

10<sup>th</sup> June 2022

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

To: Kathy Dendle – Re: Proposed Development DA37 – 2021 – 2022 for Proposed Caravan Park at Lot1 Cnr Leek and Thistle for New Beginnings Church.

We would like to raise concerns and questions of the above proposed development at Lot 1 Leek Street Blackall and how this development will impact on the surrounding properties.

1. Sewerage – We have lived at 143 Thistle Street, for the past ten years and have had terrible trouble with the sewerage. When it rains heavy the sewerage comes back up the manhole in our back yard and the adjoining neighbour's yard and then it gradually goes away after days. We consider this would be a terrible situation if future tenants were to use this line. We asked council several years ago about building on our back block and was advised against it because the sewerage was at its limit then. How much extra sewerage will be generated from the proposed park and can it handle the extra waste.
2. Storm Water – Leek, Thistle and Bedford Streets all have drainage issues. Currently, water can lay in the streets for weeks after rain and does not drain away because of the street levels. If this development was approved, what plan does Council have to rectify this matter to accommodate the Stormwater.
3. Water Supply – Even though we are very close to the town bore, in summer months, we struggle badly to keep our gardens watered with low pressure. Has Council thought of this situation, keeping a caravan park in tip top condition 24/7 uses a mammoth amount of water to maintain these gardens.
4. Electricity Supply – Has any assessment been done to gauge the amount of Electricity that would be used at the park, especially peak times April to August each year. We used to have power problems when the Roo boxes were operating in Bedford Street, so a Van Park would have an enormous use of Power.

13<sup>th</sup> June 2022  
 Blackall- Tambo Regional Council  
 PO Box 21  
 Blackall QLD 4472  
[admin@btrc.qld.gov.au](mailto:admin@btrc.qld.gov.au)

ATTN: Chief Executive Officer: Des Howard  
 Rates Officer: Kathryn Dendle  
 Mayor: Andrew Martin  
 Deputy Mayor: Lindsay Russell  
 Councillors: David Hardie, Boyd Johnson, Pam Pullos, Graham Schluter, Jane Scobie

**RE: DA 37-2021-2022 Proposed development and reconfiguring a Lot.**

Please find tabled below a detailed list of questions and concerns relating to the proposed development of 18 Leek Street, Blackall Qld 4472 (Lot 1, CP900484) and its compliance with the Blackall -Tambo Region Planning Scheme. A response in writing from Blackall-Tambo Regional Council addressing these questions and concerns is requested and appreciated.

***4.4 Categories of development and assessment—Material change of use***

For assessable development in the Mixed-Use precinct		
For assessable development	One way to achieve it (Acceptable Outcomes)	Questions and Concerns
<p><b>PO18</b>            Development does not have an adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of privacy, safety, noise, odour and fumes, lighting, and traffic generation.</p>		<p>The proposed development is adjoining residential property and will directly impact current residents. The development would mean the loss of privacy to residents, increase in noise, odour and fumes and a dramatic increase in traffic. A large fire pit is noted in the plans, how will the flow on affect from this be mitigated? Multiple members of our family are asthmatic, these fires would affect our ability to hang washing or open windows to our home.</p> <p><b><u>Council Planning Guidelines</u></b>            State in Strategic Intent            3.3.2 Facilitating responsible growth for rural and town living environments:  <i>Lifestyle and liveability</i> the lifestyle offered across the region is prized by residents and visitors alike. While development and economic growth in the region is encouraged, the enhancement of this lifestyle is of great importance.</p>
<p><b>PO19</b>            Non-residential uses are compatible with and do not detract from the domestic scale, intensity, form and character of the precinct.</p>	<p>PO19.1 New buildings and structures comply with the building heights stated in A04 of the General Development Code.            AO19.2 The scale of ancillary buildings comply with AO8 of the General Development Code.</p>	<p>The nature and scale of the plans are not compatible with the current residential culture. The proposed Tourist Park will detract from the character of the precinct.  <b><u>Council Planning Guidelines</u></b> State in Strategic Intent            3.3.2 Facilitating responsible growth for rural and town living environments:  <i>Enhancing commercial prosperity</i>            The planning scheme identifies a Commercial precinct in the Township</p>



		<i>zone, aimed at facilitating commercial development, such as commercial, government administration, professional and retail uses, in an accessible, consolidated and considered manner.</i>
<b>PO20</b> For non-residential uses, hours of operation are consistent with maintaining a reasonable level of amenity for nearby residential uses and does not prejudice the future use of other and in the Mixed-Use precinct for residential use	PO20 Hours of operation are limited to 7am to 6pm.	Are council able to ensure that no business will be conducted outside of these specified hours? Will this negatively affect the residential property market within the neighbourhood?

