Brisbane City Council ABN 72 002 765 795

City Planning and Economic Development Services
Development Services
Brisbane Square, 266 George Street, Brisbane Qld 4000
GPO Box 1434 Brisbane QLD 4001
T 07 3403 8888
brisbane.qld.gov.au

Dedicated to a better Brisbane

09 October 2026

Msl Ventures Pty Ltd
C/- I B Town Planning
PO Box 501
KALLANGUR QLD 4503

ATTENTION: Matt Whalan

Application Reference: A006662187
Address of Site: 80 BARRETT ST BRACKEN RIDGE QLD 4017

Dear Matt

RE: Further advice

Council has assessed the response to the information request. Whilst it is acknowledged that some matters have been addressed, further information is still required to suitably address some of the matters raised. There also appear to be inconsistencies between the architectural and landscape plans, and some plans do not contain complete information. The following additional information is required to complete the assessment before a decision can be made.

Flooding

1. The proposed ground level within each unit's private courtyard is impacted by high hazard flood conditions and nuisance ponding due to the proposed cut. The ground level spaces affected by flooding are not supported for use as private open space and all private open space must be provided as suspended balconies where the site is flood affected, with ground level spaces to be part of the common property (not communal open space).
    a. Amend the proposal so that each unit's private open space is provided as suspended balconies to avoid floodable areas. All ground level spaces are to form part of the common property.
    b. Suitably sized private open space is still required to be provided to each unit, noting that a minimum of 35m^2 is prescribed per unit. The currently proposed setbacks from the balconies to the side setbacks are not to be reduced, meaning the balconies will need to be increased in size whilst maintaining these setbacks. Opportunities to provide additional smaller balconies on the upper floors should be identified to supplement lower level private open space. Note: Council could consider performance outcomes for some balcony sizes given the flood constraints. However, provided private open space must still be large enough to service future residents and communal spaces must provide high quality and varied recreation facilities.
    c. The separation of unit ground level areas by fencing may create flood impacts if not represented by the model. Fencing should not be provided as the space should be in common property.
2. Flood planning levels of visitor parking have not been addressed by the flood study and would appear to be the existing levels at 6.5m AHD, lower than the Flood code

requirement. Provide amended plans demonstrating the proposal achieves the required flood planning levels and clearly show levels for parking at site frontage in accordance with PPO5 and PO7 of the Flood overlay code.

3. Modelling of the existing scenario needs to include the approved and constructed development at 153 Denham Street and 70-72 Barrett Street as requested in the original Information request and any existing obstructions etc. The levels in those lots need to be manipulated to represent to as constructed levels or best approximation and show levels on a DEM used for existing conditions, not using manning's values.

   Provide a figure for DEM used to show that the approved and constructed developments have been suitably modelled, noting that the flood mapping is showing flooding over filled areas of 153 Denham Street which does not appear to be possible.

4. The proposed cut area does not meet the Flood PSP requirements and is creating a void that will be subject to constant inundation and nuisance ponding. A maximum cut of 300mm is mandated along with the cut area matching the lowest levels so flows can drain freely which does not appear to be the case. Demonstrate through a survey that the cut void of 6.2 can drain freely to Barrett Street frontage. Note: stormwater drainage connected to the new stormwater system in Barrett Street cannot be used as it will surcharge from the pipe into this area.

5. There are mannings roughness assumptions in the modelling that are not consistent with the Flood PSP modelling requirements. Dwelling houses that obstruct flow need to be modelled obstructions or a very high mannings value of approx. 0.3. Additionally, urban area (not obstructing flows) mannings values need to be 0.10, not 0.05. Provide a report figure showing mannings values used in the modelling.

   Note: As per Australin rainfall & runoff (AR&R) requirements the floor levels need to account for climate change upscaling based on SSP2-4.5 at 2100. This is not required for assessment of impacts.

Stormwater

6. The Lawful point of discharge (LPD) for the site is the new stormwater system being constructed in Barrett Street. To demonstrate compliance with PO1 and PO3 of the Stormwater code submit:

   a. Amend plans to demonstrate LPD is connected to manhole 7/AG (IL 4.509) being constructed as part of approved operational works A007043588.

   b. It is anticipated the proposed bio-basin will not be able to drain back to a LPD and will need to be a tank within the driveway to ensure it can drain.

Conceptual Engineering Plans

7. Schematic plans submitted have not satisfactorily addressed PO2; PO3; PO4 and PO6 of the Infrastructure Design Code, PO4 of the Filling and Excavation Code or PO3 of the Stormwater Code. The proposal does not currently identify the required road works along the frontage of the site to Barrett Street.

   a. The proposed design is to include the road works required along the frontage of the site including, but not limited to, pavement widening, proposed kerb and channel alignment to match to the existing kerb and channel to the east and to the kerb and channel to the west (part of A0070443588 approval); pedestrian footpath, including road drainage (as required), and identification of any alterations to existing services as result of the proposed works.

   b. In addition, survey the existing utility services and provide accurate information with the proposed design to determine if is possible to connect the site to the identified stormwater manhole. Water infrastructure (600mm diameter pipe) is located along Barrett Street, that needs to be identified accurately and considered

in the design to ensure no clashes with proposed connections and existing infrastructure, and to confirm that the proposed design would work. It is strongly recommended to undertake further investigation (i.e. enquiries to dial before you dig, survey the infrastructure and to obtain UU advice) on the location of the existing 600mm water main to review levels and to confirm no conflicts.

8. The proposed relocation of the existing speed hump can be generally supported. However, preliminary detailed design plans for the speed hump relocation are required to be submitted for assessment. It is noted all proposed external road works, including the relocation of the speed hump are non-trunk works and will be conditioned as such.

