Prelodgement
☐ MEETING MINUTES
☒ WRITTEN ADVICE

Date of Advice:	**17/06/2026**	**Time:**	Select a time
Council Reference Number:	**DA/2026/2168**		
Council Responsible Officer:	**Nick Harrison** **Title: Principal Engineer** **(07) 5433 2991**		
Proposal:	**Prelodgement Application - Ministerial Infrastructure Designation - External traffic and access arrangements**		
Property Description:	**Lot 1 SP 148201** **Lot 2 SP 291250**		
Property Address:	**North Lakes Golf Club 33 Bridgeport Drive NORTH LAKES QLD 4509**		

Commercial in Confidence

SITE BACKGROUND / DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

i. The town planning history relevant to the site is;

(i) On 19 October 2000, Sector Plan 003-1000 Central Open Space was approved by Council. A subsequent amendment was approved by Council's delegate on 28 March 2002. Refer Council reference: MP00/3582 / 515/003-1000.

(ii) On 20 February 2001, Council approved a Material Change of Use - Development Permit for a Golf Course, Maintenance Facility and Clubhouse (including pro shop, food and beverage facilities and function areas together with ancillary uses associated with the golf course). Refer Council reference: DA/3538/2000/DA (formerly 2000/10062/MCU).

(iii) On 5 March 2001, Council's delegate approved an Operational Works - Development Permit for Vegetation Clearing (works associated with Golf Course). Refer Council reference: DA/3538/2000/OPW (formerly 2000/10062/OPW).

(iv) On 5 April 2001, Council's Delegate approved an Operational Works - Development Permit for Civil Works (works associated with golf course). Refer Council reference: DA/2002/10062 (formerly 2000/10062/OPW1)).

(v) On 19 April 2001, Council Delegate approved a Reconfiguring a Lot - Development Permit (40 lots into 18 Lots + balance area) (Council reference: DA/3538/2000/DA/3 (formerly 2000/10062/DA/3).

(vi) On 19 October 2021, a development application for a Material Change of Use - Preliminary Approval that includes a Variation Request to vary the effect of the Planning Scheme (varying the effect of the Sector Plan 003-1000 – Central Open Space Sector of the Mango Hill Infrastructure Development Control Plan) was received by Council. On 3 November Council issued an Action Notice / Not Properly Made Notice to the Applicant, advising the application could not been made under the Planning Act 2016 and the application was required to be made under the provisions of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Council reference: DA/2021/4205).

(vii) On 16 December 2021, an originating application was filed in the Queensland Planning and Environment Court (QPEC 3269 of 2021) seeking declarations and subsequent orders in relation to whether the development application lodged on 19 October 2021 (Council reference: DA/2021/4205) was properly made, pursuant to section 51 of the Planning Act 2016. On 9 June 2022, the Planning and Environment Court handed down a determination that identified that the development application was Not Properly Made and development applications in respect of land within the Mango Hill Development Control Plan (DCP) are required to be:

(a) assessed against the matters identified in section 6.1.29 of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Qld) (repealed) (IPA) to the extent the matters are relevant to the application; and

(b) decided against section 6.1.30 of the IPA, which requires the development application to be assessed in accordance with the relevant section of the Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act 1990 (Qld) (repealed) (P&E Act).

(viii) On 30 September 2022, a development application was lodged, seeking a Preliminary Approval for Material Change of Use (Retirement Village) overriding the Planning Instrument in accordance with s3.1.6 of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 and Development Permit for Material Change of Use for a Retirement Village (stage 1 and 2) and Development Permit for Reconfiguration a Lot (15 lots into 18 lots + Access Easement).

On 21 November 2023, the application was withdrawn at the request of the applicant (Council reference: DA/2022/3732).

(ix) On 22 July 2024, the State Government introduced the Housing Availability and Affordability (HAAPOLA) - Planning and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024. This amendment effectively allows for development application within Development Control Plans to be assessed under the Planning Act 2016.