#### 4.3 Categories of development and assessment

6.2.2 Assessment Benchmarks – General Development Code			
What we want to achieve (Performance Outcomes)	One way to achieve it (Acceptable Outcomes)	What we don't want to see	Questions and Concerns
<b>PO1</b> The scale of new buildings and facilities suits its site and its surroundings.	AO1 New buildings cover less than the following percentage of site area: • Township zone (where not in a precinct) - 50%; • Township zone (Mixed Use precinct) – 50%; • Recreation and Open Space zone – 10%	The scale of new buildings and facilities exceeds what is intended for the site and surrounding area.	The Scale of the new buildings (2 storey) and the facilities do not suit the site or surroundings.  The site is run in conjunction with a Church and there is nothing similar in surrounding area.
<b>PO5</b> New buildings have a similar look and feel to any surrounding buildings and look like they belong in the local area.	O5.1 In the Township zone (other than in the Commercial precinct, Industrial precinct and Mixed Use precinct), new buildings include at least 3 of the following: • verandas or porches; • awnings and shade structures; • variations to the roof and building lines; • recesses and projections of the external facade; • doors and window openings; • a range of building materials, colours and textures matching or complementing those prevailing in neighbouring buildings; or • windows or other design features which overlook the street to allow for passive surveillance.	Building designs which do not reflect the surrounding buildings, or contribute poorly to the streetscape	The proposal does not have a similar look and feel to any surrounding buildings within the residential area, the buildings will not look and blend with area. The proposed caretaker's accommodation is a 2-storey complex for which there are no other similar buildings within Leek Street. The view from the Landsborough Highway entering Blackall township will look obscured.
<b>PO6</b>			The proposed design does not allow for passive surveillance of

<p>New buildings include design features which allow for passive surveillance of the streetscape and measures that increase the safety of the neighbourhood.</p>			<p>the streetscape, nor does it increase the safety of the neighbourhood with increased transient activity.</p>
<p><b>PO9</b> Expected increases in traffic volume are properly managed and mitigated.</p>	<p>AO9.1 Local transport and traffic design standards/local laws are met. PO9.2 Development makes sure that: • local and residential roads are used only for local traffic; and • traffic or freight movement on local and residential roads is avoided.</p>	<p>Flows of heavy vehicle or significantly increased traffic along Flows of heavy vehicle or significantly increased traffic along residential streets that could create unacceptable noise or inconvenience to residents, or impact on the condition of rural roads by heavy vehicles.</p>	<p>The proposed Tourist Park has outlined that it plans to use both Thistle and Leek Street as its Entry/Exit points for potential traffic. Both of these Streets are residential in nature, and this contradicts planning guidelines. How would this be managed or mitigated? As a resident who lives on the corner of both Thistle and Leek Street both entry/exit points to our residential property would be obstructed by the increase in traffic which is larger in nature given they will be towing caravans. For many residents in these streets, they have only one access point. How will this be managed?</p>
<p><b>PO10</b> Sufficient parking spaces are provided for the use.</p>	<p>AO10.1 Car parking is provided as per the rates in Table 6.2.2.1. AO10.2 On-street parking is maintained.</p>	<p>Poor or lack of onsite parking. Reductions in on-street parking, unless more is provided on site.</p>	<p>How will sufficient parking be provided? Given that the proposal states they will have a park for each van site and one additional for every 3 sites? The New Beginnings Church currently does not have enough parks fit for purpose and the current spaces the church utilises will be taken for the Tourist Park.</p>
<p><b>PO11</b> Vehicle access and movement is: • easy and safe; • does not create problems for the external road network; and • provides safe pedestrian access – this includes access for people with a disability.</p>	<p>AO11.1 Car parking and manoeuvring areas are designed to comply with: • AS2890.1 – Parking Facilities; and • Austroads Publication AP-G34-13 – Austroads Design Vehicles and Turning Path Templates. AO11.2 Avoid conflict with obstacles which may obstruct parking – e.g., manholes, power poles, vegetation, bus stops, gully pits and other obstacles. The minimum distance between a driveway and an intersection connecting to another street is 6m, and driveway access is provided from the</p>	<p>Tight parking which reduces manoeuvring – both on premises and on-street. Lack of safe pedestrian access and parking for people with disabilities. Obstacles on or near driveway – e.g., bus stops, manholes etc. Driveway is poorly positioned and is not safe – e.g., within 6m of an intersection with another street or leads onto a busy road.</p>	<p>Has the appropriate amount of room been allowed to accommodate the additional area required when manoeuvring a 4WD and Caravan? How will this affect residential traffic?</p>



