the plan. That part of the acoustic barrier between the proposed frontage of the indicative supermarket building (Stage 2) and the fuel apron is only intended to be in situ until stage 2 is developed. That part of the barrier will then be removed to enhance pedestrian and visual connectivity between Stage 1 and Stage 2.
- A new pedestrian connection is now proposed centrally on the Goombungee – Meringandan frontage that will provide further staired pedestrian access from that frontage in addition to the ramped and PWD accessible access connection adjacent to the Goombungee – Meringandan Road and Meringandan Shirley Road intersection. The variation in levels between the Goombungee – Meringandan Road frontage and the proposed centre necessitate the provision of stair access in this area.
- Internal pedestrian linkages have been increased, including the addition of a pedestrian linkage between the car parking bay situated between the fuel apron and Stage 2 of the development. This links into the perimeter pedestrian network and will provide convenient and safe access from this parking area other use components in Stage 1, and those proposed to form part of Stage 2.

### **3.2. Aspect of Development:**

***The Engineering Plans submitted show batters greater than 1:6 proposed within the future proposed drainage reserve to be dedicated to Council. There is concern that these proposed slopes will not provide sufficient ground stability, are inconsistent with Planning Scheme Policy 2 maximum batters within public space and are unmaintainable.***

#### **Further Advice:**

***Consider the use of retaining walls or steeper landscaped batters within what will be proposed to be the future retained lot in order to amend the remaining batter within the future proposed drainage reserve to be consistent with Planning Scheme Policy 2 with batters no steeper than 1:4 or 1:6 for drainage reserve.***

### **Response**

In response to the above item, ADG Engineers met with Council in November 2025. One of the outcomes of that meet included that Council would accept retaining walls and generally 1:4 turfed batters. Council also advised that landscape treatments for the 1:3 batter would require a RPEQ to confirm the proposed landscape treatment will ensure a stable embankment.

I also refer to Council email dated 2 October 2025, which you can access via the following link: [2 Email 2.msg](#)

The Revised ADG Engineering Plans attached as **Appendix B** have been amended accordingly.

#### **4. SITE LAYOUT AND BUILDING DESIGN**

##### **4.1. Aspect of Development:**

**Item 5.1 of Council's Information Request identified issues with pedestrian movement to and through the site. The amended plans provided have addressed some of the issues raised, however the following outstanding issues remain:**

- **No direct, convenient or legible pedestrian access is provided from the north-east;**
- **An acoustic barrier separates Stage 1 and Stage 2 areas adjacent to the southern internal pedestrian path;**
- **A stormwater kerb inlet appears to reduce the width of the internal path south of the T2 waiting bays to a width that is less than 1.5m and compromises PWD accessibility; and**
- **No pedestrian connection has been provided between car parking located south of the fuel forecourt and Tenancies 1, 2 and 3.**

##### **Further Advice:**

**Provide amended plans that address the issues raised above.**

##### **Response**

In response to the above item, I refer to Amended Proposed Site Plan Dwg No. 24160-DA02 Revision E prepared by Verve Design Group and attached as **Appendix A**. A series of amendments have been made to this plan to address the issues raised by Council. A summary of key issues and our response is as follows:

- A new pedestrian connection is now proposed centrally on the Goombungee – Meringandan frontage that will provide further staired pedestrian access from that frontage in addition to the ramped and PWD accessible access connection adjacent to the Goombungee – Meringandan Road and Meringandan Shirley Road intersection. The variation in levels between the Goombungee – Meringandan Road frontage and the proposed centre necessitate the provision of stair access in this area.
- An opening has been provided in the acoustic barrier to facilitate pedestrian access and this is now notated on the plan. That part of the acoustic barrier between the proposed frontage of the indicative supermarket building (Stage 2) and the fuel apron is only intended to be in situ until stage 2 is developed. That part of the barrier will then be removed to enhance pedestrian and visual connectivity between Stage 1 and Stage 2.
- The stormwater inlet shown on the engineering and development plans can be moved to be wholly in the drive-thru exit or removed entirely. While both sets of plans continue to show it in approximately the previous location, I understand that it can be provided in this area and designed to ensure it does not limit the width of the pedestrian access or in any other way obstruct safe pedestrian movement. If Council is of the view that this issue needs to be addressed on the concept plans amended plans can be substituted, or any approval subsequently issued could condition the submission of amended plans post approval or stipulate via condition that this matter is addressed and resolved as part of detailed design.

