atomic TOWN PLANNING

atomic TOWN PLANNING
P O Box 1982
New Farm Qld 4005

0478 778 799

www.atomictp.com.au

BCC DS
RECEIVED
11/11/2026
APPLICATION REF
A006971515

11 November 2026

BCC Ref: A006971515
ATP Ref: Further Information Response.pdf

The Chief Executive Officer
Brisbane City Council
Planning Services
Lvl 1 / 266 George Street
Brisbane QLD 4001

ATTN: TYRAH ZARAFA

Dear Tyrah,

RE: RESPONSE TO THE BCC FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST EMAIL FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AT 123 & 125 RACECOURSE RD, ASCOT (BCC REF: A006971515).

Further to Brisbane City Council's email dated 16 October 2026 requesting further information, please find below our response to the matters raised.

Amended Architectural Plans, together with an amended Transport Impact Statement, an updated Engineering Report and Stormwater Management Plan and advice from a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland regarding the proposed rear retaining wall, are attached in support of this response. A corrected Landscape Concept Plan is currently being prepared and will be submitted separately, as outlined in the response to Item 7.

The BCC request for further information has been reproduced in italics, with the applicant's response following.

BCC REQUEST 1 – *BUILDING HEIGHT*

Currently, the rooftop level constitutes a "Storey" as it does not meet the definition of a "Rooftop garden" as prescribed in Schedule 1 of Brisbane City Plan 2014. Based on the sections provided, there are structures greater than 3.5m in height that are within 3m of the edge of the outermost projection of the roof. To ensure the building height is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Racecourse Precinct Neighbourhood Plan, amend the proposed rooftop level to ensure it meets the "Rooftop garden" definition.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

The architectural plans have been amended by Profile Architecture (Issue TP09 - 09/11/2026) to address this item. The roof structure shown in Sections 03 and 04 was incorrectly represented due to a setting in the drafting software and did not accurately reflect the proposed roof design.

This has been corrected on the amended plans, which confirm that the rooftop level satisfies the requirements of the "Rooftop garden" definition prescribed in Schedule 1 of Brisbane City Plan 2014. Accordingly, the rooftop level does not constitute a storey and the building height of the proposed development is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Racecourse Precinct Neighbourhood Plan Code.

BCC REQUEST 2 – *BUILDING SEPARATION*

There are concerns that the revised 5.9m high built to boundary wall proposed along the southern side boundary will impact the adjoining landowner's access to natural light, sunlight and breezes. While it is acknowledged a built to boundary outcome is envisaged for podiums within centre zones, the building separation requirements have not been addressed in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Centre or mixed use code. Demonstrate the built to boundary wall along the southern boundary will not impact on any adjoining landowner's access to natural light, sunlight and breezes, specifically for habitable spaces.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

The proposed built to boundary wall along the southern side boundary of the subject site represents a compliant outcome with respect to the side boundary setback and building separation requirements of the Centre or Mixed Use Code.

It is noted that the adjoining property to the south of the subject site, 121 Racecourse Road Ascot (Lot 22 on RP33643), contains a two storey commercial building which benefits from an approval granted by Council on 8 September 2008 for a Centre Activity (Shop / Office) (BCC Ref: A002087714).

Under Schedule 1.2 of Brisbane City Plan 2014, a habitable room has the meaning given in the Building Code of Australia (Volume 1), which defines a habitable room as:

A room used for normal domestic activities, and -

1. *includes a bedroom, living room, lounge room, music room, television room, kitchen, dining room, sewing room, study, playroom, family room, home theatre and sunroom; but*
2. *excludes a bathroom, laundry, water closet, pantry, walk-in wardrobe, corridor, hallway, lobby, photographic darkroom, clothes-drying room, and other spaces of a specialised nature occupied neither frequently nor for extended periods.*

As the building at 121 Racecourse Road is used for commercial purposes and does not accommodate normal domestic activities, it does not include any habitable rooms or windows to habitable spaces. As such, there are no habitable spaces on the adjoining site whose access to natural light, sunlight and breezes would be affected by the proposed built to boundary wall.

It is further noted that Table 9.3.3.3.C and Table 9.3.3.3.E of the Centre or Mixed Use Code both allow a blank wall to non-habitable spaces to be built to the side boundary at the height proposed.

