BCC DS
RECEIVED
16/11/2026
APPLICATION REF
A007112256

dts urban planning, surveying & development

Brisbane
PO Box 3128
West End Qld 4101
Ph: 07 3118 0600
Fax: 07 3118 0699
brisbane@dtsqld.com.au
ABN 27 010 000 843
dtsqld.com.au

Our Ref: BNE260180

16 November 2026

The Chief Executive Officer
Brisbane City Council
GPO Box 1434
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Attention: Shirley Mills, Planning Services North

Property Location:	625 Trouts Road, Aspley QLD 4034
Property Description:	Lot 1 on n RP75049
Development:	Development Permit for a Reconfiguration of a Lot (1 Lot into 35 Community Title Lots, Common Property and Open Space Lot)
Applicant:	TROUTS01 Pty Ltd
Council Reference:	A007112256

We refer to Council's Information Request dated 15 October 2026 made under clause 12.1 of the *Development Assessment Rules* ("DA Rules") and, on behalf of our client, and pursuant to clause 13.2(a), forward the following as a **full** response to **all** requested items.

In support of this response, please find attached:

- Appendix A – Amended Subdivision Proposal Plan prepared by DTS
- Appendix B – Structure Plan (Ultimate Developed Catchment) prepared by DTS
- Appendix C – Development Footprint Plan prepared by DTS
- Appendix D – Engineering Response
- Appendix E – Updated Engineering Plans
- Appendix F – Ecology Response
- Appendix G – Bushfire Response
- Appendix H – Ecological Response
- Appendix I – Concept Rehabilitation Plan

Proposed Lot Dimensions and Details

1. *The proposed subdivision plan indicates a number of lots which are under 350m2. Whilst the proposal complies with the average lot size of 350m2, regard should be given to the lots along the southern property boundary, which adjoin existing dwelling houses. The Subdivision code states that where a proposed dwelling house lot and an adjoining lot on a side boundary is 400m2 or greater, the development requires lot sizes to be a minimum of 350m2 capable of accommodating a minimum rectangle of 6 x 15m.*

    a) *Provide amended plans showing a minimum lot size of 350m2 along the southern property boundary in accordance with AO1.1/PO1 and Table 9.4.10.3.B of the Subdivision code.*

    b) *Where lots sizes are proposed to be 350m2 or below, minimum rectangles in accordance with Table 9.4.10.3.B of the Subdivision code should be notated on the plans.*

    c) *Where lots sizes are proposed to be 350 m2 or below, provide a development footprint plan, nominating an area for private open space, vehicle parking areas, and driveway access in accordance with AO27.1, AO27.2, AO27.4/PO27 of the Subdivision code.*

Response

AO1.1/PO1 and Table 9.4.10.3.B of the Subdivision Code states *"where a proposed dwelling house Lot and an adjoining lot on a side boundary is 400m² or greater",* the minimum Lots size is 350m². Note (2) to the table further clarifies that the *"Minimum lot size is an **average lot size** for the development (calculated excluding all lots greater than 900m2 and including only those lots intended for a dwelling house) provided all lots comply with minimum rectangle dimension requirements."*

Council has acknowledged that the proposed development achieves the required average lot size of 350m². In addition, all proposed lots adjoining the southern boundary are generally rectangular in configuration and have widths of 10.5m or greater, comfortably exceeding the minimum rectangle dimensions of 6m x 15m and the minimum average lot width/frontage requirement of 7.5m prescribed under Table 9.4.10.3.B. Accordingly, the proposed lots comply with the relevant requirements of the Subdivision Code.

Notwithstanding the above, it is important to recognise that the proposal comprises a Community Title subdivision, with the lots along the southern boundary oriented internally to a common property access rather than a public street. As a result, the proposed lot sizes, which comply with the applicable minimum standards, will not adversely affect streetscape character, local context or the character of the locality. The development is therefore consistent with the intent of PO1, as the resulting built form can be accommodated without generating any appreciable impact on the surrounding streetscape.

It is also relevant that the subject site represents an infill development opportunity within an established Low Density Residential area that was largely developed prior to the commencement of City Plan 2014 as well as the former City Plan 2000. An assessment of surrounding properties to the north and south has identified numerous adjoining lots of approximately 800m² or greater, many of which have the potential to accommodate future subdivision.

