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

16 June 2026

Claussen Land Pty Ltd
C/- DTS Group Qld Pty Ltd
PO Box 3128
WEST END QLD 4101
ATTENTION: Janesh Gunaratne

Application Reference: A006923960
Address of Site: 105 VAN DIEREN RD PALLARA QLD 4110

Dear Janesh

RE: Further advice

Council has undertaken a review of the Information request response and determined that further information and amendments are required to demonstrate compliance with the City Plan 2014.

Access

1) The T head turnaround proposed at the termination of the existing Edinburgh Cres autocourt is insufficiently sized to enable the efficient turnaround of the refuse collection vehicle (RCV). The wheel path for the RCV maneuvering must be contained within the carriageway and not track over the face of the kerb or the driveways of neighboring properties. The body of the vehicle must also ensure it does not impact any future verge infrastructure e.g. street lighting or street trees.

The following amendments are suggested, subject to revised RPEQ certified swept path analysis (utilise a kerb-to-kerb radius of 9.757m as per BSD-3004), for a revised turnaround design. Submit amended plans to address the following:

a) Consider increasing the length of the road pavement within the frontage of proposed lot 21, a minimum verge width of 2.5m could be considered in this instance.

b) Consider increasing the kerb radius at the corner of proposed lot 20 (ensuring a minimum verge width of 4.25m is maintained).

c) The minimum verge width at the interface between the new road and lot 209 SP306537 must be no less than 2.5m.

2) The existing Council owned basin access off Edinburgh Crescent cannot be used to access proposed Lots 5, 6 , 7 and 8 as the existing basin access is to facilitate unrestricted maintenance access to the basin and may regularly have trucks parked on the driveway crossover (with bobcat running down driveway into basin) which will block access to all proposed lots proposed to gain access across the existing basin access as shown on Drawing No. P-G0401 Issue A. This design adversely impacts Council's ability to maintain its asset and is not supported. The development is to provide its own crossover to service the proposed lots.

a) Revise the crossover for "Driveway 3" to ensure it has independent access off Edinburgh Cres. Note: a revised crossover for "Driveway 3" is to ensure the bin presentation for lot 9 (2 bins) is maintained along its subject frontage.

Refuse

3) In accordance with PO4/AO4.1 of the Subdivision code and PO8/AO8.1, AO8.2 of the Infrastructure design code, provide amended plans and supporting documents which address the following:

a) Demonstrate the frontage width created via truncation for proposed lots 13 and 14. Based on a maximum crossover width of 3m, a minimum frontage width of 9.6m must be provided and demonstrated on all relevant plans to ensure there is sufficient space to have a crossover and stand bins on collection day.

b) Demonstrate the frontage width created via truncation for proposed lot 18. Based on a maximum crossover width of 3m, a minimum frontage width of 7.8m must be provided and demonstrated on all relevant plans to ensure there is sufficient space to have a crossover and stand bins on collection day.

c) Clearly demonstrate the shared arrangement and the amended design of 'DRIVEWAY 3' which will service proposed lots 5-8 on all relevant plans.

d) Clearly demonstrate the shared arrangement and driveway design for Lots 9 and 10 on all relevant plans. Note: an easement may be required to facilitate the common driveway design in this instance.

e) Remove all reference to the utilisation of bin pads, reference to indicative collection point is sufficient.

Road corridor & footpath

4) The amended plans and the proposed "Concept Plan – Van Dieren Road Layout Plan" drawing P-R0301 Issue A does not appear to reflect Council's requirements as previously raised in the information request.

a) Non-trunk construction of Type D kerb and channel on a 6.25m alignment from the existing property boundary, pavement widening and stormwater drainage works along the full extent of the Van Dieren Rd frontage of the site.

b) Non trunk construction of a concrete footpath on the alignment established to the north along the full extent of the Van Dieren Rd frontage of the site.