	quietest/smallest road frontage available.		
--	--	--	--

What we want to achieve (Performance Outcomes)	One way to achieve it (Acceptable Outcomes)	What we don't want to see	Questions and Concerns
<b>PO13</b> Suitable connections to power and telecommunications are provided.	AO13 Telecommunications and power supplies are designed to meet provider requirements.		Has an impact assessment been completed to ensure that residential premises will not be adversely affected by the additional loads required for the proposed?
<b>PO14</b> Adequate supply of potable water is provided to the premises, and new buildings are designed to be able to appropriately treat and dispose of effluent and other wastewater.	AO14.1 In the Township zone, all new buildings are connected to Blackall-Tambo Regional Council's reticulated water supply network in accordance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Services Association of Australia (WSAA), 2011, "WSA 03-11 Water Supply Code of Australia" Version 3.1;</li> <li>and • Queensland Department of Energy and Water Supply, 2010, Planning</li> </ul>		Can current Infrastructure accommodate the large increase in capacity? Who would be responsible for these upgrades?
<b>PO15</b> Stormwater is collected and discharged to ensure no impacts on adjoining land, or Council or state infrastructure, while also ensuring environmental values of receiving waters are maintained.	PO15 Stormwater drainage is provided in accordance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queensland urban drainage manual, 3rd Edition, Queensland Department of Energy and Water Supply, 2013; and</li> <li>• Pilgrim, DH, (ed)., Australian Rainfall &amp; Runoff – A Guide to Flood Estimation, Institution of Engineers, Australia, Barton, ACT, 1987.</li> </ul>		On the proposed site in Leek Street there is currently no storm water infrastructure. Where would this stormwater be redirected? Are council and applicants able to provide details on how and where this would occur? Can it be guaranteed that this would not be detrimental to surrounding residential properties?
<b>PO16</b> Council infrastructure is protected from encroachment or interference.	AO16.1 All building proposals are clear of Council easements and underground infrastructure within site boundaries. AO16.2 All invert crossing(s) and driveways are clear of all gully pits, streetlights, power poles and other infrastructure located within the road reserve with a minimum	New buildings that impact the function and use of Blackall -Tambo Regional Council assets.	What affect will the proposed for 18 Leek Street have on Council assets? Particularly that of the Blackall Water Supply – No. 4 Town Bore? How will the additional traffic affect security and Council access given that it is routinely used by council, often multiple times a day with parking required for heavy vehicles?



	separation distance of 1 metre.		
<b>PO21</b> People and property are not exposed to intolerable risk from flood hazards.	AO21.1 New development is: • situated outside of mapped flood areas identified in Schedule 2 – Flood mapping;	Uses and activities that are incompatible with the flood risk present.	How will the applicants and Council ensure that any additional construction material such as fill which may be required to complete the project, will not raise the drainage level, and negatively affect surrounding residential property and Council assets?
<b>PO26</b> State environmentally significant areas are protected, not encroached upon, or otherwise degraded, with vegetation and wildlife movement corridors maintained.	AO26 Development occurring outside of the Township zone must be 100m from the bank of all waterways, water storages and areas identified as Matters of State Environmental Significance as identified in SPP mapping – Environment and Heritage (Biodiversity)	New development in areas of environmental significance that are identified by the State Planning Policy.	As stated by the Qld Government Department of Environmental Science ( <a href="http://www.wetlandinfo.des.qld.gov.au">www.wetlandinfo.des.qld.gov.au</a> ) and Town Planning it has been identified that threatened species of Flora and Fauna have been identified in the area. Has an impact assessment/consideration been given to the affect of such development in an area which back onto bushland in which these species potentially reside? Applicant plans to clear area external to property to comply with bushfire mitigation. Frequently sighted Fauna: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glossy black cockatoo (eastern) (Calyptorhynchus lathami lathami)</li> <li>• Painted honeyeater (Grantiella picta)</li> <li>• Major Mitchell’s cockatoo (Lophochroa leadbeateri)</li> </ul>