In response to Item 1(b), a Structure Plan has been prepared (refer **Appendix B**) which includes the required 6m x 15m minimum rectangles on all Lots in order to demonstrate all Lots can comfortably achieve this requirement. In addition to this, to illustrate the likely ultimate development pattern of the locality, the Structure Plan also shows surrounding properties with subdivision potential as redeveloped into two-lot configurations. The Structure Plan demonstrates that the proposed development integrates appropriately within a reasonable future development scenario and does not prejudice the orderly development of adjoining land. In this context, the proposal delivers an efficient residential yield consistent with the prescribed average lot size of 350m², while the Community Title format ensures that impacts on the existing streetscape remain minimal.

A Development Footprint Plan has been prepared and is included under **Appendix C.** The Development Footprint Plan nominates private open space, vehicle parking areas (i.e. internal garage location and 5.5m setback to facilitate visitor parking at the front of each Lot) and driveway access as required.

Earthworks Interface with Adjoining Property

2. *The conceptual earthworks plans show a 2.1m high retaining wall along the southern property boundary for the proposed Lot 15, which may have a detrimental amenity impact for the adjoining lot.*

    a) *Provide amended earthworks plans, which show that the proposed retaining wall will not exceed 1m in height in accordance with AO1/PO1 of the Filling and excavation code and AO2.1/PO2 of the Subdivision code. Alternatively, provide terracing of the retaining wall 1 vertical unit:1 horizontal unit in accordance with AO2.1/PO2 of the Filling and excavation code.*

Response

Refer to the attached Engineering Response by HCE Engineers under **Appendix D** in conjunction with the Updated Engineering Plans under **Appendix E**, which outlines responses to the above.

Environmental Offsets

3. *An environmental offset of 1,123m² has been proposed for significant residual impacts to matters of local environmental significance (MLES), as required by PO9 of the Biodiversity areas overlay*

code and the Offsets planning scheme policy. It is unclear if trees 166, 174, 213 and 253 have been included in this calculation of significant impacts to MLES.

a) Provide an update to the proposed environmental offset calculation and Plan 5 of the Ecological Assessment to reflect any additional significant residual impacts to MLES associated with removal of the above trees.

Response

Refer to the attached Ecology Response by Saunders Havill under **Appendix F** which includes an updated Biodiversity Areas Impact Assessment Plan.

Bushfire Hazard

4. *Bushfire reporting was submitted to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Bushfire overlay code. The Bushfire reporting identifies a corridor of potentially hazardous vegetation (Figure 2) to the west of the site as VHC9.1 (mapped by the State as VHC9.2), however it is unclear how this corridor (approx. 67m in width) is removed from any further assessment (Figure 3) as no processing of 'patch and corridor' filtering steps have been identified in the reporting. Step 3 of section 4.2.6 of Bushfire Resilient Communities (QFES, 2019) allows for patches of vegetation <50m width to be 'filtered' out of assessment as they are not sufficiently wide to support a fully developed flame front.*

   Where any 'patch and corridor' filtering is proposed, figures identifying how erosion and dilation of rasterised VHC mapping has taken place in accordance with Step 3 of Bushfire Resilient Communities must be provided.

   a) Provide revised Bushfire reporting that adequately addresses mapped potentially hazardous vegetation to the west of the site in accordance with an approved methodology. If any patch and corridor filtering is proposed, reporting must provide supporting information (including figures) that detail the processing steps in accordance with section 4.2.6 of Bushfire Resilient Communities.

   b) Provide an amended assessment against sections A and C of the Bushfire overlay code based on the conclusions of the revised Bushfire reporting.

Response

Refer to the attached Bushfire Response by Bushfire Prone Planning under **Appendix G** which includes further clarification on the assessment process.

Streetscape

5. *While frontage footpath upgrades are not proposed due to the presence of significant vegetation along Horn Road, a pedestrian connection to the proposed subdivision is required. A footpath connection between Trouts Road and the proposed driveway crossover and pedestrian entry point can be achieved while retaining existing street trees and is necessary to support a safe and accessible pedestrian network consistent with PO2 of the Streetscape hierarchy overlay code. Provide amended plans that:*

   a) Incorporate a minimum 1.2m wide footpath connection between Trouts Road and the proposed driveway crossover and pedestrian entry point.

   b) Demonstrate retention of the existing Callitris columellaris street trees.

   c) Achieve a consistent 1:50 crossfall and a longitudinal grade that generally matches the adjoining road.

Response

Refer to the attached Engineering Response by HCE Engineers under **Appendix D** in conjunction with the Updated Engineering Plans under **Appendix E**, which outlines responses to the above. It is worth noting that the proposed footpath alignment is north of the row of existing Callitris columellaris proposed to be

retained in road reserve as per the original Ecological Assessment Report by Saunders Havill (i.e. T269-T274).