- Internal pedestrian linkages have been increased, including the addition of a pedestrian linkage between the car parking bay situated between the fuel apron and Stage 2 of the development. This links into the perimeter pedestrian network and will provide convenient and safe access from this parking area other use components in Stage 1, and those proposed to form part of Stage 2.

#### **4.2. Aspect of Development:**

**Item 5.2 of Council's Information Request identified issues with the built form outcome. The response to Information Request states that an increase in setbacks from adjoining frontages have been provided and that the design of buildings along or near road frontages have been modified to introduce significantly more building articulation, openings and variations in building material and finishes.**

**Building setbacks have not increased and changes to builtform are limited to an additional screening element to the Tenancy 3 Food and Drink Outlet.**

**A landscape plan provided with the response demonstrates some screening of non-compliant building elements. However, landscaping alone cannot address identified non-compliances. Landscaping should complement and not replace the need to provide high quality built form outcomes.**

**Council's Information Request relevantly identified the following issues that remain outstanding:**

- **The entirety of the site frontage is proposed to be developed with structures and land uses that do not actively address the street. Façade treatments and landscaping are not an acceptable alternative in lieu; and**
- **Minimal setbacks are provided north of the proposed vacuum bays and east of the carwash to achieve adequate screening landscaping. The proposed low shrubs and groundcover species planted in narrow garden beds are insufficient.**

#### **Further Advice:**

**Provide an amended site layout and/or mix of land uses that provides for an active local centre that addresses external road frontages and capitalises on the locational attributes of the site (elevated corner lot).**

**Ensure landscaping within front setbacks (including to the north) provide sufficient space for screening landscaping.**

**Review the positioning of elements of the proposed development such as car wash bays and vacuum bays, to ensure these are sleeved behind development, screened from all road frontages and be relocated so as to not compromise sound urban design and pedestrian mobility outcomes for the development. This is necessary to comply with the outcomes sought under Item 4.2, as these are currently placed along the northern road frontage with minimal setbacks and significantly elevated above surrounding land on fill exceeding 1.4 metres.**

## Response

In response to the above item, we note as follows:

### **Mix of Uses**

- This development application only facilitates the establishment of Stage 1 of a multistage Local Centre. The uses in the initial stage include a Service Station, Food and Drink Outlets and a Car Wash. The subsequent stage of the development (Stage 2) is proposed to include complementary uses including the Supermarket and Health Care Services. This mix of uses includes all uses either typically found within a Local Centre, or certainly not as odds with the scale and function of such a centre.
- Location IQ have prepared a response to the matters raised in the Peer Review undertaken on Council's behalf by Foresight Partners. The Location IQ response is attached as **Appendix C**. Among other things, this assessment concludes that:

*"Overall, impacts on competing centres are well within the normal competitive range (10% and less) and will not impact on the viability of any centre. All other centres will be trading at comparable or higher levels by 2028 as compared with existing levels....."*

*.... Overall, the changes recommended by Foresight Partners do not change the conclusions of the Location IQ report, that the proposed development will not impact the viability or continued operation of any existing or proposed facility within the main trade area, wider catchment area or surrounding area. The growth in the market will more than offset competitive impacts in the short term."*

### **Frontage Treatment**

- The revised Development Plans prepared by Verve Design Group are attached as **Appendix A**.
- Changes have been made to the northern (secondary) frontage to Meringandan – Goombungee Road to the north including:
  - Redesigning the car wash to relocate staff amenity and office areas to the northern frontage and orientating these to the frontage. This includes an outdoor activity area to assist in activating the frontage. The location of this building on the northern side of car wash bays. Revised office location screens car wash and presents a more active frontage to Goombungee – Meringandan Road.
  - A new pedestrian connection is now proposed centrally on the Goombungee – Meringandan frontage that will provide further staired pedestrian access from that frontage in addition to the ramped and PWD accessible access connection adjacent to the Goombungee – Meringandan Road and Meringandan Shirley Road intersection. The variation in levels between the Goombungee – Meringandan Road frontage and the proposed centre necessitate the provision of stair access in this area.
  - The installation of featured battens and screen landscaping adjacent to the Car wash vacuum bays.
  - Retention and slight reorientation of corner pedestrian access pathway to improve pedestrian legibility.

