



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

8 September 2026

Banner Asset Management
C/- Urbis Ltd
Level 32, 300 George Street
BRISBANE CITY QLD 4000

ATTENTION: Michael Cattoni
Application Reference: A006928686
Address of Site: 47 LINKFIELD RD BALD HILLS QLD 4036

Dear Michael

RE: Further advice

Council has reviewed your response to the information request and determined that further information is required to continue assessing the proposal. While the response adequately addressed the proposed land uses over the site, the following items require clarification or amendment.

Reticulated water/sewer servicing

1. Section 3.1 of the Engineering Report prepared by Accor indicates a gravity sewer connection may not be achievable (outlining further potholing/survey investigations are required to confirm). The report also outlines if a gravity connection is not achievable the site is proposed to be serviced by private pumped sewer/onsite storage/pump-out arrangements. This proposed arrangement does not satisfy the requirement of reticulated sewer servicing as per Infrastructure design code AO9.1 and AO9.2. A gravity sewer system must be demonstrated as part of this development application (as opposed to the proposal within the Accor Engineering Report which is not supported). The proposed contingency (private pumped sewer/onsite storage/pump-out arrangements) is not supported.
 - a. Demonstrate the proposed subdivision can be serviced by reticulated sewer gravity feed and provide written consent/support from Urban Utilities (UU) for the reticulated strategy.

Stormwater code

2. The proposed subdivision plan indicates an easement (EMT B) within proposed Lot 6 for the overland flow/access to the drainage reserve. The use of an easement for this purpose is not supported.
 - a. The land must be dedicated as drainage reserve as it conveys underground drainage from the road reserve, provides an overland flow path from the road reserve, and provides access for Council to carry out maintenance within the

drainage reserve. Provide revised plans demonstrating the overland flow path/access will be dedicated as drainage reserve.

- b. Additionally demonstrate that a maintenance berm is provided for vehicle access to the drainage reserve. The proposed outlet location at the drainage reserve may also impact the maintenance vehicle access to the drainage reserve. Demonstrate vehicle access to the drainage reserve is achievable with sufficient truncations.
3. A retaining wall (RWB01 shown on preliminary bulk earthworks plan SK01-0001 issue B) is proposed along the proposed Lot 6 boundary. While a wall along this boundary could be supported to ensure overland flow is contained in the link from the road to the drainage reserve, the plans indicate the proposed wall is retaining no earth.
 - a. Clarify this issue/show the fill on proposed Lot 6 being retained.
4. Retaining walls of significant heights (2-3m) are proposed along the waterway corridor and lot boundaries, which is inconsistent with AO1/AO2 of the Filling and excavation code. The significant retaining wall adjacent the waterway could be a source of CPTED issues (graffiti).
 - a. Maintenance vehicle access to and along the drainage reserve is required to be demonstrated and justified for the proposed performance outcome as per the Filling and excavation code.
5. The stormwater management plan (SWMP) on the site has been revised regarding the management of the upslope property flows. The proposal to capture and pipe the Q100 flow is not supported, as per Council's Infrastructure design Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). A flow path within an easement/s is to be provided directing the major flows to the drainage reserve. The major flow path should be provided along the northern site boundary, directing/connecting the flows to the proposed drainage reserve.
 - a. Provide a revised SWMP to ensure a flow path is provided for the major flows directing/connecting the flows to the proposed drainage, with the minor flows piped.

Flood overlay code

6. The hydraulic report prepared by NAXOS outlines a different flood level (8.1m AHD) to the previously approved flood level of 8.40m AHD for A006105836. The report should include a Manning value of 0.15 for the revegetated waterway.
 - a. Confirm the manning value of 0.15 has been utilized in the model and RPEQ comment on the change in flood level is required.
7. The provided hydraulic report prepared by Naxos outlines flood planning levels for the proposed Material change of use (MCU), however the hydraulic report does not address the subdivision component of the proposal.
 - a. Revise the hydraulic report to include/confirm the proposal achieves the required planning levels for proposed roadways and allotments, in accordance with the Flood overlay code. It is noted the road level is currently proposed at 10.5m AHD to 11.7m AHD. The flood immunity level of the lots and road is likely compliant, but the report needs to be revised to outline the minimum flood immunity level for the lots and road as per the Flood overlay code are met.

