Planning Insights
town planning consultants

- Development Advisory
- Planning Services
- Due Diligence
- Design Advice

3 June 2026

Alexandria Wood
Urban Planner
Planning Services South
Development Services
Brisbane City Council
Via email: Alexandria.Wood@brisbane.qld.gov.au

Dear Alexandria

RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST Application No: A006852603 - 1825 Old Cleveland Road, Chandler Qld 4155

On behalf of our client, we provide this response to Council's Request for Further Information, dated 4 November 2025.

Ecological values

1. *The site is mapped within the High Ecological Significance (HES), High Ecological Significance Strategic (HESS) and Koala Habitat sub-categories of the Biodiversity areas overlay. A Tree Retention Plan has been provided to support the development, however it does not illustrate survey-accurate tree locations and the impact the proposed development will have on these mapped values. A complete assessment against Section C of the Biodiversity areas overlay code is unable to be undertaken. To ensure the development protects, conserves and restores mapped ecological values on site and any proposed impacts have been demonstrated to be unavoidable, the following information is required:*
   a. *Provide an assessment against Section C of the Biodiversity areas overlay code including:*
      i. *An ecological assessment in accordance with the Biodiversity Planning Scheme Policy prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist.*
      ii. *A Tree Survey Plan in accordance with the Biodiversity Planning Scheme Policy including:*
         1. *All trees 150mm DBH or greater on site/external works area and within 6m of site boundaries;*
         2. *City Plan's Biodiversity areas overlay mapping and the proposed development plan (as an overlay), including all services/infrastructure on site and external to the site, which clearly shows the full extent of all earthworks (cut/fill) required during construction of the development.*
      3. *A clear indication of which trees are to be retained and which trees*

are to be removed, including the following information:
a. Scientific name;
b. Height;
c. Diameter of tree trunk at breast height (DBH);
d. Crown diameter;
e. Habitat features including hollows and scratch marks, nests etc.
f. Tree Protection Zones (TPZs) (in accordance with AS4970); and
g. General health assessment.

4. If works encroach into the TPZs of any trees identified to be retained, a report from a qualified arborist (minimum AQF level 5 Arboriculture) is required to demonstrate no negative impacts on the long-term health of the trees.

iii. Where on-site mitigation measures proposed include rehabilitation:

1. 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 that includes a description of proposed rehabilitation, including earthworks, methods and objectives.

iv. For any significant residual impact, offsets may be required under the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 and the Offsets Planning Scheme Policy.

Response

Ecological investigations included desktop analysis, and on-site inspections. Desktop analysis considered State and Commonwealth environmental mapping, threatened species databases, vegetation mapping, koala habitat mapping, and *Brisbane City Plan 2014* overlays. On-site investigations included a full site walkover and detailed tree survey. The attached ecological assessment report responds to the *City Plan 2014 v35 'Biodiversity Areas Overlay Code'* and considers how green waste expansion (and other works) interact with mapped ecological values, and existing disturbed areas.

Supporting information in the ecological assessment report included:

- Detailed survey of 167 trees identifying species type, size, canopy spread, condition, habitat features, and Tree Protection Zones (TPZs).
- Identification of trees to be retained and/or removed (107 trees retained with TPZ established, and 60 removed).
- Location of all trees to be removed (i.e. landscaped areas adjoining internal aisles or surrounding the green waste expansion area).
- A search for evidence of koalas or other threatened fauna species (it was noted that no evidence of koalas and other threatened species was found, although potential habitat was identified in some areas).
- Confirmation that residual impacts to mapped ecological areas are limited, with approximately 253–256 m² of mapped *Matters of Local Environmental Significance* overlay directly affected.

The ecological report also proposes rehabilitation and environmental management measures during construction and operation, including the following:

- Vegetation and fauna management measures,
- Erosion and sediment control,
- Rehabilitation planting,
- Weed management and fauna protection procedures, and
- Construction Rehabilitation and Management Plan (CRMP).

In summary, the ecological reporting accompanying this response concludes that the proposed development is capable of complying with the City Plan 2014 v35 Biodiversity Areas Overlay Code and other key environmental legislation. This outcome is achieved by ensuring development within sensitive ecological areas is minimal with majority of impacts associated with the development concentrated in existing (disturbed) operational areas.

