URBAN CONSULTANTS

12 March 2026
JFP ref: B4687EA2_DA6

Address: 92 Redhead Street, Doolandella QLD 4077

Application Reference: A006928472

Attn: Dane Hoffmann
Re: Information Request Response Letter – Engineering Items

Dear Dane,

In relation to the *Information Request* letter dated 29 January 2026 for the above referenced application, we provide the following responses to engineering items 1, 4 & 6:

STORMWATER

1) The proposed rear lots 7 to 27 are connecting to an existing 300mm uPVC private roofwater line. As per Councils IDPSP Table 7.2.3.A, a maximum of 6 lots can be serviced by a 300mm pipe (noting this is not just based on capacity alone). A total of 12 lots are proposed to be drained from this site into the 300uPVC pipe (which also services another two lots in the downslope development. This proposed stormwater design has not considered other issues such as; Pipeline will be conveying the 5% AEP roofwater flows, which will likely result in higher flows than assumed and could surcharge in downslope lots, pipe size through the development would need to be a 375RCP where > 6 lots are proposed, but would drop one size back to a 300PVC, which is not permissible via QUDM, the SBSMP has not considered implications of major flows on adjacent and downslope lots, particularly the swale through downslope lots that only has approx. 120mm flow depth available before overtopping into adjacent properties. Amended plans are required to address the following issues, in accordance with Performance Outcome PO1 and PO3 of the Stormwater code.

a) Lots 7,10,11,14 and 15 filled to fall to Rockfield Road to direct major flows to that road via each rear lot driveway connection, not through downslope properties. Demonstrate how minor flows will be discharged either via kerb adapter and/or new inter-allotment roofwater line to new gully in Rockfield Road.

b) Rear lots 18/19, 22/23, 26/27 & Lot 28 may connect to the existing 300uPVC pipeline downslope and earthwork levels may be as proposed.

STORMWATER RESPONSE:

The proposed stormwater strategy does not exceed the downslope design allowances. We believe that the original drainage strategy is acceptable. Refer to **Section 1.1** of the revised SBSMP *Revision B* prepared by JFP Urban Consultants for a detailed response.

REFUSE

4) In accordance with AO4.1 & AO9 of the Subdivision code and AO8.1 & AO8.2 of the Infrastructure design code, provide amended plans which illustrate the following.

a) Cleary demonstrate the frontage width achieved via truncation for all proposed rear allotments. Note sufficient frontage width to accommodate driveways and refuse collection points must be provided. Note refuse collection points for the rear allotments are to be wholly contained within the frontage achieved via truncation and must not conflict with the proposed 'WSUD TREE PIT'.

b) To provide functional lot frontages for all lots, shared driveway arrangements may need to be explored as an alternative to the preferred vehicle crossings demonstrated on PLAN: B1.

REFUSE RESPONSE:

Refer to the revised Preliminary Engineering Plans which demonstrate that there is adequate road frontage to accommodate driveways, refuse collection points and other services. Narrower driveways are proposed for the lots fronting Rockfield Road to remove conflict with WSUD Tree Pits.

EARTHWORKS

6) The proposed earthworks concept plans show retaining walls exceeding 1m in height. Provide amended plans showing retaining walls to be terraced in accordance with Acceptable Outcome AO2.1 of the Filling and excavation code.

EARTHWORKS RESPONSE:

PO2 of the Filling and Excavation Code requires retaining walls to be designed and constructed to be fit for purpose, not adversely impact on significant vegetation and be easy maintenance. The proposal includes single tier fill retaining walls of up to 1.5m in the south and south-eastern boundaries. The length of walls that exceed 1m in height is minor. They are wholly contained within the site and with the ecological corridor to the south they are not expected to create adverse visual impacts to the residents.

We trust that the above responses provide sufficient responses for engineering items 1, 4, and 6 of the *Information Request* dated 29 January 2026 (application ref A006928472). Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you require any further information or clarification.

Yours faithfully,

SCOTT MARSH (RPEQ 8068)
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR – ENGINEERING
JFP URBAN CONSULTANTS