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

19 August 2026

Ben Shields
C/- Subdivisions Brisbane
8 Bloodwood Close
MOOLOOLAH QLD 4553

ATTENTION: Craig Christie

Application Reference: A007059347
Address of Site: 54 BIRDWOOD TCE AUCHENFLOWER QLD 4066

Dear Craig

RE: Information request in accordance with the Development Assessment Rules

Council has carried out an initial review of the above application and has identified that further information is required to fully assess the proposal. It is acknowledged that a previous approval (A004109297) exists over the site; however, that approval was not enacted and involved a different built form and extent of earthworks. Council is concerned that the current proposal relies on excessive earthworks and overly high retaining walls, which may result in unacceptable impacts on adjoining properties and poor interfaces within the site. These matters will need to be resolved through amended plans and supporting information before Council can make a decision on the application.

Earthworks, Retaining walls

1) The site is very steep, with an approximate 12.5m fall over 4.1m along the western side boundary. The proposed subdivision would create lots with slopes that exceed the slopes anticipated by AO2.2 of the Subdivision code. As a result, the proposed lot layout and dwelling design are highly reliant on extensive cut, fill and retaining walls, which raises concern about consistency with PO2 of the Subdivision code. The scale and presentation of the earthworks and retaining walls are considered inconsistent with the intent for development in the Hillside precinct of the Ithaca District neighbourhood plan, which seeks to limit the visual impact of benching and retaining walls (AO24.1 and AO24.2/PO24). While the code assessment report stated that there are no large retaining walls facing the street, drawings D501 and D407 show retaining wall interfaces that appear excessive in height and may create unacceptable impacts on adjoining properties and poor internal interfaces between the two proposed dwellings. The retaining walls between the two dwellings, including walls up to 6.3m high without stepping, are of particular concern.
    a) Amend the subdivision layout, dwelling design and associated earthworks to substantially reduce the extent of cut and fill and the reliance on high retaining walls. The amended design must demonstrate how the lots can accommodate development that responds to the steep topography and achieves compliance with the relevant performance outcomes.
    b) Redesign the western boundary retaining walls and the retaining walls between the two proposed dwellings to reduce their height, provide appropriate stepping, and incorporate adequate setbacks and landscaping opportunities. The amended design must demonstrate that the retaining walls will not result in unacceptable visual, amenity or interface impacts on adjoining properties or within the site.

…/2

2) Submit a revised civil concept plan/earthworks plan, supported by a code assessment table and sufficient cross-sections, levels and retaining wall details, prepared by a suitably qualified Civil Works Engineer and signed by an RPEQ. The information must clearly demonstrate the proposed extent of cut and fill, retaining wall heights, finished levels, site interfaces and how the revised design addresses the concerns identified above.

Setbacks

3) The proposed new lots and dwelling houses do not provide sufficient rear boundary setbacks on the steeply sloping western part of the site to accommodate deep planting and large trees capable of breaking up building bulk, as sought by AO23.2/PO23 of the Ithaca District neighbourhood plan. While it is acknowledged that one of the proposed lots will not have a conventional rear boundary, the previous approval (A004109297) provided 2.5m setbacks for both the dwelling unit and the small lot house. The current proposal provides reduced setbacks to the western boundary, which limits opportunities for meaningful landscaping and increases the potential visual and amenity impacts of built form and retaining structures when viewed from adjoining properties.

a) Amend the proposal to increase the western/rear setbacks of both the dwelling unit and the small lot house. The amended plans must demonstrate that adequate deep planting and landscaping can be provided to soften building bulk, reduce the visual impact of retaining structures and achieve an acceptable interface with adjoining properties.

Urban Utilities (UU)

Council does not undertake water and sewer assessment of any planning applications. Contact UU on (07) 3432 2200 to discuss any water and sewer issues and whether you are required to submit an application to UU for assessment.

Responding to this request

Your response should include a summary table which outlines any changes to performance outcomes and plans that have resulted from addressing the issues outlined above. The table should also include details of any supporting documentation.

If a response is not provided within the prescribed response period of three (3) months assessment of the application will continue from the day after the day on which the response period would have otherwise ended.

Email your response to DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au quoting the application reference number A007059347.

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

Yours sincerely



Dominic Hudson
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services North
Phone: (07) 3178 0229
Email: Dominic.Hudson@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council