<b>PO1</b> The proposed lots are of a size and dimension to meet the outcomes for development in the zones and precincts in respect of: (a) preserving land for agriculture, animal production and environmental conservation in the Rural zone; (b) achieving a safe and pleasant residential environment in the Township zone; c) consistency with the nature and layout of existing subdivision patterns; and (d) providing a variety of lot sizes for residential living, industry and commerce.	AO1 Allotment dimensions comply with Table 6.3.3.1	The size of the planned Tourist Park exceeds Blackall-Tambo Regional Council recommended guidelines for this type of proposal within a Mixed-Use precinct ,given the proposed site area is 1.002 Ha. How will this be managed?  <b><u>Council Planning Guidelines</u></b> Table 6.3.3.1 – Acceptable outcomes for lot sizes and frontages Township zone – Mixed Use precinct 800m2 Road Frontage - 20 metres
<b>PO4</b> Roads are constructed and upgraded to provide	AO4.1 New Road infrastructure is designed and constructed in	Will the applicant be accountable for the required road infrastructure upgrades that are needed to



<p>for the safe and efficient movement of: (a) vehicles to and from the site (b) emergency vehicles accessing each proposed lot (c) pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>accordance with the standards detailed in the Capricorn Municipal Development Guidelines (including Standard Drawings and Specifications, Construction Specifications and Procedures, Design Specifications and Purchase Specifications).</p>	<p>accommodate this proposal or Blackall-Tambo Regional Council and thus the Rate payer?</p>
---	--	--

Blackall currently provides as many as five (5) other options for tourists with Caravans, including one by Blackall-Tambo Regional Council itself. All of which are in the business precinct or out of town with access that does not require the use of residential streets. Multiple other longstanding businesses providing similar services would be negatively affected by the construction of a tourist park at 18 Leek Street.

What affect will the development of 18 Leek Street have on the residential property market in the area? The interest and value of a residential property within close proximity to a tourist park will dramatically decrease.

We ask that on our behalf and that of our impacted neighbours you assess the application and our concerns conscientiously. **We formally object to further development of 18 Leek Street, Blackall.**

We look forward to further communication regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

  
  
  
  


5. We feel that this Park will have lots of implications for the existing residences in Leek and surrounding streets, after being a quiet area, turned into a thoroughfare for caravans and campers. It also mentions about a firepit area to be built. I would like to ask Council are people allowed to light fires now. Every now and again would not be too bad but every day putting up with the smoke and ash would not be good for the residence in the area.
6. We would also like to know is the said land zoned as business or residential. From previous conversations with neighbours it is residential. We were told that a business could not be run from our place because it is residential, and I am also aware that a neighbour was told the same. The horse stable at the back of our block, some years ago I believe these owners were told that Council wanted the stables moved because the land was to be changed to Residential Zoning.
7. There are currently five places campers and caravanners can stay in and near Blackall. The Blackall Caravan Park, Barcoo Hotel Caravan Park, Shirley & Frank Russell Camp Area on the Ravensbourne Road, Riverside Camping and Showgrounds (Run by Council). The extra park would put considerable financial pressure on the already struggling parks in Blackall. Being an ex owner of a Caravan Park in Blackall, we know first hand how much financial strain it can put on a business, when Council opened up the riverside camping against us.
8. We would appreciate Council replying to our concerns and take into consideration the impacts on the existing infrastructure at the western end of town. We strongly object to the further development of this Caravan Park.

Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]



2<sup>nd</sup> June 2022



To Kathy Dendle – RE : Proposed Development DA37 – 2021 – 2022  
Proposed caravan Park at Lot 1 Corner of Leek St & Thistle St For New  
Beginnings Church.