(x) DA/2025/5337 - Prelodgement Application - Material Change of Use for Educational Establishment

COMMENTS:

Statutory Controls

1. The site has been designated as having a land use category of Urban Footprint under the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2023.
   ☒ Urban Footprint
2. The site is subject to the Mango Hill Infrastructure Development Control Plan No.14 (DCP). The site is included within:
   a. Precinct Plan - 003 - Central Open Space Precinct;
   b. Sector Plan -003-1000 - Central Open Space Sector.

Responses to Questions / Matters discussed

3. Pre-lodgement written advice is sought in relation to the proposed external traffic and access arrangements associated with the North Lakes Anglican School project, associated with the proposed Ministerial Infrastructure Designation (MID). A Traffic Technical Note (dated 22/04/2026 by Colliers) including additional SIDRA reporting on a proposed Midblock pedestrian crossing (Email dated 1st June 2026) has been supplied.

4. An assessment of the provided information has been conducted by various Council departments and have been summarized below, with a focus on traffic and access. It is recommended the items listed below are considered in the MID application.

5. Overall, it is difficult for Council to provide in-principal support of the access provision at this time, with the information provided.

   Response

6. There are concerns with the proposal and pedestrian access to the site, noting that roundabouts do not provide good pedestrian provision, particularly the Finnegan/Maddock Street intersection. Roundabouts at access points are a barrier to active transport.

7. The submission is incomplete and lacking in detail with internal layout not providing sufficient detail to determine the full traffic impacts.

8. There are concerns about overspill parking impacts on Maddock Street for the existing community.

9. The internal layout (as shown on the provided Preliminary Master Plan – Rev D 10/03/2026) does not work with access arrangements shown, significant

Commercial in Confidence

Commercial in Confidence

risk of blocking back onto the proposed roundabout of Endeavour Boulevard/ Archer Close as no storage capacity within masterplan car park layout.

10. It is unclear as to the impact of the volumetric lot under existing Council bridge and if there is any interface between the Council (bridge) asset and the internal college link.

11. The impacts associated with overspill parking on the surrounding area need to be addressed and mitigated.

12. It is expected informal drop-off and pick-ups to occur on Diamond Jubilee Way (DJW). This will be a safety concern with vehicles leaving and rejoining traffic (80 km/h road) and is not supported. Similarly, any access to or from Diamond Jubilee Way for any vehicles is not supported by Council, alternate arrangements need to be provided, as advised in the previous prelodgement. Implementing a school zone on the arterial road will also not be accepted due to the operational impacts.

13. Design and provision of parking and pickup/dropoff areas cannot be assessed at this stage.

14. Each intersection has been assessed separately. Due to the identified wider impacts to the network, a network assessment (i.e. VISSIM model) is recommended.

15. It is a requirement to determine the impacts of the development on the external road network and any necessary mitigation measures for 10 years following the completion of the whole development. The provided information only conducts an impact assessment up to the estimated 'full population year (2037)', while the estimate year of opening is 2030.

16. The TIA does not reference the main guide used in Queensland for new schools: *TMR Planning for Safe Transport Infrastructure at Schools – technical guidance for the provision of effective and safe transport infrastructure at schools*

17. Bus facilities should be provided. Suggest new or relocated indented bus stop on Endeavour Boulevard with appropriate shade structure that does not limit effective path width.

    This is supported by the TMR Planning for Safe Transport Infrastructure at Schools Technical guidance for the provision of effective and safe transport infrastructure at schools
    a. Table 2 Specific Outcome 1: Safe, convenient and prioritised public transport facilities are provided which adequately accommodates the proposed school population.

