

Our ref: WR14/32858

Mr Michael Nash
Director
Urban Planning Services Pty Ltd
PO Box 2091
SURFERS PARADISE QLD 4217

Dear Mr Nash

I refer to the Deputy Premier's decision to exercise his call in powers under section 425 of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* and call in a development application for Pacific View Estate at Hinkler Drive in Worongary.

The Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning has identified that additional information is required to assist the Deputy Premier in his assessment of the application.

This additional information is required by Monday 12 January 2015. Please advise at your earliest convenience if you need additional time to provide the information requested.

Geotechnical

1. Please provide an electronic copy (shape or GIS file) of "Site Analysis - Map 4 - Slope Analysis Plan" Drawing No: PA-SA-M4 in Volume 4: Attachment 25 of the Information Request Response dated July 2014. This will allow the proportion of the site steeper than a given gradient to be more easily determined.
2. Please provide a copy of this Urbis report, referred to during the site.

Ecology

1. Based on mapping provided in James Warren and Associates Information Request Response dated December 2012 (JWA 2012), the regional ecosystem clearing calculations in this report appear to be based on a superseded development layout. Please provide corrected clearing calculations for the current layout.
2. Figure 11 of the JWA 2012 report indicates that no vegetation clearing will be undertaken within the Green Space Corridor or Ecological Corridor, although clearing calculations in Table 9 of this report indicate that some clearing will be undertaken within the corridors. Elsewhere in the documentation it is stated that the Green Space Corridor will support a variety of infrastructure (e.g. sporting facilities, recreation facilities, community facilities including two-storey buildings). Please confirm that all proposed clearing within the corridors has been accounted for in the clearing calculations as well as the assessment for significant species provided in Section 6.6.4 of the JWA 2012 report.
3. The updated layout drawings of the development in the Pacific View Estate Development Code 2014 show that the Green Space Corridor has been reduced as compared to the initial extent of the Green Space Corridor shown in the 2010 drawings. Furthermore, additional infrastructure (i.e. bridges) has been proposed in the Ecological Corridor in the new drawings. Please explain why these changes have occurred and provide justification for same. It is noted that the concurrence agency response from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines with regards to vegetation clearing was based on the 2010 layout that protected a greater area of endangered remnant vegetation.
4. The James Warren and Associates Response to Gold Coast City Council Information Request Section 5: Waterway Protection July 2014 states that stormwater management features cannot be removed from the ecological corridor. Please provide justification for this statement.

Economic Matters

1. The trade areas identified in the MacroPlan Dimasi letter dated 11 July 2014 in Volume 1 of the response to Council's Information Request (MacroPlan Dimasi letter) are extensive in the context of the proposed role and function of the proposed Village Centre and supporting Neighbourhood Centres. Please provide the basis for formulating such large trade areas having regard to:
 - local road infrastructure in terms of access to the site
 - natural and man-made barriers
 - the location, role and function of existing, approved and designated centres
 - psychological barriers
 - other barriers such as railways and water courses.
2. The MacroPlan Dimasi letter generates a series of retail expenditure estimates for the combined main trade area. Please provide:
 - retail expenditure propensities (expenditure per capita or household) by expenditure group and trade area (i.e. for each of the primary and secondary trade areas) for each of the years reported (i.e. 2014, 2016, 2021, 2026, 2031)

- available retail expenditure estimates by expenditure group for each of the trade areas (i.e. for each of the primary and secondary trade areas) for each of the years reported (i.e. 2014, 2016, 2021, 2026, 2031)
3. A footnote on Table 2 and Table 3 in the MacroPlan Dimasi letter states that expenditure estimates are 'inflated dollars including GST'. Please clarify whether this means that expenditure estimates are inflated to 2014 dollars and held constant over the projection period or whether the estimates are inflated to current dollars for each year reported.
 4. Please provide an estimate of the retail floor space demand generated over time solely by Pacific View Estate residents.
 5. Table 4 of the MacroPlan Dimasi letter reports the supportable floor space by expenditure group based on assumptions relating to retained expenditure of market shares. Please provide a table for each of the trade areas showing the estimated expenditure capture of the Village Centre from each of the trade areas. These would be expected to sum to the values reported in Table 4.
 6. In the MacroPlan Dimasi letter it is stated that 7,500 residents would equate to a need for 3,750 jobs. Please provide the basis for this calculation. This might include assumed labour force structure (e.g. participation rate, industry structure, etc).

If you require any further information, Morag Elliott, Manager, Planning Services, Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, will assist and can be contacted on 3452 7653.

Yours sincerely



Graeme Bolton
Director

Development Assessment Division
Planning and Property Group