Thank you for sending through the information for the above listed proposed development. I have a number of questions and concerns which I would appreciate an investigation / response in writing to at your earliest convenience please. Depending upon the outcome / results of the questions / concerns – will influence whether or not I object to the proposed development of the caravan park.

Questions :

1. The sewage boundary trap on Leek St – Can this cope with the extra amount of sewage that will be generated from the proposed caravan park without blocking up? That is – Are the Sewage pipes big / wide enough to handle ALL of the extra waste that will be funnelling through there? Also – What condition are these pipes in? That is – How old are they and are they strong / substantial enough to cope with the extra waste? Including Washing machine / grey waste & Septic Dumping Points? And how much extra risk is there from blockages if this proposal goes ahead?
2. What is the maximum capacity of people that the caravan park can legally have stay under the license? (Including those that will stay in the managers residence)
3. Water pressure – How will the proposed development affect the current water pressure? Currently during busier or higher water usage – current water pressure drops in this area and is sporadic with pressure up and down – How can the proposed development ensure that the current water pressure will not reduce our water pressure more with such a large area to service – including lawn/garden irrigation – and 15 structures with ensuites / taps etc

4. What Surface water run off drainage system will be installed? Will All 15 of the structures / buildings – including ALL of the ensuites have guttering with down pipes plumbed into where? Where will the surface water and storm water go? There are pretty major surface water drainage issues at Bedford St & Leek St – with major water pooling and the water not draining away to where it is supposed to go – due to incorrect levels of roads and graded gutters when infrastructure was put in place. My concern is – there will be a lot more surface water run off from hard surfaces – plus roof /storm water run off – will this be plumbed into where? Where will this water go – taking into consideration the current defective surface water gutter drainage issues we already have?
  
5. What proof / justification does the client have that Blackall needs another caravan park? To my knowledge – Blackall currently has  
Blackall Caravan Park –  
Riverside Caravan Park  
Barcoo Hotel Caravan Park  
Frank and Shirley Russell on Ravensbourne Road Caravan Park  
Showgrounds Caravan park.

From what I am aware the busy season is from - Easter – through to April/May/June/July -

How can the clients justify that Blackall needs another caravan park for such a short busy season when we already have 4-5?

Would this not be taking away from what is already on offer with other caravan parks?

How many people / caravans can ALL of the current caravan parks listed above combined take - if at full capacity? (in total)

These are my questions and concerns – and I would appreciate a response in writing at your earliest convenience.

Best Regards

[Redacted signature block]

20/6/22

Blackall-Tambo Regional Council

PO Box 21

BLACKALL QLD 4472

[admin@btrc.qld.gov.au](mailto:admin@btrc.qld.gov.au)

**ATTN:** Chief Executive Officer: Des Howard

Rates Officer: Kathy Dendle

Mayor: Andrew Martin

**RE: DA 37-2021-2022 Proposed development & Reconfiguring a Lot (18 Leek Street)**

I wish to put in writing my disapproval for the proposed development of 18 Leek Street.

We are a family of four with two young boys. We choose to live here in Leek Street as it is a quiet, friendly neighbourhood with little noise & traffic & in my opinion a nice area to raise children. Going ahead with the proposed tourist park just up the road would severely impact on the noise, traffic and privacy of our street. Our lifestyle we currently have is why we choose to live where we do.

I also have concerns about water usage, storm water & sewage.... as everyone is aware, the water pressure comes under pressure in the summer months, won't a tourist park with gardens & lawn areas only add to this increase in pressure?

Who is going to fund & maintain the access roads? Will ratepayers be slugged with a rate increase to cover the upkeep & maintenance?

Finally, & of equal importance is the fact that tourist can choose from the local caravan park (who are trying to make a living out of the tourist season), the Barcoo hotel van park, the riverside park, the showgrounds & Shannendoah Park. That's FIVE existing options that are already available. As already mentioned, the caravan park is already someone's livelihood, to add another competitor would be not only highly disrespectful to them but would also decrease the value of their business should they sell it.

In closing, due to the above concerns, we are strongly voting NO NO NO!! to the proposed tourist park at 18 Leek street.

