

Our Ref: ENGX250302

20 October 2025

Logan City Council
150 Wembley Road,
LOGAN CENTRAL QLD 4114

Attention: Dale Schroeder

**RE: 2-18 LINDENTHAL ROAD, PARK RIDGE QLD 4125 – PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
(COM/42/2025) RFI RESPONSE**

Dear Dale,

This letter has been prepared to partially respond to information request (COM/42/2025, 18768376) dated 20 August 2025 by Logan City Council (LCC).

2.1. Amend the drawings to include perimeter maintenance access in accordance with Table 10 of the Bioretention Technical Design Guidelines.

A 1.0 m wide maintenance access path is provided along at least 40% of the basin perimeter, in accordance with the Bioretention Technical Design Guidelines.

Please refer to drawing ENGX250302-SK6 Rev B for details.

“Access path along one side of the bioretention system ($\geq 40\%$ of perimeter) to allow easy access on foot. Turf, gravel or concrete path $\geq 1\text{m}$ wide”

2.2. Confirm that the filter media will be greater than 50%, in accordance with section 4.5.2 of the MUSIC Modelling Guidelines, and provide amended drawings.

The base area of the basin is 304 m², with the filter media occupying 153 m², which exceeds 50% of the total base area.

2.3. Provide engineering plans extending the existing 2.0 metre wide footpath on Park Ridge Road to Weedbrook Street to the east. These works will be conditioned for this application as part of Extra Payments Provisions.

We acknowledge Council’s preference, as discussed with Emily Hinze by phone, to have the developer deliver the requested 2.0m wide footpath. However, regardless of whether this request is framed as an Extra Payments contribution or a direct construction obligation, we consider the requirement to be unreasonable for the following reasons:

1. It is not reasonable to condition the development to construct infrastructure that extends well beyond the subject site frontage. Standard practice is that each developer is responsible for delivering works within their respective frontage, not undertaking off-site works for other landowners.
2. The requested footpath traverses the frontages of Lot 2 RP164124, Lot 30 RP94215, and Lot 19 RP94215. Responsibility for both monetary contributions and ultimate construction of the footpath along these sections should rest with the respective landowners/developers, not with this development.

3. The southern verge of Park Ridge Road currently functions as a swale drain and forms the main lawful point of discharge for both this development and the catchments to the east. Constructing a footpath in this verge would compromise the swale's capacity and functionality, creating downstream flooding and drainage impacts.

Refer to drawing ENGX250302-SK8 Rev B for an example of potential clashes between the proposed footpath and the existing swale and photos below showing existing swale within southern verge of Park Ridge Road.



4. Downstream development on Lot 19 and Lot 20 RP94215 has not yet commenced. Until those developments proceed and the required land dedication is made, the footpath cannot be constructed in its ultimate alignment without encroaching into private property. It is neither

reasonable nor economical to require a temporary footpath in the wrong alignment, only for it to be demolished and reconstructed at a later stage.

5. The requested 330m length of footpath represents a significant additional cost burden estimated at \$178,000.00 including erosion sediment control, reinstatement of driveway crossovers, traffic control, earthworks to reshape swales and turf reinstatement etc. which would materially impact the project's feasibility and yield. This additional requirement, if imposed, could present a potential show-stopper for the delivery of the development.

For the above reasons, we respectfully request that Council reconsider conditioning the extension of the footpath to Weedbrook Street as part of this development. We believe that it is more appropriate and equitable for the relevant frontage landowners (Lots 2, 19 and 20) to deliver or contribute towards these works as their developments progress.

We would welcome further discussions with Council to identify a more appropriate and equitable approach.

2.5. Provide civil plans to show land dedication for Park Ridge Road and Lindenthal Road consistent with Council's concept plans.

Land dedication for Park Ridge Road and Lindenthal Road has been provided. Please refer to the updated civil plans.

2.6. Provide concept roadwork plans and cross sections at 20 metre intervals for the design and construction of the Lindenthal Road frontage to its Urban Collector Road standard including kerb and channel and footpath.

Advice Note: As stated in the Prelodgement advice, ultimate frontage works are required along the full frontage of the site from Park Ridge Road to the COM/5/2022 access.

While we acknowledge Council's request, we wish to raise a number of issues that make the delivery of the requested works unreasonable in the current form:

1. Based on Council's conceptual road design, the centre line/crown of Lindenthal Road is shifted from its current location. To achieve Council's desired Urban Collector Road standard, the entire roadway would require re-profiling and reconstruction, not just the subject site frontage. This significantly exceeds the scope of works attributable to our development.
2. Council recently upgraded kerb and channel works at the Lindenthal Road / Park Ridge Road intersection. However, this upgrade does not appear to align with Council's conceptual design data. As a result, it is not physically possible for our frontage works to tie into this kerb and channel as per Council's conceptual road design. Please refer to ENGX250302- SK18 Rev A for an overlay of the conceptual road design to existing kerb and channel.
3. Council's request is for frontage works from Park Ridge Road through to the COM/5/2022 access. Please note that Lot 4 RP815245, located within this section, is not part of the subject development site. Under Council's conceptual design, the requested frontage works would encroach into Lot 4 RP815245. It is unreasonable and beyond our responsibility to design and construct works within another landowner's frontage. Please refer to ENGX250302- SK19 Rev A for details.
4. The current stormwater regime in Lindenthal Road relies on the existing table drain within the verge. The introduction of kerb and channel in accordance with Council's request would compromise this table drain and alter the drainage regime. There is no suitable lawful point of

discharge for the re-directed catchment flows, meaning the proposed works cannot be supported without significant further drainage infrastructure beyond our frontage.

Given the above constraints, we consider it impractical and unreasonable for the development to deliver the requested Urban Collector Road standard works in isolation. We would welcome further discussions with Council to identify a more appropriate and equitable approach to the ultimate upgrade of Lindenthal Road that ensures consistency, constructability, and fairness between affected landowners.

As part of this response, we have provided roadwork cross sections at 20-metre intervals to demonstrate the proposed development works in relation to the future road levels. Please refer to ENGX250302 – SK16 and SK17 for details.

3.1. Demonstrate that the Q20 water level within the detention basin is 1.2m or lower in accordance with section 3.6.6.3 of Planning Scheme Policy 5 - Infrastructure.

The Q20 water level within the detention basin is at RL 41.27 m, with a corresponding water depth of 0.77 m.

Please refer to drawing ENGX250302-SK6 Rev B for confirmation of the Q20 water level.

3.2. Provide a minimum 3.0 metre wide setback on the top of bunds for maintenance access to the basin in accordance with Section 3.6.6.3 of Planning Scheme Policy 5 (Infrastructure).

A 3.0 m wide setback is provided along the top of the bund to allow access for maintenance of the basin outlet and weir.

Please refer to drawing ENGX250302-SK6 Rev B for further details.

3.3. Demonstrate that the proposed retaining wall along the drainage reserve and Lot 22 boundary will be wholly contained within Lot 22.

The proposed retaining wall along the drainage reserve and Lot 22 boundary is located entirely within the boundaries of Lot 22.

Please refer to the updated plans for further details.

Yours faithfully,
EngX Consulting



Calvin Kirk
Director
BEng (Hons), MIEAust, CPEng, NER, DipPM, RPEQ 19536

ATTACHMENT 1

UPDATED CONCEPTUAL CIVIL PLANS

