

# Response to Information Request

**Development Application:** 2–6 Ashmore Street, Everton Park

**Application Type:** MCU – Multiple Dwelling and Short-Term Accommodation

**BCC Reference:** A006826022

**Council RFI Date:** 29 April 2026

**Council Officer:** Chris Dixon, Senior Urban Planner, Planning Services North

Dear Assessment Manager,

This letter is submitted in response to the Further Advice letter issued by Brisbane City Council dated 29 April 2026, in relation to the Development Application for 2–6 Ashmore Street, Everton Park (BCC Reference: A006826022).

The applicant has carefully reviewed each item raised and provides a point-by-point response addressing all matters identified. This response is structured to directly correspond with the original RFI numbering to assist assessment clarity and transparency.

## Supporting Documentation Lodged with this Response:

**Amended Architectural Drawings - DA03** [Document ref: 18060\_260615\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_EVERTONPARK\_DA03.pdf]

**Amended Landscape Concept Plan – Landscape Architect** [Document ref: TBC – to be provided by Landscape Architect]

**Amended Traffic Impact Assessment / Swept Path Analysis – SITE Traffic** [Document ref: TBC – to be provided by SITE Traffic RPEQ]

## RFI Item-by-Item Response

### Shadow Diagrams

#### RFI Item 1 – RFI Requirement:

*The shadow diagrams provided do not provide a comparison of compliant vs proposed building height, and do not illustrate surrounding development to deliver an understanding of how the shadows could affect nearby development. Provide amended shadow diagrams showing the impact of additional height.*

#### Response:

Shadow diagrams have been prepared and incorporated within the amended Drawing Set 03. The submitted diagrams illustrate the proposed development at the

proposed maximum ceiling height of 11.5m, as well as a compliant maximum overall building height scenario of 11.5m, to demonstrate the resulting shadow impacts during both the summer and winter solstice periods.

The assessment indicates that the proposal results in minimal additional overshadowing to adjoining properties, with impacts generally contained within the subject site and immediate interfaces. To further illustrate the extent of any potential impact, the adjoining lots identified as 8/SP242317, 456 1/RP108984 and 450/SP260974 have also been included within the shadow study diagrams for comparative context and assessment purposes.

### **Supporting Documents:**

**Amended Architectural Plans – DA03 (Shadow Study)** [Document ref: 18060\_260615\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_DA03.pdf]

## **Containerised Planting**

### **RFI Item 2 – RFI Requirement:**

*The proposed plantings are not supported by adequate soil depth and volumes or adequate shade tree planting to achieve effective shading of the communal space in accordance with PO30 of the Multiple dwelling code and PO13 and PO15 of the Landscape work code. Provide an amended Landscape Concept Plan prepared by a suitably qualified Landscape Architect demonstrating amended containerised planters with a minimum soil depth of 1200mm and horizontal dimension of 1.5m, including a subtropical shade tree capable of achieving a minimum canopy width of 5m at maturity. Include a plan demonstrating 25% shading of the communal open space area within 5 years.*

### **Response:**

An amended Landscape Concept Plan has been prepared by a suitably qualified Landscape Architect in direct response to this item. The revised plan proposes large, containerised planters on the rooftop communal open space, designed and dimensioned to provide effective subtropical shade cover.

The amended containerised planters demonstrate the following:

- A minimum soil depth of 1200mm is provided to support healthy tree establishment and long-term canopy growth;
- A minimum horizontal planter dimension of 1.5m is achieved across all shade tree planter locations;
- Selected subtropical shade tree species are capable of achieving a minimum canopy width of 5m at maturity; and
- The planting arrangement demonstrates that 25% shade cover of the communal open space area will be achieved within 5 years, consistent with PO30 of the Multiple dwelling code and PO13 and PO15 of the Landscape work code.