## 5. STORMWATER

### 5.1. Aspect of Development:

**The submitted Site Based Stormwater Management Plan provided in response to Information Request Item 7 (Stormwater) does not substantiate the claim that a detention system is not required for this development with an appropriate hydrological model.**

#### Further Advice:

**Provide a hydrological model for the entire creek to adequately assess the effects of the development on the creek. The format/file type of the digital model could be any of the following: URBS, RORBS, WBNM, XP-RAFTS, with Council's preference being the XP model. This model may be used to back up the statement that stormwater detention is not necessary.**

#### Response

In response to the above item, we confirm that no detention for stormwater runoff is proposed for the development, as runoff from the site is able to be immediately discharged to Meringandan Creek. It is also noted that this approach aligns with the recommendations outlined within the Meringandan Urban Stormwater Master Plan. Noting that Meringandan Urban Stormwater Master Plan recommends stormwater associated with the developments within this catchment area is discharged without onsite detention so that the developments peak stormwater discharges do not coincide with the upstream catchment's peak stormwater discharge.

Further to this, the updated Flood Impact Assessment dated 23/02/2026 modelling demonstrates no changes to flood levels +/- 10mm to all events for the up to the 1% AEP event, without the incorporation of a detention basin.

Considering the outcomes found within the Meringandan Urban Stormwater Master Plan, and our existing stormwater reporting and updated flood impact assessment, we have concluded that stormwater detention is not necessary.

## 6. FLOOD HAZARD

### 6.1. Aspect of Development: Scope of works which will be completed upon approval

**The proposed works being applied for are limited only to the western side of the creek. There is concern that the submitted Flood Impact Assessment does not accurately detail the effects of the proposed works alone. Additionally, there is concern that upon completion of the proposed works the properties located on the eastern side of the creek will receive additional inundation that has not been assessed. This may also result in scouring to the creek and loss of land due to erosion on the eastern bank as it is not currently proposed to receive any treatment which will prevent erosion. It is acknowledged that the applicant is the landowner on both the east and west sides of the creek at the proposed development location.**

#### Further Advice:

**In addition to the design scenario for the theoretical future construction, the provided Flood Impact Assessment report must also include a design scenario that evaluates the effects of the proposed works**

alone, as anticipated under the current development application (limited to the western side of the creek).

Alternatively, where all works are required or proposed to be undertaken as part of this development, including on land east of Meringandan Creek not forming part of this application, this land must be included as part of the application on an amended DA Form 1.

**Note:** This would be a change made to the application during the assessment process. A determination would be made by Council upon receipt of this change as to whether the change is a minor change and the effect this may have on the development assessment process.

### **Response**

In response to the above item, an updated Flood Impact Assessment dated 23/02/2026 has been provided which includes two scenarios: the standalone western side of the creek scenario, and the ultimate design scenario. Refer to Sections 3, 5 and 6 of the report for details and modelling outcomes.

The updated Flood Impact Assessment prepared by ADG Engineers is attached as **Appendix D**.

### **6.2. Aspect of Development: Filling of the floodplain causing increased water levels and hazard conditions to third party property including Council Road reserves**

*The submitted report identifies increases to flood levels along Goombungee Meringandan Road/Main Street (GMR/MS) and third-party property north of the site. Flood maps provided identify that minor increases to inundation levels occur as low as the 0.5EY (Q2) and worsen as the events get larger. In a 2% AEP event (the required cross drainage immunity for a major road DSS) the flood maps demonstrate that flood levels along GMR/MS increase up to between 50-100mm. Additionally, landowners consent to increase flood levels within property which is not owned by the applicant has not been submitted to Council. The development is proposing to cause actionable nuisance to third party properties as the development is unable to be located outside of the current extent without modifying surrounding flood levels. However, the development is proposing to alter flood conveyance and increase flood levels within third party properties without the relevant landowner's consent. The development is not permitted to reduce the flood immunity of the existing roadway and must not cause actionable nuisance to third party properties. The proposed development does not currently comply with this requirement.*

### **Further Advice:**

**Please provide an amended Flood Impact Assessment addressing the above issues.**

### **Response**

In response to the above item, the updated Flood Impact Assessment prepared by ADG Engineers is attached as **Appendix D**.

