

27 July 2026

Job Ref: B4867PA1-DA1

Att: Ryn Casey
Planning Services
Brisbane City Council
GPO Box 1434
Brisbane Qld 4001

Via email: DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au : ryan.casey@brisbane.qld.gov.au

BCC DS
RECEIVED
27/07/2026
APPLICATION REF
A006894140

RE: RESPONSE TO FURTHER ADVICE – 226 KING AVENUE, DURACK QLD 4077

APPLICANT: TUAN HO & TRANG THY TRAM C/- JFP URBAN CONSULTANTS

COUNCIL REF: A006894140

Dear Ryan,

We refer to Council's Further Advice, dated 3rd June 2026, regarding the abovementioned application.

In accordance with s13.2 of the *Development Assessment Rules*, we hereby provide all of the information requested. In support of our response, please find **enclosed** the following documents for assessment: -

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Attachment A. | Amended Reconfiguration Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants |
| Attachment B. | Evidence of IA submission to Council |
| Attachment C. | Amended Building Envelope Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants |
| Attachment D. | Amended Preliminary Engineering Drawings, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants |
| Attachment E. | Amended Tree Retention Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants |
| Attachment F. | Amended Landscape Concept Plan, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants |
| Attachment G. | Arborist Report, prepared by JFP Urban Consultants |
| Attachment H. | Offset Recalculation, prepared by s5 Consulting |
| Attachment I. | Amended Architectural Plans, prepared by Licon Consulting |
| Attachment J. | A006894140 Further Advice Notice 26.06.03 |

In response to Council's request, and as further detailed below, we note that the proposed development has been amended as follows: -

- Amendments to the proposed layout as a consequence of the reduced esplanade road width.
- Minor Amendments to the additional consultant drawings and plans to reflect the changes.

In accordance with Schedule 2 of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) and Schedule 1 of the *Development Assessment Rules*, we confirm that the above changes do not: -

- result in a substantially different development;
- seek approval for prohibited development;
- require the application to be referred to any additional referral agencies; or
- change the type of development approval sought.

Our responses to Council's outstanding issues are as follows: - refer to page 3

BIODIVERSITY AREAS AND BUSHFIRE MANAGEMENT

- 1) Figure 1 in the Information request response from S5 Environmental identifies a total offset area of 0.29ha. However, this area does not include vegetation that is being impacted along the road interface, bushfire management zones, and the stormwater basin and outlet.
 - a) Provide a revised Tree Retention Plan that includes the Biodiversity areas overlay mapping.
 - b) Provide a revised Environmental Offset impact calculation that accurately identifies all impacts to MLES in accordance with PO9 of the Biodiversity areas overlay code and the Offsets planning scheme policy.
- 2) The eastern property boundary of Lot 48 is to be realigned to correspond with the easternmost extent of the identified Bushfire Management Zone (BMZ). This additional area is to be incorporated into the broader ecological corridor and is to be dedicated to Council.
 - a) Provide a revised subdivision plan that realigns the eastern boundary of Lot 48 to the easternmost extent of the BMZ.
 - b) Ensure the BMZ matches between the site-specific bushfire hazard assessment and the proposal plans

Applicant Response:

- 1) Noted. Please refer to the amended Tree Retention Plan prepared by JFP Urban Consultants for Council's further assessment as well as the revised Environmental Offset calculation prepared by S5 Consulting. The offset calculation incorporates all native vegetation within the HES and HESS mapping areas with noted weed and exotic species not included in the calculation.
- 2) Please refer to amended Reconfiguration Plan prepared by JFP Urban Consultants. The eastern boundary of the Development Footprint in Lot 48 has been retained in the previous proposed location. The additional area in Lot 48 will be retained and managed by the applicant as an interface to the adjoining dedicated open space. As indicated on the plan, the remaining 90,650m² of land will be dedicated to Council which is considered reasonable in this instance given the applicant is only retaining 2,931m² of Lot 48. The additional land area would not provide any meaningful contribution to the land for open space purposes. It would however be of material benefit for the applicant with a bushfire management and interface function (refer to Figure 1).

