



15 April 2026

Brisbane City Council  
GPO Box 1434  
Brisbane QLD 4001

**Attention: Abby Bannan, Planning Services North**

Dear Abby,

**RE: Response to Information Request: A006939586 – 645 Mount Crosby Road, Mount Crosby**

Doyen Planning act on behalf of Mahamevnawa Buddhist Monastery of Brisbane Limited in relation to the site at 645 Mount Crosby Road, Mount Crosby (the site).

We refer to correspondence from Brisbane City Council dated 25 February 2026 constituting an Information request, pursuant to Part 3 of the Development Assessment Rules (DA Rules).

In accordance with section 13.2(a) of the DA Rules, it is advised that the following is provided:

- (a) All of the information requested

Given all of the information requested under section 13.2 of the Development Assessment Rules has been provided, the applicant response period has ended, and we advise that Brisbane City Council should proceed with the assessment of the Development Application in accordance with Section 14.1 of the DA Rules.

Following this letter, a response is provided to each part of Council's Information Request, providing the extract and a corresponding response.

The response includes the following documentation:

- **Attachment A** – Amended Proposal Plans
- **Attachment B** – Bushfire Report
- **Attachment C** – Civil Engineering IR response
- **Attachment D** – Erosion Hazard Assessment Form

Should you have any questions in relation to the proposal, please contact our office on (07) 3180 4702.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rm", written over a dotted line.

**Rhianna Murphy**

Town Planner  
Doyen Town Planning





# Response to Information Request

## 645 Mount Crosby Road, Mount Crosby

### Introduction

We refer to Council's letter dated 25 February 2026 in relation to the aforementioned site and provide below a response to the raised matters.

The Applicant and their project team have undertaken a detailed review of the Information Request to deliver an amended development outcome that is well considered and seeks to address and balance the various matters raised by Council.

### Item 1 –

#### Bushfire Hazard

*The proposed development is within an area mapped as high hazard buffer area within the Bushfire overlay, triggering assessment against the Bushfire overlay code. Bushfire reporting has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with the Bushfire overlay code, however further information is required to meet the appropriate performance outcomes of the Bushfire overlay code.*

*A radiant heat exposure assessment was provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be exposed to radiant heat exceeding 29kW/m<sup>2</sup>, however the proposed reporting is not in accordance with Council's Technical Assessment Guide for Bushfire Reporting. The assessment has utilised a Method 2 assessment (AS3959) using an alternative dataset (i.e. QFES inputs) however have not used all the standard parameters as set out in Council's technical assessment guide (i.e. 1200k flame temperature). Additionally, a flame width of 60m has been used, rather than the default 100m, without any quantitative justification to demonstrate the reduced flame width.*

*Revised bushfire reporting will be required that is in accordance with Council's Technical Assessment Guide for bushfire reporting, addressing the above items. The revised reporting may result in relocation of the proposed building or bushfire management zones encroaching into mapped areas of high ecological significance identified within the Biodiversity areas overlay.*

- a. *Provide revised Bushfire reporting that utilises standard parameters set out in the Council Technical Assessment Guide for bushfire reporting where alternative datasets (i.e. QFES inputs) are used for a Method 2 assessment. Alternatively, provide a radiant heat exposure assessment using another accepted method (e.g. SPP Asset Protection Zone calculator, AS3959 with standard inputs).*
- b. *Where reduced flame width is proposed, provide quantitative evidence to support the use of a reduced flame width for the radiant heat exposure calculations.*
- c. *Where bushfire management measure will result in the removal of mature native vegetation a brief ecological assessment will be required including a tree survey plan identifying trees proposed for retention/removal within the bushfire management zone.*

### Item 1 Response

A revised Bushfire Report was submitted to Council for assessment on 11 February 2026. Particular attention is drawn to Appendix A of the revised report which addresses each item raised by Council in Item 1 above.

This revised Bushfire Report is attached again to this response in **Appendix B**.

## Item 2 – Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code

*A traffic statement endorsed by an RPEQ is required to demonstrate that the proposal for access, parking, and servicing complies with the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Planning Scheme Policy (TAPS PSP). The below items need to be addressed:*

- a. *The provided plans do not show sufficient dimensions of the carparking area to determine compliance to TAPS PSP requirements. Dimensioned plans of the car parking area are required to demonstrate compliance to TAPS code; including the dimensions of the new car parking space, and the PWD space/shared zone (please refer to Table 18 of TAPS PSP and Section 7.8.2 of TAPS PSP), the existing aisle width should also be detailed. Any performance outcome proposed to TAPS code is to be justified by sufficient RPEQ comment/reasoning.*
- b. *Demonstrate that a standard B85 vehicle can manoeuvre to turn around within the site in the event that the car parking spaces are full.*

## Item 2 Response

Excluding the inclusion of one additional car parking space, no changes are proposed to the existing car park on the site, which will continue to operate as intended. This includes the existing aisle width & PWD space/ shared zone. No changes are additionally proposed to the ability of vehicles to manoeuvre the car park when full.

In light of the above, a traffic statement endorsed by an RPEQ is not required for the existing car park.

The new car space has been dimensioned in the amended plan set attached to this response, demonstrating compliance with the standard car parking space dimensions outlined in the TAPS PSP.

## Item 3 – Stormwater Code

*The proposal has not addressed the Stormwater (SW) code sufficiently. The code assessment report outlines “the development does not propose any changes to the discharge method for the site”. However no detail of the existing arrangement or lawful point of discharge have been provided and the addition of a new building (roof area) will alter the SW arrangements on the site. Provide a concept SW plan demonstrating how the new roof area will drain to a lawful point of discharge.*

## Item 3 Response

The above item has been addressed in the attached letter & accompanying concept roofwater drainage sketch prepared by HCE Engineers (refer **Attachment C**).

## Item 4 – Erosion and Sediment Control

*Provide a completed and signed Erosion Hazard Assessment (EHA) form as part of the development application as required by Council’s Infrastructure Design PSP Chapter 7, Table 7.11.2.1.A*

## Item 4 Response

A signed Erosion Hazard Assessment form has been completed by HCE Engineer – refer **Attachment D**.