We look forward to hearing from you in regard to any correspondence &/or a sensible outcome.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

07/06/2022

Blackall- Tambo Regional Council  
PO Box 21  
Blackall QLD 4472

[admin@btrc.qld.gov.au](mailto:admin@btrc.qld.gov.au)

ATTN: Kathy Dendle

RE: DA 37-2021-2022 Proposed development and reconfiguring a Lot.

We have received information on the proposed development of the neighbouring site at 18 Leek street along with the relevant site documents for this also.

We have the following questions/concerns regarding the above proposed development that we would like the Council & Applicant to address. We are of the view that the proposed development will impact surrounding properties and the below items need to be carefully assessed and managed accordingly. We feel that any further development of this type in this area should first have basic infrastructure in place to accommodate it.

1. Social Impacts

1.1 Privacy - As this development is on the adjoining block to our property, the proposed Development is within plain sight of our backyard and plans show a BBQ area on the fence line to our property as well as a caravan site. The current fence will not give adequate privacy into our property in its entirety of the site area (See photos attached for reference). We ask the applicant address how this can be managed and agree on a suitable outcome.

If the development were to be approved, we see this item as a priority for this to be addressed before any site works were to commence.

1.2 The applicant also mentions a fire pit in the letter supplied. We don't want to be impacted by the Smoke, Embers & Ash from the fire with the southerly winds throughout April - September. The picture supplied also shows that our clothesline is situated in that corner of our property and smoke will leave washing on the line tainted, along with it entering our residence when the back door or windows are open.

2. Infrastructure impacts

2.1 Electricity Supply capacity

Has an impact assessment been completed for the Electricity Distribution network for the Leek Street area? We feel that the connection of a commercial business's Electrical loading would impact the existing residences Electricity Supply.

I have occasionally experienced voltage problems when the Roo Boxes in Bedford street were in operation, as well as in recent times through monitoring devices I occasionally see issues at peak times. The proposed site development will be adding additional loads to the network and would further impact this.

## 2.2 Water connection

Has an Impact assessment been completed for the Water connection to supply this development?

The recent summer heatwave has identified that the capacity of the current bore supplying existing residences struggles to maintain adequate water supply pressure. All residences in this part of town also see similar issues.

What is the supply capacity of the adjacent bore, what is it currently supplying and is it adequate for any development?

What will be done to fix any issues if unacceptable water pressures are experienced because of this additional connection? Not only is it to supply the facilities, but year-round for the landscaping at this site.

## 2.3 Sewerage connection

Has an impact assessment been completed on the current Sewerage network & system capacity?

Will the proposed connection of 16 ensuite sites with Showers & Toilets and the managers residence impact on the surrounding properties?

Can the sewerage system handle the number of additional toilets and showers discharge?

Can the current sewerage system accept additional connections for this development regarding the amount of fall required for the sewerage connection to properly flow to the Manhole location?

Our property was unable to connect to the town sewerage system & required a septic system to be installed with a pumped discharge for the greywater, to a connection point on my boundary, running across to the Manhole/Sewer. We were advised by council that system could not accommodate a standard connection due to the elevation and distance of our site and the heights of the manhole/Sewer, which is in front of the Church Building. I also note in the plans provided for the proposed site; the natural ground level is 0.3m lower than that in front of the Church.

## 2.4 Drainage of Storm water

No Storm water drainage infrastructure exists on the Western side of Leek street.

The Eastern side does have storm water piping but does not drain away due to the differing levels along the street.

There has been no development in this part of town with regards to accepting Storm water runoff from when the Leek/Rose street and Racecourse road was formed & sealed.

Water currently lays along Rose street, Leek street, Bedford Street intersections for weeks, as there is not enough natural fall to other parts Bedford, Rose, Thistle and towards Shamrock Street to allow it to drain away (see attached Photos).

With the Extension of Thistle street requested, where will the surface run off water be directed on the western side?

Currently during amounts of rainfall, the water in front of the church flows across my driveway to the Leek/Rose Street corner and sits there for weeks when it reaches the

level of the Bitumen surface, as the sealed surface is higher than the drainage level (see attached photos for reference).

The site plan or attached letter does not mention any site elevation details to accommodate the site construction. If the proposed site development and road construction required fill, what impacts will this have on the street with the surrounding properties.