## Supporting Documents:

**Amended Landscape Concept Plan - SEED Landscape Design** [Document ref: 18060\_260608\_2 ASHMORE\_SEED\_Landscape Drawings\_DA issue 260608.pdf]

**Amended Architectural Plans - DA03 (Rooftop Communal Space)** [Document ref: 18060\_260615\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_EVERTONPARK\_DA03.pdf]

## RCV Swept Path

### RFI Item 3 – RFI Requirement:

*Submit revised RCV swept paths to include a kerb-to-kerb parameter of 9.757m as specified on the BSD (wall to wall of 9.757m has been used which shows a tighter turning radius achieved than the design vehicle specification).*

### Response:

The Traffic Engineer has reviewed the swept path analysis and confirms that the vehicle parameter utilised was a typographical error. The swept path analysis has been amended to correctly apply a kerb-to-kerb turning radius of 9.757m as specified in the BSD, in lieu of the wall-to-wall dimension previously used. The revised swept paths demonstrate that the RCV can safely navigate the site with the corrected design vehicle specification, and the turning radius achieved reflects an appropriate and realistic on-site manoeuvre.

## Supporting Documents:

**Amended Traffic Impact Assessment / Swept Path Analysis (RPEQ Certified)**  
[Document ref: 18060\_260526\_SITE Traffic Report - TIA - Rev 2.pdf]

## Parking and Bicycle Spaces

### RFI Item 4 – RFI Requirement:

*The Traffic Impact Assessment report references the number of cycle parking spaces but has not considered the AS2890.1 (2015) requirements for location and access needs for practical use. Wall mounted over bonnet storage is inconsistent with the AS requirements. There are areas where bikes are shown mounted vertically above each other with no practical access, and similar issues for spaces shown within the meter room. Provide updated reporting and design with particular reference to servicing outcome and provision of cycle parking.*

### Response:

The applicant acknowledges Council's comments regarding the practical access and layout of the proposed bicycle parking spaces, including the use of wall-mounted / over-bonnet racks.

The revised Traffic Impact Assessment confirms the overall bicycle parking provision of 41 secure resident spaces and 23 visitor spaces, being 64 spaces total. It is noted that the BCC City Plan does not nominate a specific bicycle parking rate for Short-term accommodation. In the absence of a nominated STA bicycle rate, the proposal has conservatively adopted the Multiple dwelling bicycle parking rate, notwithstanding that actual STA bicycle demand is expected to be lower than permanent residential occupation.

The proposed bicycle parking provision is considered appropriate given that the development comprises predominantly Short-term Accommodation, with only three nominated Multiple Dwelling units. Notwithstanding, the approved design is capable of accommodating additional bicycle parking spaces equivalent to a higher Multiple Dwelling provision, demonstrating that sufficient capacity exists within the development should future demand warrant it.

#### **Supporting Documents:**

**Amended Traffic Impact Assessment (RPEQ Certified) – Bicycle Parking** [Document ref: TBC – SITE Traffic Rev 2]

**Amended Architectural Plans – DA03 (Bicycle Parking Layout)** [Document ref: 18060\_260615\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_DA03.pdf]

#### **RFI Item 5 – RFI Requirement:**

*The annotation of a wash bay over the PWD space shared area is inconsistent with the intent of the shared area and Australian Standard requirements. Remove the wash bay from the plans.*

#### **Response:**

The wash bay annotation has been removed from the amended architectural plans. The PWD shared area is now shown free of any wash bay designation, consistent with the intent of the shared space provisions and Australian Standard requirements.

#### **Supporting Documents:**

**Amended Architectural Plans – DA03 (Basement / Carpark Layout)** [Document ref: 18060\_260615\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_DA03.pdf]

## **Refuse**

#### **RFI Item 6 – RFI Requirement:**

*The proposed 'Bin Storage' does not provide sufficient storage, capacity, and source separation for the yield of units. The waste rates utilised (120L general refuse / 80L commingled recycling per unit per week) are not supported. The refuse solution must provide 240L of general refuse and 240L of commingled recycling per unit per*

week. Provide amended architectural plans demonstrating a refuse room or refuse enclosure with a minimum GFA of 33.67m<sup>2</sup> (internal dimensions 9.2m × 3.66m) to house 12 × 1100L bulk bins (6 general refuse + 6 commingled recycling) serviced twice per week per stream. Denote the GFA and internal dimensions on the plans.

**Response:**

The refuse storage area has been revised in response to this item. The amended architectural plans demonstrate the provision of a dedicated internal refuse room accommodating 12 × 1100L bulk bins, comprising eight (8) × 1100L general refuse bins and four (4) × 1100L commingled recycling bins, with each waste stream serviced twice weekly.