Figure 1. Revised ROL Layout (SOURCE: JFP)



EXISTING COUNCIL-CONTROLLED VEGETATION

- 3) *The loss of Council-controlled vegetation, including parkland trees, is not supported. All proposed earthworks and retaining wall structures are to be located outside of the tree protection zones, structural root zones, and notional root zones of council-controlled vegetation. The proposed onsite civil design and extent of earthworks will need to be modified to comply with PO12 and PO19 of the Subdivision code and PO2 of the Filling and excavation code requirements.*
- a) *Provide a Vegetation Retention Plan (VRP) addressing all vegetation located on Council land. This plan is to document only Council-controlled vegetation. The VRP is to be supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (AIA) of which has been prepared by a qualified AQF Level 5 Arborist (Diploma in Arboriculture).*
 - b) *The revised VRP and Arborist Report must clearly show the surveyed location of all vegetation and must include the following information:*
 - o *The tree schedule is to be divided into parkland trees and street trees.*
 - o *Photos of each tree and/or groups of trees is to be provided within the AIA report.*
 - o *Botanical species name.*
 - o *Height (m).*
 - o *Crown diameter (m).*
 - o *A general tree health assessment.*
 - o *Diameter at standard height (DSH), measured as the trunk diameter at 1.4m above ground level.*
 - o *Tree protection zones/SRZ/NRZ must be provided on the drawings/report with reference to Australian Standards - AS4970 - 2025 Protection of Trees on Development Sites. Arborist is to specify the minor and major encroachments.*
 - o *The proposed development layout, including a revised earthworks plan for the proposed development, with the indication of the existing and proposed levels and details of all retaining walls in relation to surveyed vegetation.*
 - o *Location of proposed services that will impact upon council-controlled vegetation (above and below ground).*

The Arborist Report should demonstrate that all tree retention has been considered for all proposed construction works, including civil infrastructure, earthworks and construction management activity; noting adjoining neighbouring and parkland trees are not to be impacted by this proposal.

Applicant Response:

Council's advice has been noted. The Preliminary Civil Drawings have been amended to show that future filling and excavation works will be located outside of the tree protection zones, structural root zones, and notional root zones of council-controlled vegetation in the adjacent parkland. In addition, an Arborist Report prepared by JFP Urban Consultants has been prepared in accordance with Item 3(a-b) which documents all vegetation at the interface of the proposed development.

DEDICATION OF LAND TO COUNCIL

- 4) *OO3h of the Doolandella neighbourhood plan code only anticipates development comprising of Dwelling houses and Multiple dwellings where land is dedicated in public ownership for habitat areas and ecological corridors. The revised proposal to dedicate land to Council (shown as drainage reserve on the plans) in accordance with the Doolandella neighbourhood plan is acknowledged. Accordingly:*

- a) Commence the process of entering into an Infrastructure agreement with Council to dedicate part of the site to Council. To request an Infrastructure agreement, download and complete the Infrastructure Agreement Request Notice form from Council's website and email it to DS_Infrastructure@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

See the following link to Council's website: <https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/building-andplanning/fees-and-charges/infrastructure-charges>).

Applicant Response:

Noted. JFP on behalf of the applicant submitted a formal request to enter into an Infrastructure Agreement with Brisbane City Council on 29 June 2026. The application is currently with Council's Infrastructure team and will be assessed concurrently with the development application. Evidence of the submission has been enclosed as part of this this Further Advice Response.

ROAD 1 FOOTPATH

- 5) Council's current LGIP does not provide for a north-south shared path through the site. Accordingly, amend the plans to include the following:
- a) Reduce the width of Road 1 to 14m, with local widening provided only as required at the southern end of Road 1 to provide an appropriate transition to the existing of section of shared path in Hackney Street.
 - b) Reduce the width of the western verge of Road 1 to 3.75m and increase the width of the eastern verge to 4.75m.
 - c) Provide a standard 1.2m wide footpath in the western verge of Road 1, in lieu of the 3m wide footpath that is currently proposed in the eastern verge of Road 1.
 - d) Reduce the width of the path in the 5m wide pedestrian link between Road 1 and King Avenue to 2.0m.