The updated Flood Impact Assessment which includes the western development only precinct. Modelling demonstrates no changes to flood levels +/- 10mm to all events for the up to the 1% AEP event.

**6.3. Aspect of Development: The existing immunity of the Goombungee Meringandan Road/Main Street (GMR/MS) culverts at Meringandan Creek has not been clearly stated in the report.**

*Based on the flood mapping provided the GMR/MS culverts do not provide a 0.5EY (Q2) road immunity. The development is not permitted to reduce the flood immunity of the existing roadway. The proposed development does not currently comply with this requirement.*

**Further Advice:**

***Comment must be made regarding the existing immunity of GMR/MS by the RPEQ.***

**Response**

In response to the above item, the updated Flood Impact Assessment prepared by ADG Engineers is attached as **Appendix D**.

The updated Flood Impact Assessment which includes the western development only precinct. Modelling demonstrates no changes to no change to road immunity for all events up to the 1% AEP event.

**6.4. Aspect of Development: Consideration to upstream detention basin failure impact assessments has not been included.**

*A failure impact assessment is available to the consultants via development.i within OW/2024/6364. Although it is acknowledged that the proposed development is not yet proposing locations for persons at risk (PAR) (due to theoretical future subdivisions), the failure of the 'failure impact assessment' may become relevant to future subdivisions and reduce the extent of the proposed developable land area. The development is not permitted to facilitate development which would lead to upstream structures becoming referable dams.*

**Further Advice:**

***Comment regarding this failure impact assessment must be included within an amended version of this flood impact assessment.***

**Response**

In response to the above item, the updated Flood Impact Assessment prepared by ADG Engineers is attached as **Appendix D**.

The updated Flood Impact Assessment with commentary on the dam failure impact assessment from OW/2024/6364. Refer to section 6.3 of the updated Flood Impact Assessment for commentary which concludes the proposed development will not alter the hazard classification of the Northern Regional Detention basin or increase Population at Risk (PAR).

**6.5. Aspect of Development: Digital model**

*A digital model has not been provided to accompany the submitted Flood Impact Assessment.*

**Further Advice:**

*Please provide a digital model of the analysis conducted.*

**Response**

In response to the above item, ADG Engineers have provided a Digital Flood Model.

You can access the ADG Engineers Digital Flood Model files via the following link: [Flood Model Digital Files](#)

**6.6. Aspect of Development: Overlay**

*Identification of the extend of works for this development towards the Flood Hazard Overlay has not been identified.*

**Further Advice:**

*Overlay the Flood Hazard Overlay layers and proposed works on the same plan.*

**Response**

In response to the above item, we note the Revised Engineering DA Plan Nos. 4\_25195\_DA\_ADG ADG Drawings\_260413 prepared by ADG Engineers and are attached as **Appendix B**.

The Flood Hazard Overlay relative to the subject site is illustrated on drawing 25195-DA102.

**6.7. Aspect of Development:**

*It is unclear whether any earthworks are proposed within the 1% AEP flood extent.*

**Further Advice:**

*Provide amended plans that clearly demonstrate the extent of earthworks within the 1% AEP flood extent. the development is not permitted to alter existing ground levels within this flood- affected area. All proposed works including fill batters, retaining structures, and any other associated earthworks must be located entirely outside the existing 1% AEP flood extent. The plans should accurately delineate the flood boundary and confirm compliance with this requirement.*

**Response**

In response to the above item, ADG Engineers have noted that minor fill has been accepted by Council as part of Operational Works application OW/2025/846.

I also refer to Council email dated 2 October 2025, which you can access via the following link: [2 Email 2.msg](#)

## 7. SWEEP PATHS

### 7.1. Aspect of Development:

*The submitted turn paths for the design vehicle (AV) cross over the proposed pedestrian path, which is not acceptable.*

#### Further Advice:

*Provide updated layout plans that ensure the design vehicle (AV) does not encroach upon or pass over the pedestrian footpath. The revised design should maintain a clear and safe separation between vehicular movements and pedestrian areas in accordance with relevant safety and design standards*

#### Response

In response to the above item, we note the Revised Engineering DA Plan Nos. 4\_25195\_DA\_ADG ADG Drawings\_260413 prepared by ADG Engineers are attached as **Appendix B**.