Bushfire

9. A bushfire report has been provided to support the development application and confirms that hazardous vegetation does exist to the north of the site within Gold Bushland Reserve. A Method 2 assessment has been undertaken and a 15.6m set back has been recommended. The report concludes that the development does not materially increase the number of premises exposed to unacceptable risk during bushfire events and that the internal common driveway is considered to provide efficient access and egress.

   The Method 2 assessment utilises a 1090K flame temperature. Council's Bushfire Guidelines require a 1200K input. Additionally, given that the distance between the road frontage and the furthest point of the rear units exceeds 70m, the development is to demonstrate how the requirements of Table 8.2.5.3.C – Road design requirements for emergency vehicle access under the Bushfire overlay code are achieved. Note: where a turn-around is proposed, it must remain outside of the ecological corridor at the rear of the site.

   a. Provide an updated bushfire management plan based on the 1200K flame temperature input and confirm set back and management requirements; and

   b. Demonstrate how the development achieves the requirements of PO4 of the Bushfire overlade code including how it facilitates safe and efficient emergency services to access and egress the site during a bushfire. This is to include an assessment of compliance against Table 8.2.5.3.C under the Bushfire overlay code.

Ecological Corridor

10. Updated plans show a reduction in the width of the ecological corridor at the rear of the site and an increase in the communal open space area. While this can be supported from a Biodiversity areas perspective, plans must be updated to refer to the 'deep planting' area as the 'Ecological Corridor'. The proposed Landscape Plans are to be updated to state 'Ecological corridor subject to rehabilitation' and any reference to the specific type of planting in this area removed from the Landscape Plans as this will be assessed as part of a separate Rehabilitation Plan lodged. Note: Council acknowledges this corridor will still contain large trees and will still function as deep planting as well as an ecological corridor.

Communal Open Space

11. Whilst large areas of communal open space are shown on the plans, there are limited recreation facilities proposed with the LCP only showing one gazebo and what appears to be one other bench at the rear of the site, with the spaces near the frontage containing no identified recreation facilities. Amend the proposal to provide an improved offering of recreation facilities, which will be particularly important should performance outcomes be sought for private open space where needed to overcome flood constraints.

Landscaping and Deep Planting

12. Whilst the Landscape concept plan (LCP) indicates the provision of large trees to the site frontage, this is not accurately shown on the architectural plans and the provision of deep planting areas on the frontage have not been clearly shown. Amend the architectural

plans to show the deep planting of large trees along the site's frontage consistent with the LCP and ensure the calculation of deep planting percentage is updated accordingly.

13. The proposed landscape design appears to provide a 1.8 m wide landscape buffer to the eastern boundary and a minimum 2.2 m wide landscape buffer to the western boundary. However, further information is required to demonstrate that the proposed side boundary landscape areas can be practically accommodated within the available setbacks and that the landscape design appropriately responds to the mapped overland flow path and biodiversity extent.

    a. Amend the LCP to identify the mapped overland flow path and mapped biodiversity area, and ensure it is consistent with the architectural plans, to enable a comprehensive assessment of the proposed landscape and screening outcomes.

    b. Amend the LCP to ensure private open space areas, clotheslines and paved areas are located outside the mapped overland flow path as noted previously.

    c. Amend the landscape and architectural plans so they are consistent and show all proposed vegetated screening elements, including the location, species, mature height and spread of screen planting and any associated structures. Provide information demonstrating that sufficient planting width, soil volume and clearance from buildings, retaining walls and private open space areas are available to establish and maintain the proposed screening.

    d. Demonstrate that the available side setbacks can accommodate the long-term establishment of the proposed screening trees (*Backhousia citriodora*), having regard to their mature height of 10–15 m and spread of 6–10 m. Amend the plant schedule and screening design where necessary to reflect species suited to the available planting areas.

    e. Provide confirmation from a suitably qualified hydraulic engineer that the proposed screen planting, other landscaping, fencing and associated landscape works are compatible with the site's overland flow characteristics and will not adversely affect flood conveyance.

Refuse

14. The roofed and screened bin enclosure appears to be adequately sized; however, the dimensions of the enclosure have not been denoted on the proposed plans. Submit amended plans which denote the bin enclosure internal dimensions (i.e. 5.2m x 4m).

15. The provided RPEQ endorsed Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) swept path analysis is not clear, does not show vehicles parked along Barrett St and the distance between the boundary and the ramp is only 11m.

    a. In accordance with PO32 of the Multiple dwelling code and PO1, PO19 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing code, provide a RPEQ endorsed swept path analysis demonstrating a RCV as per BSD 3008 sheet 2 of 2 can safely and efficiently service the development.

    b. Overlay the swept path on clear scaled proposed plans and include parked vehicles along Barrett Street.

    c. The RCV requires a length of 11.5m for the RCV and loading of bins at the rear of the RCV. This will mean the RCV will overhang the boundary. The overhang must be shown on the swept path and addressed by the RPEQ.

Plans Details

16. Submit amended plans and sections which clearly show the existing ground level and 9.5m above ground level lines, maximum height of the proposal and RL's for each level and roof ridge of the units.

17. Amend the architectural plans to clearly denote the dimensions (length and width) of driveways, aisles, visitor parking and resident garages.
18. The information response has indicated that screening will be provided to side facing balconies to mitigate potential privacy impacts and over-looking. However, the screening has not been indicated on the architectural or landscaping drawings.
    a. Amend the architectural and landscaping plans to show all screening elements.
    b. Provide additional details demonstrating that the proposed screening mitigates impacts on amenity and overlooking.

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

Yours sincerely



Dominic Hudson
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services North
Phone: (07) 3178 0229
Email: Dominic.Hudson@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council