An arboricultural impact assessment has considered the recommendations in the ecological report and made the following recommendations;

- Retain 107 trees and remove 60 trees that are directly affected by proposed works.
- Tree Protection Fencing is to be installed around retained trees before works commence, and any works within root protection areas are to be supervised by the Project Arborist.
- Appoint a qualified Project Arborist to oversee tree protection throughout design and construction.

Overall, the report finds that tree impacts can be managed through the recommended protection measures and ongoing arboricultural supervision, allowing the development to proceed while retaining the majority of significant trees on the site.

Bushfire Overlay Code

2. *The site is mapped within the Bushfire overlay, however no code assessment has been provided. To ensure the proposed development does not result in an intolerable level of bushfire risk, the following is required:*
   a. *Provide a site-specific Bushfire Hazard Assessment in accordance with the Bushfire Planning Scheme Policy or other approved methodology. The Bushfire Hazard Assessment must include any rehabilitation areas that are proposed within the site, taking into account the vegetation at full maturity. Bushfire reporting and hazard assessment guidelines are available within the technical assessment guide (bushfire reporting) available on Council's website.*

Response

The attached bushfire management report identified that the site is within a *potential impact buffer* with surrounding areas generally consistent with the *medium* to *high hazard* ratings shown in *City Plan 2014 v35* overlay mapping. Field investigations confirmed that development areas generally retain low hazard vegetation classes, however, stands of vegetation with higher hazard ratings were encountered to the north, west and south of the site. The report found

that the development would be exposed to a maximum radiant heat flux of 8.10kW/m², which is equivalent to a BAL-12.5 rating.

The report concluded that bushfire risk can be managed through ongoing vegetation maintenance, appropriate building design and continued site management practices. Recommended mitigation measures include maintaining low fuel loads through vegetation management, ensuring reliable access for emergency vehicles, and adequate firefighting water supply (likely to exist). The assessment also confirmed that the proposed development can comply with the Queensland State Planning Policy and Brisbane City Council bushfire planning requirements, provided the identified mitigation measures are implemented and maintained.

Stormwater Quality Management Plan

3. *A Site Based Stormwater Quality Management Plan addressing Section B & PO16 of the Stormwater code is required, detailing more specifically the proposed treatment pond and swales. As part of the Site Based Stormwater Quality Management Plan, the following is required:*
   a. *Provide MUSIC modelling demonstrating compliance with the prescribed pollutant % reduction targets;*
   b. *Provide a detailed & scaled Stormwater Plan showing drainage paths & direction (both surface & sub-surface networks) and lawful point of discharge etc;*
   c. *Include additional treatment pond details i.e. depth, filter media, x-sections, planting species etc, measures to ensure it does not become stagnant and a proposed maintenance/management plan to ensure its ongoing treatment effectiveness; and*
   d. *Include details on how the swale/s will discharge into the site's stormwater treatment network and associated swale specifications i.e. depth, width, x-section, planting species etc.*

<u>Response</u>

Please find attached ATC Williams drawing set outlining stormwater discharge and treatment design.

The site generally slopes from east to west. The current drainage system uses a combination of vegetated swales and pits and pipes that carry water to the western boundary of the site, where it enters a grassed swale and ultimately treatment pond prior to discharge off site. The proposed expansion to the greenwaste pas will follow the same drainage approach used in the previous redevelopment. This includes keeping the same lawful point of discharge, catchment layout and stormwater treatment method. Any extra runoff from the new hardstand areas will be managed within realigned swales and the oversized pipe network. The hardstand expansion has been planned so the grassed swales along the east, southern and western boundaries remain in place, as shown in the drawings.

The expansion will increase impervious area in the WTS catchment by approximately 20% which is considered necessary for better management of interactions between people and

machinery, (improving safety in the hardstand area). As mentioned, the Chandler WTS can accommodate increased operations regardless of this proposal under its EA License Conditions hence existing systems in place generally anticipate receipt of higher waste volumes and higher processing requirements. Notwithstanding, increased runoff is expected to reduce potential of water-quality issues because increased hard stand will add to water volume drained which is expected to dilute anticipated/known pollutants. In line with existing stormwater conditions, the development will keep the stormwater treatment strategy set out in the approved Site Based Stormwater Quality Management Plan (Aurecon, 9 September 2014). That strategy includes the following water-sensitive urban design measures:

- Oil and sediment separators to remove oil, hydrocarbons and sediment from hardstand runoff before it enters vegetated treatment systems.
- Rainwater tanks to collect and reuse roof water from the resource recovery facility.
- Upgrading the existing grassed swale by adding bioremediation plants, such as vetiver grass, to improve treatment performance.

