

Our Reference: MCUI/2019/5122  
 Contact Officer: Emily Hinchliffe  
 Contact: 07 4698 3876  
 Email: [development@tr.qld.gov.au](mailto:development@tr.qld.gov.au)

### FURTHER ADVICE

*Planning Act 2016 Section 68  
 Development Assessment Rules Section 35*

George Weston Foods Pty Ltd  
 C/- Precinct Urban Planning  
 PO Box 3038  
 TOOWOOMBA QLD 4350

Email: [andrew@precinctplan.com.au](mailto:andrew@precinctplan.com.au)

19 February 2026

Dear Sir,

**Application for:** **Material Change of Use – Impact – Preliminary Approval for change of use of premises under the Planning Scheme**  
**Location:** **Mort Street, HARLAXTON QLD 4350**  
**Property Description:** **Lot 1 SP116255, Lease F on SP183756, Emt D SP297263, Emt B on RP810589, Emt E on RP 856489, Emt A on SP116255, Lot 2 RP17546, Lot 3 RP17547, and Lot 2 RP17536**

The further information provided by you in response to Council's Information Request dated 21 October 2024 was received on 18 September 2025 and has been reviewed.

Council provides the following further advice in relation to certain aspects of your proposal that require additional clarification/information in order to enable proper consideration and determination of your application:

#### 1. TRAFFIC

##### Summary

The updated Traffic Impact Assessment and supporting Tech Note retain the proposal for a third connection to the south via Griffiths Street. Council's position remains unsupportive of this access. In addition to the previously stated safety reasons, additional discussion held between Council and Queensland Health regarding the Bailey Henderson Hospital has identified that; given the timing delay on the Mort/Griffith level crossing that causes a significant back up of traffic east along Griffiths Street, ambulances heading to the hospital will be required to travel along the eastbound lane and wait at the level crossing until safe before proceeding through the intersection. In order for this to be achieved, the eastbound lane must be clear of vehicle traffic when the crossing is in use. Allowing an access from this development to Griffiths St would compromise emergency vehicle's ability to safely navigate Griffiths Street during the level crossing use. The TIA will need to be amended to remove this access location and adjusted to consider the remaining two accesses to Mort Street.

<b>Aspect of Development:</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	Section 3.6.3 of the TIA states that traffic associated with the Baillie Henderson Hospital expansion is unreasonable to include in the background traffic for this development as the impact mitigations for the expansion have not yet been implemented. Given the hospital expansion is currently due to be operational before the proposed opening year of this

	development (Stage 1 currently due for completion in 2029, compared to proposed opening year for GWFL of 2033), it is considered both reasonable and relevant that the background traffic calculations be updated to take the expansion into consideration given there are several overlapping intersections impacted by both developments.
	<b>Further Advice</b> Provide an amended TIA which addresses background traffic.
1.2	<b>Aspect of Development:</b> Section 5.3.2 of the TIA retains the same traffic distribution percentages as the original TIA submitted in 2019. This distribution needs to be revised to take into consideration the significant population expansion, particularly to the north and west of the development site.
	<b>Further Advice</b> Provide an amended TIA which addresses population increase.
1.3	<b>Aspect of Development:</b> Section 6 of the TIA identifies 3 intersections that exceed the DDS under development conditions (Mort/Griffith/Hogg Street, New England Highway/Griffith Street & Mort/North Street), with the Mort/North Street intersection exceeding DDS under background conditions and therefore excluded from proposed mitigation measures. However, the information provided indicates that the increase in traffic from the development would still warrant mitigation measures at this intersection. The TIA is not clear as to whether mitigation measures to manage background traffic would be sufficient such that additional measures would not subsequently be needed due to development traffic.
	<b>Further Advice</b> Provide an amended TIA which confirms whether mitigation measures to manage background traffic would be sufficient such that additional measures would not subsequently be needed due to development traffic.
1.4	<b>Aspect of Development:</b> Section 9 of the TIA states that public and active transport connections to the development site can be considered at a later date as part of future development applications.
	<b>Further Advice</b> Provide an amended TIA which demonstrates how the site will integrate both public, active and pedestrian transport connections, with particular consideration to connections between the development, Baillie Henderson Hospital, and the proposed residential development to the east of Gowrie Creek (as also identified with the referral response provided by SARA).