Street Trees

6. *Street trees are protected under Natural Assets Local Laws (NALL). Removal of any street trees will require approval from Council's Public Space Operations section. No approval is given for any street trees to be removed at this stage of the process. Street trees should be retained wherever possible. Where the removal of street trees is unavoidable, robust justification should be included with the response, including an identification of trees, size, diameter, species and overall health.*

Response

The proposed development will seek to minimise the loss of existing street trees wherever practicable. As demonstrated by the originally submitted Ecological Assessment Report by Saunders Havill, existing trees located within the Horn Road reserve will be retained wherever possible, where not conflicting with other Council requirements such as upgrades to the Horn Road frontage. It is worth noting that the majority of trees in question is essentially regrowth within the existing Horn Road reserve as a result of the existing partially formed road pavement, rather than formal street trees. That said, as the reporting demonstrate, the development is able to retain a significant number of these trees. The Applicant acknowledges that a separate approval process will need to be run with PSO for removal of any street trees necessitated under a development approval.

Proposed Subdivision Plan

7. *The proposed subdivision plan does not adequately incorporate the recommendations made by the traffic and civil engineers' consultants. Specifically, the head of cul-de-sac to Horn Road is not identified, the internal lot amendments (lots 14 and 15) minimum verge width and area at the T-head necessary for the RCV to perform manoeuvres within common property, the truncations and widening necessary for lots 30 and 31 and the proposed location of the traffic calming devices, etc).*

a) *Provide an amended subdivision plan and civil plans which incorporate the design recommendations made by traffic consultants, to ensure consistency and accuracy across the documents.*

Response

The Subdivision Proposal Plan has been updated to include the following amendments:

- Incorporate the alignment of the proposed Horn Road cul-de-sac head and verge;
- Lots 14 and 15 truncations in line with Traffic Report
- Truncation and widening of access to Lots 30 ad 31.

Please refer to the Amended Subdivision Proposal Plan by DTS under **Appendix A** and Traffic Response by Colliers under **Appendix H.**

Lot Access (Lots 29 to 32)

8. *The proposed access arrangement for lots 29, 30 ,31 and 32 requires further review and amendments. Lot 29 has a 7.5m frontage. Lot 32 has a frontage of approximately 6.5m.These two lots are required to provide truncations for the rear lots (Lots 30 and 31) to accommodate bin presentation areas and essential services location. It is not acceptable to present bins within the frontage of neighbouring lots. The proposal requires amendments to ensure that all lots have an appropriate and functional access frontage.*

    a) *Provide amended plans addressing these issues in accordance with AO3.2/PO3 of the Subdivision code and the standards in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy.*

Response

Refer to the attached Traffic Response by Collies under **Appendix H** which includes clarification on the proposed (adjusted) access arrangement for Lots 29-32. Essentially, vehicle access to all four Lots have been consolidated which has increased opportunity for bin presentation areas for these Lots.

Roadworks

Trouts Road

9. *Pavement widening is required along Trouts Road in accordance with AO3.1/PO3 of the Subdivision code and AO1/PO1, AO2/PO2 and AO6/PO6 of the Infrastructure design code. These works have not been identified within the current proposal and material provided.*

    a) *Provide an amended subdivision plan and civil plans which clearly identify the extent of the required works.*

Response

Refer to the attached Engineering Response by HCE Engineers under **Appendix D** in conjunction with the Updated Engineering Plans under **Appendix E**, which outlines responses to the above.

Horn Road Verge

10. *The Traffic Report justification for the reduced verge width at the Horn Road cul-de-sac has been reviewed and is not considered adequate. Horn Road is not a constrained road corridor, and the verge width along this section of the road is not consistently substandard to warrant a reduced verge outcome at this location.*

    a) *The proposed development is required to provide 3.75m verge width at the Cul -de- sac to provide a consistent verge along the corridor in accordance with AO3/PO3 of the Infrastructure design code. A reduction in the standard verge width may be considered, where the existing verge is consistently narrower than the standard width for the full length of the street block; and/or to accommodate constrained pinch points for a short distance. Verge widths less than 2.5 metres will not be considered. The design and supporting justification are to be reviewed and amended. Any constrained pinch points to justify a reduced verge width are to be clearly identified.*

Response

Refer to the attached Traffic Response by Collies under **Appendix H** which provides a response to the above.

