



03 August 2026

Brisbane City Council
Chief Executive Officer
GPO Box 1434
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Via Email: DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au

ATTN: Justin Lynham

Dear Justin,

RE: RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST FOR AN OTHER CHANGE APPLICATION FOR A MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE AND BUILDING WORK FOR WAREHOUSE, LOW IMPACT INDUSTRY & FOOD AND DRINK OUTLET (X2) UPON LAND AT 62 BLUNDER RD, OXLEY (COUNCIL REFERENCE A007037087)

We write in relation to the abovementioned application and Council's Information Request dated 03 July 2026. Pursuant to section 13.2 of the Development Assessment Rules under the Planning Act 2016, we provide the following response to Council's Information Request.

To assist Council with their assessment, and in conjunction with this written response, we attach for your records a copy of the following documents:

- Proposed Subdivision Plan prepared by *Statewide Survey Group*;
- Amended Development Plan prepared by *Thomson Adsett*;
- Revised Stormwater Technical Memorandum prepared by *STP Consultants*;
- Stormwater Music Model (.sqz file) prepared by *STP Consultants*; and
- Revised Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by *Lambert & Rehbein*.

We trust that the information provided is sufficient for your purposes. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me at the office on (07) 3361 9999.

Yours faithfully

TOWN PLANNING ALLIANCE PTY LTD

Harrison Cain
TOWN PLANNER

Enc. *Response to Information Request*

1. Traffic

The proposed Warehouse parking is less than previously approved despite an increase in the number of tenancies and Gross Floor Area (GFA) for the Low impact/Warehouse tenancies. Submit amended plans showing:

- a) *The intended use of each mezzanine i.e. storage and/or ancillary administration area;*
- b) *The proposed mezzanine for each tenancy (including clarification on the total number of tenancies and GFA per mezzanine) to enable a detailed assessment of parking requirements; and*
- c) *Provide an amended RPEQ Traffic Report to reflect the updated plans and demonstrate how any performance outcome for car parking achieves compliance with the City Plan. There may need to be a reduction in the number of tenancies and/or additional GFA to achieve compliance with the car parking requirements in City Plan.*

As requested, the amended Development Plans (refer Drawing A-00-1.01, Revision 45) have been updated to include additional detail regarding the proposed mezzanine level for each unit. Notably, the plans now provide specific notation confirming that each mezzanine is intended for ancillary storage purposes only.

In response to the above item, we confirm that the mezzanine areas are limited to ancillary storage associated with the ground floor industrial use. On this basis, the mezzanines are not expected to result in any material increase in staff numbers, visitation or operational intensity, and therefore do not generate additional parking demand. A *Traffic Impact Assessment and Information Request Response Letter* has been prepared by Lambert & Rehbein (refer letter dated 28 July 2026) and is submitted with this response. The report provides a detailed assessment of the proposed car parking provision against the requirements of the City Plan 2014. Importantly, the increase in GFA results in a revised minimum parking requirement of 110 spaces for the industrial component. The proposal provides 88 spaces, representing a shortfall of 22 spaces, or 80% of the required provision without the application of any discounts.

We note that Brisbane City Council has established a precedent whereby provision of 80% of the TAPS car parking rate is considered acceptable for Industrial Units (Warehouse). Specific reference to these approvals is provided below:

- 13 Loam Street, Acacia Ridge A006568565 – MCU for a Warehouse;
- 1307 Kingsford Smith Drive, Pinkenba A006301099 – MCU for a Warehouse;
- 95 Basmalt Street, Geebung A005834556 – MCU for a Warehouse & Low Impact Industry;
- 41 Bishop Steet, Kelvin Grove A006768191 – MCU for a Warehouse.

Applying the precedent rate of 80% of the principal parking requirement to the proposed GFA results in a requirement for 88 parking spaces. Accordingly, the proposed parking provision meets the adjusted minimum parking requirements.

Whilst we acknowledge that the proposed parking provision represents a numerical shortfall against the Acceptable Outcome of City Plan 2014, it is our view that the operational characteristics of the warehouse units, together with the ancillary nature of the mezzanine areas, do not generate additional parking demand beyond that provided. The submitted *Traffic Impact Assessment* prepared by Lambert & Rehbein demonstrates that the intent of the relevant Performance Outcome is achieved.