## 2. VARIATION SCHEME DOCUMENT

### Summary

The proposed Variation Scheme Document provided as part of this application includes Assessment Tables. Council has concern around the broad stroke approach with this part of the Variation Scheme Document (VSD). It is considered that a more fine-tuned approach is required for the Assessment Tables to reflect the intent of each precinct. The VSD be revised with consideration given to the intent for each precinct and the specific uses envisaged within the precinct. In addition, a review of the area (sqm) of the precincts, the minimum lot sizes, and storeys should be undertaken.

Council is willing to facilitate a meeting with the applicant to discuss the specifics of each precinct.

2.1	<b>Aspect of Development:</b> The Economic Reporting (Table 5.1 – Summary of Potential Uses) provides a suggested maximum GLA for intended uses. These maximums have been reflected in Appendix F of the VSD, being the Use-Specific Development Thresholds. These threshold limits, being the maximum area supported by the Economic Report, seem relatively low when compared to the land area of the proposed precincts of the VSD. As such, it is unclear whether there is appropriate demand for the size of certain precincts.
	<b>Further Advice</b> Provide an amended VSD which considers the Economic Report and identified threshold limits, and the area of the precincts required to meet the need identified.
2.2	<b>Aspect of Development:</b> Similar to item 2.1 above, it is unclear whether there is appropriate demand regarding the

	allowable height limits of certain precincts given the Economic Report. In addition, it is unclear how the proposed maximum height limits correlate with the minimum lot sizes identified for each precinct noting that Precinct 2 has a minimum lot size of 300sqm but also has a maximum building height of 10 storeys. It is suggested that a staggered height relating to lot size could be imposed.
	<b>Further Advice</b>
	Provide an amended VSD which considers the intended building height and lot sizes of each precinct as they relate to the Economic Report
2.3	<b>Aspect of Development:</b>
	Uses subject to Accepted and/or Code Assessment should be exclusively limited to the uses intended for that precinct. At present, uses which are not intended for a precinct are permitted as Code Assessable development. Further, many of these uses do not have confirmed demand in this locality.
	<b>Further Advice</b>
	Provide an amended VSD that allocates uses within each precinct based on the cumulative thresholds determined in the economic reporting.
2.4	<b>Aspect of Development:</b>
	Certain uses nominated in the VSD have not been raised in the Economic Report. There are uses included in the VSD permitted as Accepted Development / Accepted Development Subject to Requirements which have not been assessed as part of the Economic Report. For example, the Economic Report does not discuss a Veterinary Service, Car Wash or Crematorium however these uses are all listed as Code Assessable uses under the VSD.
	<b>Further Advice</b>
	Provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) an amended VSD which removes uses which are not raised in the Economic Report from being categorised as Accepted Development or Code Assessment within the Assessment Tables of the VSD; or</li> <li>(b) an amended Economic Report which demonstrates that there is a need for these uses at this location.</li> </ul>

#### Responding to the Further Advice

Please advise within two (2) business days of the receipt of this letter whether you intend to respond to Council's further advice and if so, a proposed timeframe for your response to Council.

Should you not agree to respond to the further advice contained in this letter, Council will proceed to determine the application in accordance with the original decision making period on the basis of the information supplied.

If you require clarification of any of the above and in particular specific details of the further advice, please contact Council's Lead Senior Planner, Emily Hinchliffe on the above number.

Yours faithfully



Joe Kirkwood  
Manager, Planning Branch

CC: [toowoombasara@dspdip.qld.gov.au](mailto:toowoombasara@dspdip.qld.gov.au)