18. Local experience has shown that roundabouts at school accesses often cause gridlock of the road network as queues for school pickup and unbalanced traffic flows interact with other movements. See other examples where significant revisions have been required to address some of the issues:
    a. Capestone Blvd, Mango Hill at St Benedicts College
    b. Mallard Street, Mango Hill at Mango Hill State School
    c. College St, North Lakes at The Lakes College

Commercial in Confidence

This is supported by the TMR Planning for Safe Transport Infrastructure at Schools Technical guidance for the provision of effective and safe transport infrastructure at schools:

d. Table 3 Specific Outcome 3: Avoid roundabouts as traffic control devices at accesses to school car parks and pick- up/drop-off areas where there are high levels of pedestrian and cyclist activity. School access intersections should generally be configured as t-intersections, or four-way intersections with alternative means of traffic control.
e. Table 1 Specific Outcome 1: Pathways have priority over motor vehicles and avoid crossing entrances to car parks and areas and areas cannot be avoided, the where vehicles pick-up and drop-off students.

19. Active Transport (AT) and school bus generation is not factored into the assessment.

    Pedestrian trips dispersed across the network will increase the number of pedestrians crossing during critical peak periods. This will impact intersection operation and has currently not been factored into the SIDRA. Base year 2025 pedestrian volumes carry through to the 2037 with development case. This is particularly a concern given the expected high reliance on AT trips. The vehicle generation of 469 drop-off trips (vehicles leaving the site in the AM peak) for 1550 students means that even with >1 students per vehicle, there are hundreds of students (800+) expected to walk or cycle to school. The pedestrian demand needs to be considered in the SIDRA impacting signal timing, but also in a broader engineering and operational review of the infrastructure (safe crossings, safe paths, storage of pedestrians in refuges, etc.).

20. Endeavour Blvd / Plantation Road:
    a. The 2037 base case is over capacity (exceeding 0.85 DOS and therefore not meeting the DSS). It should be noted that the proposed upgrade (labelled “Upgrade 1” is only offsetting the impact of development traffic and does not achieve the DSS in 2037. Furthermore, the proposed upgrade only offsets the impact of the development in a scenario where all movements access to Endeavour Blvd for the school is provided. Any final proposal needs to ensure a combined assessment.
    b. The 2037 Dev Case + Upgrade 2 is an improvement to the 2037 Base Case, however, still exceeds the DSS for roundabouts (<0.85 DOS).
    c. The proposed slip-lane may create an unsafe pedestrian environment. Pedestrian treatment crossing the slip-lane may be required.
    d. Existing pedestrian crossing facilities across all intersection approaches and departures are not conducive to safe movement of pedestrians of all ages and abilities. Introducing pedestrian demand to this situation will exacerbate the existing deficiencies. Specifically, crossing multiple lanes without priority is not a suitable outcome. This remains true for numerous locations surrounding the site and a broader investigation of AT facilities should be undertaken.
    e. If a slip lane is to be constructed, all users including pedestrians and cyclists should be considered in design. Slip lanes can exhibit

increased risk due to high vehicle speeds co-located with pedestrian desire lines

f. The additional lane may impact existing sight lines for the round-about. An assessment on the sight lines would be required to ensure compliance is achieve with the relevant design standards.