2. Stormwater

The Stormwater management plan (STP SK-C100) has altered the Lawful Point of Discharge for the development. Previously all flows were being directed to the waterway, where the latest plans direct flows from part of the site to the Factory Road Loop existing stormwater gully. This stormwater connection likely does not have capacity for site flows. In response to PO1, PO3 and Section B of the Stormwater code provide:

- a) *An RPEQ capacity assessment of existing infrastructure, detailing any stormwater detention requirements; and*
- b) *Amended plans showing drainage at driveway crossover to Factory Road Loop.*

In response to the above item, STP have prepared a revised Stormwater Technical Memorandum. The Technical Memorandum confirms that the proposed development complies with the State Planning Policy

and Brisbane City Council's stormwater quality requirements. The revised plans enclosed within STP's Technical Memorandum show an amended treatment system to suit the updated stormwater drainage design. Refer to the STP Civil Stormwater Plans for details.

3.

The proposed location of the Atlan storage tank within the suspended area is not supported, noting that this tank cannot encroach into the volumetric easement (e.g. below 7.5m AHD). Given a surface level of 8m AHD, this would only provide 500mm to house the tank and accommodate its wall thickness, effectively providing no volume to the tank. In response to PO1 and Section B of the Stormwater code and PO7 of the Flood overlay code provide:

- a) Amended plans showing this tank located in the filled area of the site where a deeper tank will have no impact on flooding.*

As requested, the storage tank has been relocated outside of the easement area. The revised location is illustrated on the STP Civil Stormwater Plans.

4. Refuse

It is noted 3000L front lift bulk bins are proposed; however, the bulk bins will be unable to enter the refuse enclosure due to the width available between the stairs and the edge of the door. It is also noted the Heavy Rigid Vehicle (HRV) swept path analysis provided details the HRV reversing into the loading area. A RPEQ endorsed swept path analysis has also not been provided for a front lift Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV).

In accordance with PO17/AO17.2 of the Industry code and PO8/AO8.1, AO8.2 of the Infrastructure design code, demonstrate on amended plans the following:

- a) The proposed front lift bulk bins can enter and exit the refuse enclosure without being impacted by the stairs or any other obstructions; and*
- b) Provide a RPEQ endorsed swept path analysis demonstrating a front lift RCV as per BSD 3009, can safely and efficiently service the development.*

OR

- c) Remove the reference to front lift bins and remove the indicative bins within the enclosure from the architectural plans. Ensure the dimensions of the refuse enclosure are shown on the amended plans and reference is made to a 'Roofed & Screened Refuse Enclosure'.*

As requested, the amended Development Plans (refer Drawing A-00-1.01, Revision 45) no longer reference the 3,000 L front-lift bulk bins. The dimensions of the refuse enclosure are now shown on the amended plans, which identify the facility as a 'Roofed & Screened Refuse Enclosure.' Further compliance can be appropriately conditioned by Council.

5. Environmental Protection Zone

The proposed change application appears consistent with previous Development Approval A006250342 in relation to the extent of the Environmental Protection Zone (EPZ). The EPZ however has not been depicted and/or labelled on the Plan of Reconfiguration nor the Development Plan. Inclusion of this information is necessary to ensure survey accuracy relative to the previously approved EPZ extent, and to clearly define the area required for rehabilitation in accordance with the Biodiversity areas overlay code and the Waterway corridor overlay code.

- a) Provide a revised Plan of Reconfiguration and a revised Development Plan which depicts the extent of the Environmental Protection Zone. The EPZ must be in accordance with previous Development Approval A006250342.*

As requested, a revised *Plan of Reconfiguration* and *Development Plan*, depicting the extent of the Environmental Protection Zone in accordance with Development Approval A006250342, are enclosed for Council's review. It is acknowledged that the proposed EPZ boundary differs marginally from the previously approved extent, as illustrated in Figure 1 below. Specifically, the entry driveway footprint from Factory Loop Road has been amended to provide additional manoeuvring space, following further input from the project traffic engineers.

