



*Dedicated to a better Brisbane*

29 May 2026

El Al Investment Group Pty Ltd  
C/- B Planned & Surveyed Pty Ltd  
19/25 Samuel Street  
CAMP HILL QLD 4152

**ATTENTION:** Daniel Zilli  
**Application Reference:** A006914564  
**Address of Site:** 149 BENHIAM ST CALAMVALE QLD 4116

Dear Daniel

**RE: Further advice**

Council has carried out a review of the Information request response material received on 2 April 2026 and the following information is required to progress the application further:

**Metes and bounds**

- 1) The development application has specified part of 169 Benhiam Street (Lot 48 on RP94849) as a subject premises, limited to a metes and bounds area for the access easement for stage 1 / new road for stage 2. However, the proposal involves a stormwater easement area (406m<sup>2</sup>) within 169 Benhiam Street (Lot 48 on RP94849) which has not been included in the metes and bounds development area.

Submit amended application material which clarifies if the entirety of 169 Benhiam Street (Lot 48 on RP94849) is a subject premises of the development application. Alternatively, provide an amended metes and bounds development area which includes the stormwater easement area over 169 Benhiam Street (Lot 48 on RP94849).

**Bushfire hazard**

- 2) The response to Council's information request in relation to bushfire setbacks (PO1) is reliant on Queensland Development Code (QDC) and Dwelling house (small lot) code setbacks to control potential exposure of future dwellings to radiant heat exposure and therefore did not identify any setbacks within proposed lots 1-8 to reflect <29kW/m<sup>2</sup> (PO1). As siting requirements can be varied or relaxed independent of this development approval, this proposed approach is not supported by Council. Additionally, revised Civil plans still do not reflect any earthworks required for the proposed emergency services vehicles turnarounds.
  - a) Provide revised plans identifying the required setback to achieve <29kW/m<sup>2</sup> within the road reserve and frontage of lots 1-9.
  - b) Provide revised engineering plans that reflect earthworks required for the construction of the turnaround for emergency services vehicles.

## Biodiversity

- 3) The proposed Biodiversity offset of 5,303m<sup>2</sup> within the Lot 3 on SP324952 is considered acceptable. However, potential impacts associated with the new road on 169 Benhiam St and the sewer connection have not been considered as part of this application as sought by Council's Information request. As the proposed development is contingent on these works occurring, independently of the development approval on Lot 48 on RP948949, the impacts of these works to matters of local environmental significance (MLES) need to be accounted for, if works occur as part of this development approval.
- a) Provide a revised Tree Survey plan identifying all impacts associated with the proposed development including proposed services (i.e. sewer and stormwater), roads (on both 149 & 169 Benhiam St) and earthworks associated with temporary turnarounds. Where works encroach into the tree protection zone of trees to be retained, a report from a qualified arborist (AQF level 5 Arboriculture) is required to demonstrate no negative impacts on the long-term health of the trees.
  - b) Provide a revised environmental offset that accounts for all impacts associated with the proposed development, including the new road and sewer connection on Lot 48 on RP948949 that may be required to be constructed in support of this development approval. The environmental offset must consider all impacts to vegetation within mapped areas of HES/HESS in accordance with the Offsets Planning Scheme Policy definition of significant residual impacts to MLES.

## Stormwater and Flood Management

- 4) The response to Information request relating to land dedication has not addressed Performance outcome PO18 (items a to f) of the Flood overlay code. It is noted that the response has identified compliance with Acceptable outcome AO18.3 of the Flood overlay code, however PO18 is relevant as the development does not comply with the requirements of AO18.1. Please update the response and include the following:
- a) Provide amended plans which address the following:
    - i. Address safety and nuisance/scour from upslope developments/runoff.  
*Note. The response mentions flood immunity without addressing the above issues.*
    - ii. It needs to be noted that an easement does not consider safety or nuisance and does not manage boundary fencing resulting in the obstruction/blocking of flow paths.  
This flooding outcome is unsafe and does not meet the Performance outcome. A flooded land, waterway corridor, is to be dedicated to Council as non-trunk land as shown on Sketch 1 sent on 23 January 2026 as part of the Information request.
    - iii. Lot 900 shown on Sketch 1 is to serve as a water quality offset area consisting of a non-trunk waterway rehabilitated and dedicated to Council. This will ensure that entry and transport of soils and contaminants to the water way is avoided or minimised (in accordance with section B of the Stormwater code).
    - iv. The proposed WSUD tree pits on the verge of the new road are not supported and do not meet the water quality pollutant removal targets. Council preference is for consolidated systems as dedicated land rather than structures/WSUD within the road reserve as these pits represent a long-term maintenance liability in addition to access and safety risks.
  - b) The flood impact analysis needs to allow for the approved development at 169 Benhiam Street as the existing condition (e.g. Catchment A5 must be considered as impervious area as approved). Please confirm NO impacts downslope with an updated catchment model, as current much of the flow mitigation achieved is a result of differing catchment peak flow timing, which may be less pronounced with 169 Benhiam Street being developed.

## Servicing

- 5) The provided RPEQ endorsed swept path analysis shows the manoeuvre of the Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) body encroaching into Lot 10. Additionally, a forward in reverse out manoeuvre to the turnaround easement is shown, a 9.757m kerb to kerb turning radius has not been utilised and the vehicle clearance envelope has not been included. Submit amended plans which address the following:
- a) In accordance with PO9/AO9 of the Subdivision code and PO1/AO1, PO18/AO18 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing code, provide a RPEQ endorsed swept path analysis demonstrating the RCV as specified in BSD 3004, can safely and efficiently service the development and utilise the turnaround easement.
  - b) The RCV must perform a forward in and a reverse out manoeuvre to the turnaround easement.
  - c) Ensure to utilise a 9.757m kerb to kerb turning radius and a minimum 300mm clearance envelope.
  - d) Demonstrate the entire body of the RCV is contained within the turnaround easement.

Should you wish to amend the application to resolve these matters it is recommended that you extend or stop the current period by written notice in accordance with the Development Assessment Rules.

Please phone me on the telephone number below during normal business hours if you have any queries regarding this matter.

Yours sincerely



Nicholas Cudicio  
Urban Planner  
Planning Services South  
Phone: 34030404  
Email: [Nicholas.Cudicio@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:Nicholas.Cudicio@brisbane.qld.gov.au)  
Development Services  
Brisbane City Council