Accordingly, the proposed built to boundary wall is consistent with the built to boundary outcome envisaged for podiums within the District Centre Zone and does not compromise residential amenity, in accordance with the building separation provisions of the Centre or Mixed Use Code.

BCC REQUEST 3 – *TRANSPORT IMPACT STATEMENT*

The proposed development includes several performance outcomes that are sought against the Transport, access, parking and servicing code. Performance outcomes against the TAPS code will only be considered by Council when supported by a formal report that includes suitable supporting evidence that is certified by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland of appropriate experience. Failure to provide an appropriately RPEQ certified report will result in the application being not supported.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

Attached to this response is an amended Transport Impact Statement prepared by Rytenskild Traffic Engineering (RTE Ref: 25279, dated 10 November 2026), which has been updated to address the amended architectural plans (Issue TP09). The report has been reviewed and certified by Luke Rytenskild (RPEQ 6293), as shown on the signed certification page at page 2 of the report.

The performance solutions sought against the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code, including the car parking provision (Section 4.2 of the report) and the service vehicle arrangements (Section 6.0 of the report), are justified within the report and supported by swept path analysis. A response to the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code is provided at Appendix A of the report.

BCC REQUEST 4 – *ACCESS AND MANOEUVRING*

The submitted Transport Impact statement suggests the reduction of the bus zone to accommodate a relocated marked parking bay. While Council sought the relocation of the marked parking bays, the reduction to the bus zone area it is not considered an acceptable outcome.

a) *Demonstrate that there is no potential for the relocation of the marked parking bays on the site frontage or within the local area and provide justification for the loss on the existing Marked parking bays.*

b) *Provide an updated Concept Traffic Functional layout plan that is clear and to scale, ensure that the drawing scale, legend and all dimensions are provided.*

c) *Provide RPEQ-certified swept path demonstrating vehicles entering/exiting the site while the bus zone is occupied. This is to include a Refuse Collection Vehicle, Medium rigid vehicle and B99 cars. Include scenarios of when the service bay at the front of the site is occupied.*

d) *Provide RPEQ-certified swept path analysis demonstrating the Refuse Collection Vehicle entry and exist manoeuvres. Including the entire clearance envelope, demonstrate that there are no conflicts with any on-street vehicle parking or the bus top when occupied.*

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

The vehicle crossover layout has been revised so that the existing bus zone is retained unaltered, as shown in Figure 5.2 of the amended Transport Impact Statement prepared by Rytenskild Traffic Engineering. As such, the reduction of the bus zone previously proposed no longer forms part of the application.

a) No replacement on-street parking bays are proposed. The revised layout requires the removal of the two existing marked parking bays to the south of the existing site access, rather than a reduction to the bus zone. Rytenskild Traffic Engineering confirms that it is not possible to retain either of the two existing marked parking bays while providing satisfactory access to the site and retaining the existing bus stop. Due to the existing driveways, bus stops and parking restrictions in the surrounding area, there are also no alternative locations within the local area to relocate the bays.

   The loss of the two marked parking bays is considered acceptable in this instance. The development provides 41 on-site car parking spaces, which exceeds the assessed parking demand of 31 spaces. As such, the development is not expected to generate demand for on-street parking. The site is also located approximately 420m walking distance from Ascot train station and is serviced by bus routes along Racecourse Road, whilst retaining the full bus zone maintains the operation of the existing bus stop, as sought by Council.

b) An updated Concept Traffic Functional Layout Plan is provided at Figures 5.1 and 5.2 of the amended Transport Impact Statement. Figure 5.1 dimensions the proposed crossover, driveway splays and pedestrian sight splay, whilst Figure 5.2 shows the retained bus zone, the kerbside parking spaces to be removed and the proposed warning signage. These figures are overlaid on the amended architectural ground floor plan prepared by Profile Architecture (Drawing A.02.03, Issue TP09), which is drawn at a scale of 1:100 and can be used to verify the dimensions of the site access arrangements.

c) As shown in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 of the amended Transport Impact Statement, the Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) and Medium Rigid Vehicle (MRV) can enter and exit the site while a bus is standing in the bus zone. Figures 6.3 and 6.4 further demonstrate that a B99 car can enter and exit the site while a bus is standing in the bus zone and while an RCV or MRV occupies the service bay, using the passing width provided adjacent to the service bay.

d) Figure 6.1 of the amended Transport Impact Statement shows the full clearance envelope for the RCV entry and exit manoeuvres, which does not conflict with on-street parking or with a bus standing in the bus zone.

