

**Our ref:** STP4689  
**Contact:** Alexander Steffan | alex@steffanharries.au  
**Website:** [www.steffanharries.au](http://www.steffanharries.au)  
**Phone:** 07 3317 0042



Tuesday, 14 April 2026

Chief Executive Officer  
Brisbane City Council  
GPO Box 1434,  
Brisbane Qld 4001

**Attention:** Kayal Chandrasekar  
Via email: [DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au)

## RE: RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

**Reconfiguring a Lot (1 into 10 lots)**  
**COUNCIL REF:** [A006845738](#)  
**15 Portal Street, Oxley QLD 4075**  
**Lot 13 on RP84476**

Dear Kayla,

I refer to the Information Request received from Brisbane City Council dated 16<sup>th</sup> of September 2025 in relation to the development application lodged for a Reconfiguring a Lot (1 into 10 lots) at 15 Portal Street, Oxley. On behalf of the applicant, Steffan Harries provides the following response in addition to the following attachments:

- **Appendix A** – Civil engineering response
- **Appendix B** – Traffic engineering response
- **Appendix C** – Ecological response
- **Appendix D** – Bushfire management plan
- **Appendix E** – Amended subdivision proposal plan

---

### Stormwater

1. It is noted that further investigation is necessary to determine if the existing stormwater network has capacity to cater for the proposed development. Refer to the as constructed information drawings for existing stormwater drainage line WP55224 and submit details on the downslope drainage line capacity in accordance with AO4.2/PO4 of the Subdivision code and PO1 and PO3 of the Subdivision code.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix A** for a response to this matter raised.

2. Provide easements (minimum 900mm wide) in favour of Council over the upslope drainage connection line at the rear of lots and shown on the ROL plan.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix A** for a response to this matter raised.

### Traffic

3. While the supporting structure plan is considered generally acceptable and consistent with anticipated development in the area, there are a number of matters requiring revisions to design and supporting reports. The followings to be addressed.
  - a. As per Infrastructure design planning scheme policy (IDPSP) SC6.16 Section 3.3.6.3, the desirable minimum intersection spacing (centre-line to centre-line) is 40 m when intersections are located on opposite sides of a through street. This requirement is to be addressed.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix B** for a response to this matter raised.

- b. A 10m road reserve is insufficient to construct kerb and channel. The minimum width of  $\frac{3}{4}$  road is 10.75m for constructability as per IDPSP SC6.16 Section 3.7.3.2. The minimum standard verge width for a new road is 4.25 m. The minimum verge of 1m on a  $\frac{3}{4}$  road is required for constructability and maintenance.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix B** for a response to this matter raised. Furthermore, the proposed 10.5m road reserve width along the southern frontage is considered to achieve PO3 of the Subdivision code, despite being marginally less than the 10.75m width referred to by Council from SC6.16 Section 3.7.3.2 for a  $\frac{3}{4}$  road constructability outcome. That 10.75m figure is a standard design dimension in the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy, but the assessment under the planning scheme remains performance based. The relevant question is whether the road is provided at an adequate width, suitable gradient and appropriate construction standard, and whether it will safely and efficiently cater for the expected vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist movements without unreasonable detriment to adjoining premises, as required by PO3 of the Subdivision code. In this case, the variation is only 0.25m and is not of a scale that would, by itself, justify a conclusion that the road corridor is inadequate or unsafe. The proposed 10.5m width still allows a practical and functional frontage outcome that can accommodate the necessary pavement and kerb and channel works, maintain access to the proposed lots, and provide a usable verge and service corridor outcome. It also remains consistent with the broader intent of AO3.1, which is directed to safe travel, access to properties, provision of utilities, delivery of a quality streetscape and the creation of a durable, low maintenance public asset. While SC6.16 identifies preferred cross-sections and standard verge dimensions, those standards should be read as guiding the preferred engineering outcome rather than operating as an inflexible rule in every circumstance. Here, the proposed departure is minor, does not alter the function of the road, and does not produce any material compromise to road safety, constructability, maintenance, network efficiency or public realm function. On that basis, the proposed 10.5m reserve width should be accepted as satisfying PO3 of the Subdivision code and remaining consistent with the intent of AO3.1 and SC6.16 Section 3.7.3.2.

- c. Retaining wall within road reserve is not supported. Consider revising roadworks levels to minimise cut/fill where batter can be supported in the interim.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix A** for a response to this matter raised.

- d. Road 1 standard (2 way) cross fall is to be provided as the proposed 1 way cross fall

would jeopardise future stormwater management when the road is extended.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix A** for a response to this matter raised.