21. Diamond Jubilee Way / Endeavour Blvd
    a. The proposed upgrade does not offset impacts of school traffic, nor does it result in acceptable performance. 2037 Base Case meets the DSS with 49 seconds average delay (LOS D) and 0.838 DOS. 2037 Dev Case + Upgrade has 55 seconds average delay and 0.936 DOS. This does not bring the Dev Case within acceptable DSS (<0.9 and LOS D). It should be noted that the average delay of 55 seconds is right on the threshold of LOS E (55-80 seconds) which would also be less than DSS. The second paragraph on page 18 is false based on these results.
    b. The signal phases, cycle times and phase times differ significantly across scenarios; it is therefore difficult to adequately assess the impact of the with and without development and the with and without upgrade scenarios. While it is not unreasonable to assume that Council will revise signal timing as future traffic demand changes, it makes this no longer a comparative assessment. Notwithstanding, the results are still enough to question the suitability of the proposed works.
    c. Signal timing used in the assessment varies from 144 seconds to 109 seconds and user given phase times are specified. Current intersection group schedule in STREAMS has the intersection running:
        i. Plan 20 during the AM peak 140 seconds ACDEB
        ii. Plan 24 during PM school peak 130 seconds ABDEFC
        iii. Plan 4 during PM commuter peak 130 seconds CABDEF
    d. New right-turn lane on Diamond Jubilee Way will reduce the pedestrian storage capacity on the island which is risk for pedestrian movement noting significantly ‘bump out’ of schools and issues Council are already experiencing on Anzac Avenue.
    e. Any new right turn lanes needs to accommodate the appropriate design vehicles and clearance for a dual right turn movement. The southern departure on Endeavour Boulevard needs to be investigated for any amendments to accommodate the manoeuvring and associated clearances.
    f. Diamond Phasing needs to be maintained at all times.
    g. In late 2025 Council introduced raised platforms prior to the pedestrian crossings for 3 of the 4 slip lanes. The assessment does not appropriately reflect the introduction of the raised platforms.

22. Archer Close/Endeavour Boulevard
    a. No traffic survey at Archer Close was obtained/ provided. Volumes on the Archer Close leg are estimated based on 35 dwellings at 0.85vph per dwelling. Archer Close services access to 75 townhouses so this assumption needs revision.
    b. DOS exceeds DSS for roundabouts.

23. Trip distribution

Commercial in Confidence

a. It is difficult to establish at this stage the suitability of the trip distribution. There may be a broader catchment that utilise the Bruce Highway to access the site. 5% is shown to come from Mason Street would be the shortest route via the southbound off ramp.
b. The assumed broad distributions are shown for each campus (Senior and Junior) as if they have individual access point and cannot utilise separate access point. There is uncertainty with the distribution and a risk associated with an increased utilisation of any minor roads access points, such as Mason Street, which are not correctly reflected within the assessment. Without a clear understanding of the internal access arrangement that may limit or not limit the internal access, it is difficult for Council to provide comment on this.
c. No increase in traffic shown on Lakeside Drive seems unlikely given 15% of traffic heading north. Possibly not a capacity issue but a complaint issue.
d. No increase in traffic shown on Memorial Drive despite traffic heading east.

24. Trip Generation
    a. The report shows an assumed 5% shared trip discount applied between the primary and secondary campuses. It is unclear where this assumption has come from or its validity when applied to the trips as generated from the quoted sources. i.e. if these sources already consider P-12 campuses then there should not be any discount applied.
    b. The ITA have chosen to not assess the PM peak hour based on earlier results. The PM peak is often the critical peak for schools when there are operational impacts to the network due to queuing and a very short peak window (15-20min). Even just providing the results of acceptable performance will at least give Council some information to assess how the network may operate and consider if potential issues may arise.
    c. The report finds that almost 50% of students will not be in vehicles (only 561 inbound vehicle movements applied to the network in the AM for 1,030 total student movements) or about 1/3 of the student population generates an AM vehicle trip (from a maximum enrolment of 1,550 students).
    The remaining trips must be walking, cycling, and bus trips. This level of active and bus transport would warrant a high level of active and public transport facility.
    d. Active transport provision has not been considered. Pedestrian number have not increased in the 2037 Development Case intersection analysis, or have been completely omitted.
    e. If high active transport mode share is to be assumed, they should also be distributed to the network.
    f. The background growth value adopted would need further justification to support the values used.

25. The proposal will impact the environmental capacity of the minor roads, such as Maddock Street, Finnegan Drive and Lakefield Drive.

26. Maddock Street shows a 6.0-meter-wide carriageway which would be in sufficient to cater for the expected generation and the requirements of the Pine Rivers scheme and standards. This needs to be considered in the assessment. Impacts need to be mitigated.