BCC REQUEST 5 – *PWD PARKING AND BICYCLE PARKING*

The location of the visitor bicycle parking spaces, places visitors within the main vehicle entry point of the site when attempting to secure their bicycle, this an unnecessary hazard to cyclists. In accordance with PO4, PO5 and PO7 of the TAPS code and the TAPS planning scheme policy, relocate the visitor bicycle parking spaces to the ground level adjacent to the street or main entry point and outside of the vehicle access point.

Additionally, the proposed PWD vehicle parking space requires anyone utilising this space to walk up the main driveway to access to the retail component or foyer of the site. Retail visitors that need to access the amenity are also required to transverse the driveway. It is also noted that due to the solid wall next to the shared space creates a visual obstruction. Demonstrate how safe access to the foyer can be achieved from the proposed vehicle space and amenities area in accordance with PO15 of the TAPS Code.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

The visitor bicycle parking has been relocated from the ground level vehicle entry to the first basement level and the bicycle parking on both basement levels has been reconfigured to provide 10 spaces on each level. As a result, the development now provides a total of 20 bicycle parking spaces, exceeding the minimum requirement of 1 space per dwelling plus 1 visitor space per 4 dwellings. It is noted that there is no requirement for bicycle parking to be provided for the commercial tenancies.

Whilst it is noted that Council has requested that the visitor bicycle parking be relocated to the ground level adjacent to the street or main entry point, the relocated visitor bicycle parking complies with the relevant provisions of the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code. Signage directing visitors to the bicycle parking will be provided at the site frontage in accordance with AO5.3 of the code and can be included as a condition of approval. As such, the relocated visitor bicycle parking is considered to satisfy PO4, PO5 and PO7 of the code.

The ground floor plan (Drawing A.02.03, Issue TP09) has also been amended to reconfigure the prioritised pedestrian pathway from the PWD car parking space. The pathway now runs from the shared space adjacent to the PWD car parking space directly into the building foyer, which provides access to the building entry on Racecourse Road and the retail tenancies. As such, anyone using the PWD car parking space is no longer required to utilise the main driveway to access the retail tenancies or foyer and the pathway does not conflict with vehicles manoeuvring within the driveway.

The amenities are also accessed directly from the reconfigured pathway and foyer, so retail customers walking to and from the amenities are not required to traverse the driveway. As the reconfigured pathway leads pedestrians from the shared space directly into the foyer, pedestrians are no longer required to walk past the solid wall adjacent to the shared space and into the driveway, which removes the visual obstruction identified by Council. Accordingly, safe access to the foyer is achieved from the PWD car parking space and amenities area in accordance with PO15 of the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code.

BCC REQUEST 6 – *STORMWATER*

The proposed discharge to the kerb and channel is not supported, the total discharge allowable is 30L/s not 30L/s per lot as per section 7.6.3.1 of the ID PSP. There is existing Council infrastructure on the site frontage that is suitable as the lawful point of discharge, in accordance with AO3.1 of the Stormwater code provide a revised conceptual engineering plans showing the site discharge into the existing stormwater gully pit on the Racecourse Road frontage of the site. Alternatively, provide a new stormwater gully pit on the site frontage and connect into the existing stormwater main line within Racecourse Road.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

As requested, the stormwater design has been amended so that roof water from the development discharges into the existing stormwater gully pit on the Racecourse Road frontage of the site, rather than to the kerb and channel. The amended design is detailed in the attached updated Engineering Report and Stormwater Management Plan prepared by vT Consulting Engineers (vTCE) (ref VTCE-25298-ENG-E, Revision E, dated 4 November 2026), reviewed by A. van Tonder (RPEQ 16132).

As shown on the Preliminary Services Layout Plan (Drawing P300, Revision D), roof water is directed via a new concrete grated pit with a heavy duty Class D bolt down lid at the southern end of the site frontage, which connects into the rear of the existing stormwater gully pit within Racecourse Road. Surface water from the balance of the site will continue to flow over the rear boundary as sheet flow, at less than the pre-existing flows.