We recommend Council impose Conditions to include submission of a final Stormwater Management Plan prepared by an RPEQ at detailed design stage (prior to undertaking of the works).

Airport environs overlay code – Bird and bat strike zone sub-categories

4. It is unclear how the development addresses AO4.1/PO4 of the Airport environs overlay code, to not attract birds and bats into operational airspace.
a. Demonstrate how the development within the Bird and bat strike zone subcategories area addresses AO4.1/PO4 of the Airport environs overlay code

Response

Section 'B', AO4.1/PO4 of the *City Plan 2014 v35 Airport Environs Overlay code* refers to 'bird and bat strike (BBS) zone sub-categories and comprise the following pertaining to airports in the Brisbane Area:

- 0 – 3km extended from the airport itself including the grounds, terminals, runways/operational areas etc.
- 3 – 8km extends into suburbs where flight paths may cross wetlands, green space, waterways, & residential areas that either 'could' or 'do' provide habitat value.
- 8 – 13km extends into broader areas where flight paths may cross, residential or other areas that could attract wildlife, and/or large natural areas possessing habitat value. Chandler WTS's existing green waste receiving and processing area is situated within the 8 – 13km 'bird and bat strike zone sub-category'.

The proposed development includes extension of the existing green waste pad, and consequential amendments to the stormwater systems and driveway/weighbridges. The

covered tipping floor is to remain as is (at this stage). Chandler WTS currently receives green waste and processes it into uncovered stockpiles.

We propose the following against Performance Outcome (PO4) of the Airport environs overlay code in relation expansion of the green waste pad.

Brisbane City Council's waste transfer stations collectively receive and process more than 30,000 tonnes of green waste annually. The green waste received generally comprise garden waste volumes categorised as putrescible and non-putrescible per the following:

Green Waste – Putrescible Decompose Quickly/Produce Odour	Green Waste – Non- Putrescible Decompose Slowly/Less Odorous
Grass Clippings	Woody Branches
Fresh Leaves	Twigs
Weeds	Tree Trunks
Flower Cuttings	Dry leaves
Green Plant Material	

As with Brisbane's other Waste Transfer Stations, Chandler WTS does not permanently store green waste on site (or any waste for that matter) rather it's the receiving/processing point prior to departure for final destinations (for all waste streams). Operations associated with green waste at Chandler WTS typically include:

- Temporary storage of green waste prior to processing with departure (of processed green waste) typically timed to occur prior to known decay rates associated with generation of odour, & attraction of insects/birdlife etc.
- Processing of the green waste involves mulching/chipping via on-site plant equipment, whilst monitoring air quality as required by existing EA license conditions.
- Use of machinery (chippers/front end loaders), and regular ingress/egress of vehicles in the green waste pad would disturb animals seeking to roost and/or feed. We believe such disturbances negatively affect any 'potential' habitat value that may be associated with green waste stored and processed.
- While expanding the green waste pad will increase the site's capacity to receive more material, the primary focus is on ensuring green waste can be delivered and processed safely and efficiently. The expansion's principal focus is to improve the management of people, vehicle and plant interactions to reduce risks and streamline on-site operations. It's important to note that EA license conditions allow Chandler WTS to receive increased tonnage of green waste irrespective of the 'Green waste Area' expansion proposed.

Summary –

- The expanded green waste receiving area does not alter the fundamental operation of the Chandler WTS facility, which is currently licensed to receive and processes green waste on a regular basis.
- All green waste received is stored on a short-term, basis and is processed and shipped prior to circumstances that would attract wildlife.

- Expansion of the green waste pad is primarily intended to improve operational efficiency and safety, particularly the management of people–plant–vehicle interactions.
- Its acknowledged the expanded green waste pad will increase (the pad's) total hard stand area however, this is unlikely to impact existing mitigation practices, controlled storage durations, continual disturbance from plant & traffic, and ongoing monitoring.

This concludes our response to Council's information request, should additional information be required, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at Planning Insights (0439 794 636).

Yours sincerely

Matthew Taylor
DIRECTOR