The BBQ area is proposed to go in the rear of the site along the adjoining fence line being the lowest spot in the site, how will the current water pooling be managed in this area? Placing any fill in this area will divert water around the back of my property where it lays going stagnate, and as a mosquito breeding area. I currently must maintain a spoon drain myself to divert any storm water away from my property along the racecourse side fence. This will not be sufficient to manage the neighbouring property's surface water runoff due to diversion from building up the site. Additional solutions need to be identified for this issue.

### 3. Economic Impacts

Currently there are another 4-5 options for short term Stay for tourists with Vans. During this current tourist season, it has been observed that most travellers with vans prefer to free camp rather than stay in parks, typically due to trying to keep down costs with the rising fuel and food prices. A number of these current business's rely totally on these tourists to operate.

Other businesses of similar nature need to be consulted about this application as they will be directly impacted by this development. What need is there for another Van park at all? Especially in an area that cannot support it. Should the development be approved, Alternative sites that can support it should be given preference.

With the extension of Thistle Street requested to accommodate this development, and possibly numerous other upgrades to support it, will the costs of the proposed works be passed on to the rate payers, or the developer? I Believe the wider community should also be consulted on the development also.

The concerns we have mentioned above will not only impact us as a neighbouring property, but also the council and the wider neighbourhood. We ask that Council and the applicant carefully assess these concerns raised and provide information back on the items listed. We Respectfully Object to the further development of this site.

We look forward to your communication.

Regards,

████████████████████  
██████████  
████████████████  
██████████  
████████████████











[REDACTED]

21<sup>st</sup> June 2022

To the CEO, Mayor and Councillors

I am writing to express my objections to the proposed Development Application 37-2021-2022.

I am the owner of the Blackall Caravan Park, where there is already provision for 70 caravan sites and approximately 100 additional sites in Blackall.

I have invested large amounts of both time and money in developing the Blackall Caravan Park in my time as manager and am fearful of the impact of an additional caravan park on my business and sale value.

Development of an additional caravan park in Blackall will severely impact the viability of my caravan park. During the peak season, Blackall Caravan Park is able to accommodate all enquiries for short term accommodation and caravan sites. Given that the majority of my cashflow is obtained during these peak flow periods, my business will be negatively impacted with the development of the new caravan park.

In the absence of the implementation of the "Blackall Levee- Concept Design Report" (2017), I also object to any further developments in Blackall due to the inherent risks of future floods to our town. The 1990 and 2012 floods (Blackall Levee Concept Design Report) reached a height of 292.3m AHD and 292.2m AHD respectively. To allow a development to proceed at a minimum height of 282.52 AHD does not make sense, especially given the ongoing flooding events in Blackall and the prediction of future above average rain falls.

I believe that the priority of council should be the construction of the Blackall Levee before approval is given to future developments.

I am also objecting to this development, on the grounds that it will potentially create traffic congestion in our town centre and residential areas.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

20TH JUNE 2022

BLACKALL-TAMBO REGIONAL COUNCIL

PO BOX 21

BLACKALL. Q. 4472.

ATTN: C.E.O DES HOWARD

MAYOR: ANDREW MARTIN, DEPUTY MAYOR: LINDSAY RUSSELL

COUNCILLORS: DAVID HARDIE, JANE SCOBIE, BOYD JOHNSTONE, PAM PULLOS  
GRAHAM SCHLUTER

RE: DA 37-2021-2022 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND RECONFIGURING A LOT  
RELATING TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF 18 LEEK STREET, BLACKALL 4472  
(LOT 1, CP 900484)

WE VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE THIS DEVELOPMENT AS THIS WILL IMPACT  
THE SURROUNDING STREETS WITH INCREASED NOISE DISTURBING NATIVE  
WILDLIFE AND RESIDENTS. THE AREA OF THIS DEVELOPMENT DOES NOT  
FIT IN WELL WITH OUR COMMUNITY. BLACKALL IS VERY WELL CATERED  
FOR WITH 2 PLACES FOR CARAVANS, AND ACCOMMODATION IN MOTELS

Blackall-Tambo Regional Council	
RECEIVED	
23 JUN 2022	
Action	Completed
Task	