Commercial in Confidence

Commercial in Confidence

Parks and Recreation department comments

27. Impacts associated with construction will need to be mitigated and where required, offset in an appropriate manner. Given much of the landscaping in the approach landscapes to the campus is now significantly matured, replacement trees and soft landscaping will need to be at an acceptable level of maturity using advanced plant stock.

28. Unencumbered public right of way for active transport needs to be maintained through Lot 11 and Lot 500 with acceptable design solutions to manage CPTED issues and user experience on approach pathways.

29. Physical impacts to Lot 605 associated with the new roundabout need to be mitigated, noting there is community infrastructure on the east side of the intersection and landscaping and path connections will be disrupted more widely by the works. Detailed design solutions for impacts to Council managed land will need to be implemented to Council's satisfaction. Council requires seamless transitions between development initiated works and existing landscaping and infrastructure. This includes other impacted lots including Lot 1770 SP224076 or other impact land.

Response to Pedestrian Crossing proposal provided on June 1st, 2026

30. Pedestrian delay to cross Endeavour Boulevard in the AM peak is shown to be almost two minutes. This is outside the recommended maximum provided by TMR for signalised crossings (90 seconds).
    a. Compliance becomes an issue due to long pedestrian delays.
    b. Storage space both on the median and on the footpath becomes an issue due to long pedestrian delays and a high number of active transport users including bicycles and PMDs

31. Single stage crossings are preferred for pedestrian and cyclist amenity.

32. Grade separation would be the ideal for pedestrians, however the challenges associated with this are acknowledged.

33. PM peak operation is not shown and cannot be verified. The queues in PM peak may be worse due to:
    a. Vehicles arriving and departing in a condensed period
    b. Students all being dismissed at the same time

34. Delays and queues on the northern approach to the Plantation Road intersection are noted as the biggest impact
    a. This may cause problems due to high numbers of vehicles being released from the proposed dual right turn from DJW. This has not considered here as the DJW intersection and signal timing is not included in the network.

35. Poor pedestrian Level of Service achieved: The other assumption is maximum frequency of one call per two minutes (120 seconds cycle time) which leads to a LOS E for pedestrian with wait times of 54.3 seconds average, per stage of the crossing. That is 108.6 seconds of wait time to cross

the road. If the signals were managed better to reduce pedestrian delays in school peaks, it could again worsen the expected vehicle delays and queuing.

36. Low pedestrian demand assumed: Phase Frequency for the pedestrian phases is 81.4% as determined by SIDRA based on an assumed volume of 50 pedestrians per hour (53 pedestrians: default 50 pedestrians divided by default Peak Flow Factor 0.95 = 52.5). Queuing and delays may be worsened if pedestrian demand is higher than 50 total pedestrians in the peak hour by increasing the phase frequency. Further to this, no justification for the pedestrian volumes is shown.
    a. Correcting the above two issues (item 35/36) creates potential for the queuing from the signalised crossing to then impact the roundabouts' performance. Above points also combine with other advice, such as including bus traffic in the assessment (adding Heavy Vehicle traffic in/out of the site) and deriving pedestrian demands based on an adopted modal split for all 1550 students plus staff.

37. Combining the signalised crossing with the site access as a fully signalised intersection could be a better network outcome and pedestrian outcome overall. It is recommended this is investigated, noting the above items raised by council demonstrating the unsuitability of roundabouts at school accesses.

Disclaimer: Pre-lodgement advice is a process to provide an exchange of information in respect to proposed development prior to submitting a development application. The advice provided should NOT be taken as a commitment as to whether an application would be approved with conditions or refused by council. The pre-lodgement process cannot override council's duty of care and legislative responsibilities in the assessment of development applications including considering matters raised by possible submitters and referral agencies or which come to light during the detailed assessment process.

Should you require any further information about this matter, please contact the Responsible Officer as referenced above.

Yours faithfully

Nick Harrison
Principal Engineer
Development Services

Commercial in Confidence