The proposed allocation reflects the anticipated waste generation profile of the development, which comprises predominantly serviced Short-term Accommodation. Given the nature of the accommodation and its associated operational management arrangements, a greater proportion of general waste storage is considered appropriate. Notwithstanding, the overall bin capacity remains equivalent to Council's requested provision, with the distribution between waste streams tailored to the expected operational requirements of the development.

To minimise impacts on the deep planting provision and overall site landscaping outcomes, the refuse room has been efficiently designed with an internal gross floor area of 23.8m<sup>2</sup>. The layout has been developed using the dimensions of the nominated 1100L bulk bins (1240mm × 1070mm) and demonstrates that adequate maneuverability and operational access can be achieved within the proposed arrangement.

**Supporting Documents:**

**Amended Architectural Plans – DA03 (Refuse Room Layout)** [Document ref: 18060\_260615\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_DA03.pdf]

**RFI Item 7 – RFI Requirement:**

*The RCV loading and servicing area of 10.5m long × 3.6m high does not include additional space for the loading of bulk bins between the rear of the RCV and built form behind. Provide amended architectural plans demonstrating the RCV standing / loading area has a minimum vertical operational clearance of 3.6m between the Basement FFL and lowest projection above, for the entire 6.5m wide aisle / carriageway for a length of 11.5m, to enable loading of bulk bins.*

**Response:**

Amended architectural plans have been prepared to further illustrate the clearance requirements associated with the operation of the RCV. The revised drawings clearly

demonstrate that the required vertical operational clearance area for the RCV is provided and maintained within the proposed loading location.

The RCV standing and loading area is located along the Newhaven Street frontage adjacent to the carpark entry and remains open to sky, ensuring unobstructed vertical clearance for RCV operation and bulk bin collection activities. Relevant clearance dimensions and operational extents have been clearly annotated within the amended drawing set.

### **Supporting Documents:**

**Amended Architectural Plans – DA03 (Basement Floor Plan)** [Document ref: 18060\_26015\_CAB\_2-6\_ASHMORE\_DA03.pdf]

### **RFI Item 8 – RFI Requirement:**

*The swept path vehicle specifications have utilised a lock-to-lock time of 4.00s. Under AS2890.2:2018, an RCV would be characterised as a HRV, requiring a minimum lock-to-lock time of 6.00s per Table 5.1. Additionally, the standing location of the RCV does not allow for bulk bins being manoeuvred to the rear of the RCV. Provide an amended RPEQ certified swept path analysis for a 10.24m Rear Loading RCV (as per BSD-3008-2) using a lock-to-lock time of 6.00s. Demonstrate that lawfully parked cars along Newhaven Street do not conflict with RCV entry and exit manoeuvres. Demonstrate that the RCV standing / loading location provides at least 1.2m between the RCV and car parking bays to facilitate bin manoeuvring.*

### **Response:**

The RPEQ Traffic Engineer has reviewed the swept path analysis and confirms that the lock-to-lock time of 4.00s was a typographical / parameter error. An amended RPEQ certified swept path analysis has been prepared for the 10.24m Rear Loading RCV (BSD-3008-2) incorporating the correct lock-to-lock time of 6.00s in accordance with AS2890.2:2018 Table 5.1.

The revised swept path analysis demonstrates:

- Safe and efficient on-site servicing by the 10.24m Rear Loading RCV using a lock-to-lock time of 6.00s;
- That lawfully parked cars along the Newhaven Street frontage do not conflict with RCV entry and exit manoeuvres, including the full clearance envelope; and
- That the RCV standing / loading location provides a minimum of 1.2m clearance between the rear of the RCV and car parking bays, facilitating unobstructed bulk bin manoeuvring to the rear of the RCV for collection.

### **Supporting Documents:**

**Amended Traffic Impact Assessment / Swept Path Analysis (RPEQ Certified)**  
[Document ref: 18060\_260526\_SITE Traffic Report - TIA - Rev 2.pdf]

The applicant considers that the above information satisfactorily addresses all matters raised in the Further Advice letter dated 29 April 2026. The proposal has been refined in response to Council's feedback to improve technical compliance and overall development outcomes.

We respectfully request that Council proceed with assessment of the application on the basis of the enclosed response and supporting documentation.

Should further clarification be required, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully,

Mercury Design

On behalf of CAB Projects Pty Ltd

**Benjamin Hennig**

Director

+61 413 155 865

office@mercury-design.com