Section 5E of the updated report provides rational method calculations for the pre and post-development scenarios. As the roof water runoff will discharge into the existing gully pit and the flows from the rear sheet flow catchment are reduced by 36L/s in the 100 year ARI event compared to the existing site conditions, vTCE confirms that the development will not cause adverse impacts or actionable nuisance to surrounding properties and that stormwater detention is not required. Accordingly, the existing gully pit on the Racecourse Road frontage is adopted as the lawful point of discharge for the development, in accordance with AO3.1 of the Stormwater Code.

BCC REQUEST 7 – *DEEP PLANTING*

The submitted architectural sections indicate retaining structures along the rear property boundary incorporating substantial footings within the nominated deep planting area. In addition, the submitted Landscape Concept Plan appears to be incorrectly scaled and suggests that the building overhang extends along the length of the proposed deep planting area. This outcome does not support large subtropical shade trees which address amenity impacts to residential dwellings in accordance with PO1 and PO2 of the Racecourse precinct neighbourhood plan and PO55 and PO56 of the Centre or mixed use code.

a) *Amended architectural and landscape plans demonstrating a continuous, unobstructed deep planting area with a minimum width of 4 metres along the rear boundary.*
b) *Revised retaining wall details along the rear boundary demonstrating that footings and associated structures will not significantly reduce the available soil volume or planting area required to support large subtropical shade trees.*
c) *Supporting advice from a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ) confirming that the proposed retaining wall design will not compromise the intended deep planting outcomes.*

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

The architectural plans have been amended to remove the building overhangs into the deep planting area. As such, the amended architectural plans demonstrate a continuous, unobstructed deep planting area with a minimum width of 4m along the rear boundary.

The architectural plans have also been amended to show the correct retaining structure along the rear boundary. The previous plans incorrectly showed this structure as a block retaining wall with strip footings, whereas the proposed retaining structure is a concrete sleeper retaining wall that does not require a continuous strip footing. Accordingly, the footings previously shown within the deep planting area have been removed from the proposal.

Attached to this response is a letter prepared by Kelvin Crofton & Associates (Project No. 7367, dated 9 November 2026) and certified by

Kelvin Crofton (RPEQ 2073). The letter confirms that the proposed concrete sleeper retaining wall will have a maximum height no greater than 1.0m and will require approximately 14 x 100UC/100PFC steel posts, each set in a 350mm diameter bored pier with a maximum depth of 1.0m, with the total plan area of the 14 piers equating to approximately 1.35m^2. The letter further confirms that the soil between the piers remains continuous and is not confined by any strip footing, capping beam or other structure, allowing tree roots to grow between and beyond the piers and concludes that "the footings and associated structures will not significantly reduce the available soil volume or planting area within the deep planting area".

It is noted that the scaling issue identified by Council within the submitted Landscape Concept Plan is the result of a drafting error, whereby the upper levels of the building were shown extending approximately 300mm into the deep planting area. The amended architectural plans, from which the minor building overhangs have also been removed, maintain the 4m deep planting setback for all levels of the building. LAUD ink has confirmed that the Landscape Concept Plan is being corrected to align with the amended architectural plans and the corrected plans will be submitted to Council as a matter of urgency.

Having regard to the matters outlined in this correspondence and the information previously provided in the Town Planning Report, it is considered that the proposal achieves suitable compliance with the relevant assessment benchmarks of City Plan 2014 and that the application warrants approval by Council.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries regarding this response or the application in general.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Kind regards
ATOMIC TOWN PLANNING

LAURIE BEVERLEY M. URB DEV., MPIA
PRINCIPAL TOWN PLANNER

ATTACHMENTS

- Amended Architectural Plans – Profile Architecture, Issue TP09, dated 9 November 2026;
- Engineering Report & Stormwater Management Plan – vT Consulting Engineers, ref VTCE-25298-ENG-E, Revision E, dated 4 November 2026 (including updated civil drawing set);
- Amended Transport Impact Statement – Rytenskild Traffic Engineering, RTE Ref: 25279, dated 10 November 2026;
- Retaining wall advice – Kelvin Crofton & Associates, Project No. 7367, dated 9 November 2026.