Note: The footpath is to be constructed with a 0.5m setback from the property boundary and must tie into the existing footpath north of the subject site to accommodate future construction of a separate cycle track within the verge.

c) A non-trunk 1.2m wide concrete footpath is required along the site's frontage to Edinburgh Cresent, refer to BSD-1014 Rev F for standard alignment details.

Stormwater

5) The Stormwater Management Plan by RMA Engineers has not fully addressed the requirements related to the Stormwater code and Infrastructure design (ID) planning scheme policy (PSP). Provide further information and amended plans to address the following:

a) The stormwater flows are to be connected into the existing manhole downstream of the site instead of piping to the existing pond on private property. Discharge into the existing dam is not supported as flow would not have concentrated in that area as proposed.

b) The DRAINS model and catchment maps have not included the existing roofwater flows from developed lots to the north of Van Dieren Rd (e.g. roofwater line at 104 Van Dieren Rd) and are to be amended.

c) Major flow paths have not been adequately considered by the Stormwater Management Plan and engineering design. Driveways 1,2 and 3 will direct major flows into Lots 8,13,14 and 18 as these lots are located lower than the driveways. It is not possible to collect or pipe 1% AEP flows (roofwater design is only 5% AEP) and therefore a flow path must be provided at the end of each driveway through to the covenant areas with easement in favour of Council.

d) DRAINS modelling to justify no detention/impacts does not appear to reflect the civil design. The proposal would only result in roofwater (being 5% AEP flows) being directed to the bio basin from approximately a 220m^2 roof area, with other lot flows passing through each lot until it reaches the covenant area. Again, it is not possible to pipe 1% AEP flows as building works cannot be controlled by this development application, nor does it reflect best practices and QUDM.

e) Headwall H1/2 into the proposed basin cannot discharge to a rock chute at the basin. The pipe must extend to basin filter being at an invert level at the extended detention depth (200-300mm above filter) and discharge with a non-scouring velocity.

f) Additional detail on the basin earthworks is required due to the very high risk of constructing a basin on such a steep slope. Provide existing and design levels on the basin cross sections.

g) Ensure any basin battering occurs outside of any vegetation protection or TPZ areas.

Ecological values

6) The revised Subdivision Proposal Plan reconfigures Lots 18 and 21, resulting in Lot 21 having an increased interface with the Environmental Covenant along the western boundary of the site. Notwithstanding this change, the Environmental Covenant remains registered on Lot 18, which is not considered an appropriate arrangement from a long-term management and maintenance perspective and is not supported. Accordingly, the subdivision plan must be amended to transfer ownership of the Environmental Covenant to Lot 21 to align covenant responsibility with the affected landholding.

a) Provide a revised Subdivision plan, demonstrating ownership of the Environmental Covenant to Lot 21 (from Lot 18).

7) The submitted Tree Retention Plan identifies a proposed development impact area. However, it does not include the detailed engineering design information previously requested (such as retaining walls, earthworks, etc). This information is necessary to enable a comprehensive assessment of tree retention and removal. While receipt of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment is acknowledged, it does not sufficiently justify the proposed removal of several trees (including Trees 213, 198, 200, and 249) located within the Environmental Covenant. To facilitate a thorough assessment of vegetation retention in the context of engineering impacts, and to demonstrate compliance with Performance Outcome PO4 of the Biodiversity areas overlay code, the following additional information is required.

a) Provide a revised Tree Retention Plan reflective of the subdivision layout changes requested above. The Tree Retention Plan must show Tree ID numbers, as well as all proposed engineering details (earthworks, services, retaining walls etc.).

b) Based on the revised Tree Retention Plan (and if applicable), provide an updated Offset Delivery Strategy that confirms the total impact area to be offset in accordance with PO9 of the Biodiversity areas overlay code and the Offsets planning scheme policy.

Should you wish to amend the application to resolve these matters it is recommended that you stop or extend the current decision period by written notice in accordance with the Development Assessment Rules.

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

Yours sincerely

Errin Xiaofang Lu
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services South
Phone: (07) 3403 3694
Email: Errin.Lu@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council