- e. Construction of a concrete footpath (non-trunk) along the full site frontage on Portal Rd and the new road is required.

Note: Any Performance outcome sought is to be suitably supported by a RPEQ report.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix A** for a response to this matter raised.

### Refuse

4. It is noted on the proposed plans that there appears to be one (1) turnaround facility on Lot 9, however no RPEQ certified swept path analysis has been provided to demonstrate the Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) is able to utilise the facility. Furthermore, a separate crossover for lot 9 has not been demonstrated. In accordance with PO4/AO4, PO9/AO9c of the Subdivision code and PO1/AO1, PO19/AO19.3 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing code, provide the following:
  - a. A RPEQ certified swept path analysis for a side loading RCV as per BSD 3004 that clearly demonstrates safe and efficient manoeuvring. The RPEQ swept paths are to include the RCV utilising the turnaround facility. Grades on interim turning to be shown and demonstrated to comply with TAPs requirements for service vehicle manoeuvring.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix B** for a response to this matter raised.

- b. Provide amended plans demonstrating the crossover for Lot 9 is separate from the turnaround facility. Ensure there is a minimum kerbside presentation area of 1.8m between the proposed turnaround facility and the required crossover for Lot 9 mobile garbage bins. If the intent is not to provide a separate crossover on Lot 9, then an easement over the entire lot will need to be provided until such time as the road network to the west is completed.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix B** for a response to this matter raised.

- c. Clearly denote the dimensions of the turnaround facility and specify it is for the RCV on amended plans.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix B** for a response to this matter raised.

### Biodiversity areas overlay

5. The development is within the mapped High Ecological Significance Strategic (HESS) subcategory of the Biodiversity areas overlay. In accordance with the performance outcomes of the code, the development should ensure ecological features and processes and areas of strategic biodiversity value are protected, conserved and restored (PO4). Considering that the western boundary of the site is mapped within the HESS overlay, this area should be considered for conservation and restoration to provide an ecological corridor from north to south within the landscape. Submit amended plans including the following:
  - a. Provide an updated lot layout showing the conservation of ecological values along the western boundary of the site.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix C** for a response to this matter raised.

- b. Provide a brief ecological assessment of the site outlining the ecological values, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix C** for a response to this matter raised.

- c. Where on-site mitigation measures proposed include rehabilitation, provide a Concept Rehabilitation Plan. Development must enhance biodiversity, native habitat and fauna movement. This plan is to be in the form of scaled plans and supporting documentation.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix C** for a response to this matter raised.

### **Bushfire Hazard**

6. The site is mapped within a Bushfire Hazard Area in the State's Natural Hazards, Risk and Resilience mapping. Provide an assessment against the SPP Assessment Benchmarks for Natural Hazards, Risk and Resilience. City Plan's Bushfire overlay code can be used as a means of demonstrating compliance with these benchmarks. Additionally, the Queensland Government has recently published SPP guidance material to assist in demonstrating compliance with the SPP Natural Hazards, Risk and Resilience assessment benchmarks.

Response: Please find a Bushfire management plan attached as **Appendix D**. The report demonstrates that the subject site is only affected by a BAL12.5.

### **Retention of Significant Vegetation**

7. It is evident from recent aerial photography that some 'Significant Vegetation' is present on site. Council requires the retention of significant vegetation as part of the development. In accordance with Section C1, PO19 of the Subdivision code, demonstrate that the development layout retains and responds to existing significant vegetation (both on the development site and/or on adjacent sites if proposed works are likely to impact vegetation).
  - a. To demonstrate this, submit a Vegetation Retention Plan, in line with the Vegetation Planning Scheme Policy, which describes the actions and processes that will be used to manage vegetation before, during and after construction on a site. Submit all relevant documentation as outlined in s1.7.3, s1.7.4 and s1.7.5 of the IDPSP.

Response: Please refer to **Appendix C** for a response to this matter raised.

---

As a result of the amendments required to the plans, please also find an updated subdivision proposal plan attached as **Appendix E**.

As per section 13.2 of the DA Rules, this letter provides a response to:

- a) all of the information requested; ~~or~~
- b) ~~part of the information requested; or~~
- c) ~~a notice that none of the information will be provided.~~

Should Council have any outstanding issues associated with the information provided within this report, we formally request that Council informs us prior to making a decision.

We will now proceed with public consultation accordingly.

Kind regards,



Alexander Steffan | Director

**Steffan Harries**

**Email:** [alex@steffanharries.au](mailto:alex@steffanharries.au)