New Road

8. The plans have been revised to now provide an interim turn arrangement of a cul-de-sac head, partially within proposed Lot 5 (within an EMT). While the arrangement can be supported in principle, please clarify:
 - a. Proposed plan 25169-DA09 prepared by Verve Design Group appears to only show the pavement extents within the proposed EMT (verge area excluded). Demonstrate a minimum 2.5m verge is within the EMT extent.
 - b. Confirm any/all services associated with the potential future extension of the road (including telecoms and electrical) will be within the ultimate road reserve and not in the EMT extents.

Parking Provisions for proposed Lot 4 use

9. The RPEQ comments regarding the proposed Lot 4 MCU use parking demand have been reviewed. The presented performance outcome is an improvement on the prior layout (particularly with the removal of parking in front of roller doors). However, the proposed parking spaces within the building/units (on proposed Lot 4) are not supported. It is noted that the area of internal building spaces has been excluded from the Gross Floor Area (GFA) calculation used for parking calculations, the report states the units are approximately 80-90m² GFA and appears to disregard the mezzanine areas. The below items are to be addressed with revised plans and revised RPEQ reporting:
 - a. Remove the internal building car spaces from the plans.
 - b. Include the mezzanine areas in the GFA calculation and outlining clear limitations on the extent and use of the mezzanine for ancillary use.
 - c. It is recommended removal of the end unit on the central aisle to produce a supportable outcome to the site's parking provision through the removal of GFA and opportunity of additional spaces in this area.

Noise Emissions

10. The Noise Report Revision R1 by Assured Environmental 12/6/26 Project ID 18001 Release R1 has been reviewed, and the following information is required to clarify the assessment methods:
 - a. Confirm if tenancies in Table 6 would operate from 6AM – 7PM. The table mentions 100% usage at night, with night being from 10PM – 7AM and the proposed hours are only for 6AM – 7PM in the remainder of the report and the rest of the application.
 - b. Revisit the criteria in Table 16 as these appear inconsistent with the report which uses the correct criteria.
 - c. Advise if the roller doors are open or closed in the assessment.

Stormwater Quality

11. Refer to Figure 15 of the Stormwater Management Report Revision 3 dated 23/6/26 by Acor Consultants and submit this overall treatment plan in a digital format (MUSIC model).

Acid Sulphate Soils

12. Refer to Table 5.10.15—Potential and actual acid sulfate soils overlay. If the proposed development causes disturbance equal to or less than 5m AHD, provide a response to the Potential and actual acid sulfate soils overlay code and:
 - a. An Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) Investigation Report and Management Plan prepared by an appropriately qualified and experienced person, and prepared in accordance with relevant policies/guidance materials and technical guidelines/manuals such as:
 - i. State Planning Policy and SPP Guidance Materials;
 - ii. Queensland Acid Sulfate Soil Guidelines: sampling guidelines; laboratory methods guidelines/manuals; and
 - iii. Queensland Acid Sulfate Soil Technical Manual: Soil Management Guidelines.

Refuse area within ecological overlays

13. The amended Proposed Site Plan indicates that the proposed refuse storage area is partially located within the mapped Waterway Corridors Overlay and Biodiversity Areas Overlay. This location is not considered suitable and conflicts with the outcome and intent of the respective codes. The refuse storage area is to be relocated wholly outside of the mapped ecological overlays.
 - a. Provide amended plans which show the refuse area wholly outside the mapped Waterway corridors and Biodiversity areas overlays.

Inconsistent proposal with existing approval A006105836

14. Council is unable to support proposed development conflicting with the existing development approval for the Service station (A006105836). The proposed plans show a different layout, carparking arrangement, access, and potential impacts to the landscaping.
 - a. Either a change application to A006105836 or amended proposal plans are required to demonstrate the proposed development proposal aligns with the approved Service station.

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

Yours sincerely



Jenny Bernard
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services North
Phone: 0731780855
Email: Jenny.Bernard@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council