Applicant Response:

Council's advice has been noted. Please refer to the amended Reconfiguration Plan, Building Envelope Plan, and Preliminary Civil Drawings prepared by JFP Urban Consultants which addresses the issues raised in Item 5. The overall layout has been adjusted as consequence of Council's request.

EXTERNAL RETAINING WALL INTERFACE

- 6) It is unclear how the proposed interface with Inala / King Avenue or Linacre Street Park adequately mitigates the proposed loss of character and landscape values, given that retaining walls exceeding 1m in height are still proposed. Retaining walls are also to be outside of the NRZ of Council owned trees.
- a) Submit amended plans to step/tier retaining walls along the external boundaries of the site where they exceed 1m in overall height.

Applicant Response:

Noted. The retaining walls have been located away from the TPZ of Council owned trees. Please refer to the amended Preliminary Civil Drawings prepared by JFP Urban Consultants. Any walls at the interface are in cut, ensuring no interface/amenity issues with the adjoining parkland.

TERRACE LOT LANDSCAPING

- 7) *The submitted Landscape Concept Plan appears to conflict with the architectural drawings. The landscape plan indicates deep planting areas of approximately 2.3m in width, whereas the architectural plans indicate planting area widths of 3m or greater. Moreover, with reference to PO28 and PO35 of the Multiple dwelling code, the proposed layout does not demonstrate sufficient separation between Lots 18 and 20 and the proposed laneway manoeuvring and refuse collection areas. Accordingly, submit revised Landscape Concept Plans and proposal plans that:*
- a) Provide dimensions consistent with the architectural drawings.*
 - b) Include linear dimensions on the plans to enable accurate assessment.*
 - c) Amend the depth of Lot 19 and the terrace lots to provide a minimum 1.5m wide landscape buffer between the laneway hardstand and the western side property boundary with the adjoining house lots.*

Applicant Response:

We note that the proposed Landscape Concept Plan and Architectural Plans have been amended to ensure consistency.

AWNING AND SCREENING

- 8) *The amendments do not provide awnings to windows, however the upper-level projection over the doors to the lower level provide weather protection. Windows to the east and west are provided with some protection from the inclusion of eaves over and screening has been applied to westerly windows. The two windows to south and north have no weather protection to allow use during inclement weather. With reference to AO26.2 / PO26 of the Multiple dwelling code:*
- a) Submit amended plans to provide awnings over north and south-facing windows and delete vertical screening to north-facing windows to allow controlled solar gain beneficial during winter.*

Applicant Response:

Noted. Please refer to the amended Architectural Plans prepared by Licon Consulting. These matters can be further conditioned by Council.

TERRACE STREET INTERFACE

- 9) *The retaining wall heights to the street frontages have not been reduced and remain over 0.6m in height, with a combined fence and retaining wall height of 1.9m.*
- a) Submit amended plans that provide a gentle fall away from the front of the terraces to achieve a retaining wall height that is no greater than 0.6m to the street in accordance with AO12.3 / PO12 and AO37.3 / PO37 of the Multiple dwelling code. Any fence along a street boundary that is taller than 1.2m is to be at least 50% transparent and no more than 1.5m in height.*

Applicant Response:

Noted. Please refer to the amended Architectural Plans prepared by Licon Consulting. The new design proposes a two-tier retaining wall which steps the wall height to provide a suitable interface with the street.

This correspondence and attachments represent a response to all the information requested, in accordance with s.13.2 of the *Development Assessment Rules*.

We trust the above and enclosed information satisfactorily addresses Council's request, noting that we will be commencing public notification of the application as soon as possible. Please do not hesitate to contact the office should you have any queries.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Liam Worrall', with a long horizontal stroke extending from the bottom of the signature.

LIAM WORRALL
TOWN PLANNER (BRTP)
JFP URBAN CONSULTANTS