Internal Private Road

11. *The subdivision plan and civil engineering plans require amendments to address the traffic recommendations in terms of land required as common property for the RCV to perform within the private road (vehicle manoeuvring arrangements), verge provision, lot truncations and access widening and to incorporate the proposed traffic calming devices.*

Response

Refer to the attached Traffic Response by Collies under **Appendix H** which provides a response to the above. Necessary adjustments have been made to the Amended Subdivision Proposal Plan under **Appendix A** (NB. The proposed internal access way has always maintained a 10.0m wide reserve width, with the internal carriageway and verge arrangement to be determined by the Civil and Traffic Engineer in accordance with relevant requirements).

Stormwater

12. *The proposal is generally supported from a stormwater and flooding perspective. However, land dedication of flooded areas and waterway (non-trunk) is required in accordance with Section B and PO16 of the Stormwater code.*

    The proposed stormwater water quality devices may be removed and replaced with a stormwater quality offset; this could be part of a performance outcome associated with the area of (proposed Lot 900) being a drainage lot rehabilitated and dedicated to Council for flooding stormwater and environmental purposes.

    Note: It is noted that the plans refer to this lot as dedication for Public Open Space, to align with the existing parkland to north and south. However, the land is required for flooded areas and stormwater.

    a) Provide amended plans noting the above requirements.

Response

Refer to the attached Engineering Response by HCE Engineers under **Appendix D** in conjunction with the Updated Engineering Plans under **Appendix E**, which outlines responses to the above.

Please also find enclosed a Rehabilitate Concept Plan prepared by Saunders Havill under **Appendix I** in support of the rehabilitation of proposed Lot 900.

Refuse

13. *A review of the submitted plans indicates that the proposed mobile garbage bin (MGB) presentation arrangement relies on kerbside frontage of lots that are not party to the shared access arrangement for rear Lots 30 and 31, placing an unreasonable burden on lots that do not benefit from the shared access arrangement. Furthermore, the submitted swept path analysis demonstrates the Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) encroaching beyond the carriageway and potentially conflicting with the property boundary of Lot 15.*

    To achieve a compliant servicing outcome, it is recommended that Lots 29 and 32 gain access via the shared access handle, thereby providing sufficient kerbside presentation for Lots 29-32, supported by a compliant T-Head turnaround and updated swept path analysis.

    In accordance with AO4.1c/PO4 of the Subdivision code, AO8.1, AO8.2/PO8 of the Infrastructure design code and AO19.2, AO19.3/PO19 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing code:

    a) Provide amended plans demonstrating a compliant kerbside presentation area of 1.8m per lot for Lots 29-32 which does not place unreasonable burden on Lots not party to the shared access arrangement. Ensure the bins are in a position which can be reached by the side loading RCV arm.
    b) Submit an updated RPEQ certified swept path analysis for a 10.3m Side Loading RCV (as per BSD 3004) which demonstrates safe and efficient servicing, including clearance envelope wholly within the CTS carriageway. Ensure the amended swept path includes vehicle specifications (i.e., length, width, track, operational height, lock-to-lock 6s, curb-to-curb turning radius of 9.757m etc)

Response

Refer to the attached Traffic Response by Collies under **Appendix H** which provides a response to the above.

14. *The 'Structure Plan' indicates that the development does not meet the requirements of the Community Title Scheme (CTS), Table 9.4.10.3.C – Design of access ways in community title development of the Subdivision code i.e., have a minimum carriageway width of 6.5m, minimum total access way reserve of 10m and minimum verge width of 1.5m.*

a) *a) Provide amended plans showing CTS access way of 10m, with a minimum 6.5m carriageway width and a minimum 1.5m verge width. The CTS access way must not form part of the subdivision lots.*

Response

As per the above response to Item 11, refer to the attached Traffic Response by Collies under **Appendix H** which provides a response in relation to the Internal Private Road. Necessary adjustments have been made to the Amended Subdivision Proposal Plan under **Appendix A** (NB. The proposed internal access way has always maintained a 10.0m wide reserve width, with the internal carriageway and verge arrangement to be determined by the Civil and Traffic Engineer in accordance with relevant requirements).

We advise that this Response to Council's Information Request is being made under clause 12.1 of the DA Rules and constitutes a **full response** containing all of the information requested as outlined in Clause 13.2(a) of the DA Rules.

The applicant will now undertake public notification in accordance with the DA Rules.

We trust that this application will be given the utmost attention and consideration. Should you require any further information, we would be pleased to assist.

Your sincerely,



Janesh Gunaratne – Senior Urban Planner
DTS Group QLD Pty Ltd
Email: planning@dtsqld.com.au