These include revised vehicle swept paths.

## 8. CAR PARKING

### 8.1. Aspect of Development:

*29 car parking spaces have been provided for the development. Plans indicate that 33 car parking spaces are required and that a compliant number has been provided when including 4 vacuum bays. The following issues are raised:*

- *38 car parking spaces are required for the mix of uses proposed, in accordance with Table 9.4.6:3 of the Transport, Access and Parking Code;*
- *The Planning Report and plans appear to have miscalculated car parking by applying a lesser rate for the Food and Drink Outlet tenancies and not including the car parking required for a Car Wash;*
- *Vacuum bays are limited to the Car Wash use and cannot be considered to contribute to total car parking across the site. At most, Council may accept 2 of these vacuum bays as complying with the 2 car parking space requirement for the Car Wash component; and*
- *The development provides 9 fewer car parks (7 fewer if including 2 vacuum bays) than required under AO<sub>2.2</sub> of the Transport, Access and Parking Code and an evidence- based response has not been provided to demonstrate compliance with corresponding PO<sub>2</sub>.*

#### Further Advice:

*Provide car parking to comply with AO<sub>2.2</sub> of the Transport, Access and Parking Code or otherwise provide information to demonstrate compliance with the corresponding Performance Outcome PO<sub>2</sub>.*

#### Response

In response to the above item, we note that in accepted practice in mixed use developments that operate in an integrated manner to apply a composite parking rate recognising:

- The ability of such developments to facilitate multi-purpose trips, meaning that a proportion of those accessing the centre will access it for more than one purpose concurrently. For example, some users may access the centre to concurrently refuel and access food and drink outlets.

Similarly, a single to trip to refuel and access the car wash is common in combined service station/car wash facilities.

- Uses in many mixed use centres, including those with the mix of service station, food and drink outlets and a car wash have differing peak usage times. In practical terms, this means that overall car park provision can be reduced, as parking allocations between related uses are used interchangeably. For example, peak usage times for fast food premises are typically in the AM and PM peaks. Typically, car washes are underutilised in morning peak and evening time periods. Service stations have varied peak times based on location, and due to extended trading hours.
- The GFA allocation indicated on the plans of 62m<sup>2</sup> for the Car Wash is overly conservative and overstated. The open car wash bays and the vacuum bays are not fully enclosed and arguably do not comprise GFA. Similarly, the ground level office doubles as a foyer which is also not GFA. Finally, the plant room in the car wash would also be excluded from the total GFA for this use.
- All uses in the centre are car-based convenience uses. The food and drink outlets are serviced by drive-thru facilities which must provide significant queuing space for vehicles accessing the drive-thru (minimum 10 spaces), which amounts for a high proportion of patrons accessing such facilities. Similarly, those accessing a car wash directly access the washing and vacuum bays in their vehicles before typically exiting the facility. This means that there is in practice limited need for additional parking associated with such uses. Service stations are primarily accessed by those refuelling, who may also purchase incidental products will remitting payment for fuel. Patrons typically park at the bowser for such combined purchases.
- Finally, as previously noted, this application seeks approval for the initial stage of multi-staged Local Centre for which a planning and economic need has been demonstrated. In such centres it is not unusual for cumulative parking provision to be provided across multiple stages, with such parking provision not evenly distributed across each stage. Notwithstanding that the preceding matters provide a justifiable basis for a practical reduction in overall parking provision within Stage 1. In that regard the applicant has not sought to rely on future parking provision in later stages of the development to offset a deficit in Stage 1. In the alternative, we contend for the reasons outlined that the existing level of parking provision in Stage 1 is sufficient and achieves compliance with PO<sub>2</sub> of the Transport, Access and Parking Code.

## SUMMARY

The above responses address each of the items raised in Council's Further Advice correspondence. Having regard to the information provided, we request that Council proceed with the assessment of the application. Should you require any additional information or clarification please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on phone 07 4632 2535, mobile 0427 737 526 or by email at [andrew@precinctplan.com.au](mailto:andrew@precinctplan.com.au).

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Bullen", with a long, sweeping underline.

**Andrew Bullen**  
**Precinct Urban Planning**