

9 July 2026

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

Attention: Tyrah Zarafa, Senior Urban Planner

|                              |                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Property Location:</b>    | 96 Goldieslie Road, Indooroopilly QLD 4068                                                      |
| <b>Property Description:</b> | Lot 4 on RP803072                                                                               |
| <b>Development:</b>          | Request to Change a Development Approval under Section 81 of the Planning Act 2016 – A006149162 |
| <b>Applicant:</b>            | Nicholson Gold Pty Ltd                                                                          |
| <b>Council Reference:</b>    | A006982987                                                                                      |

We refer to Council's Further advice received on 18 May 2026 and, on behalf of our client, forward the following as a **full** response to **all of the** requested items.

In support of this response, please find attached:

- **Attachment A** – Amended Architectural Plans (in parts)
- **Attachment B** – Landscape Plans
- **Attachment C** – Traffic Report

#### Concrete Escape Path

It is noted that a new concrete “escape path” is proposed to the rear of the development. This concrete path extends further into the covenant area approved as part of the original development application which is not supported by Council's ecologist. In addition, works to connect this footpath to a UU maintenance path within the adjoining Council owned park land is not supported. While it is understood this footpath is for fire evacuation purposes, further encroachment into the biodiversity area, and convent area is not supported by Council. Amend the proposed plans (architectural and LCP) to remove this footpath.

**NB:** Should the footpath remain wholly contained within the existing built form and footprint, preliminary earthworks plans and an amended LCPs should be provided to demonstrate how the existing land will be graded to allow for safe pedestrian thoroughfare, while not impacting flows through the mapped overland flow path, or inhibit the rehabilitation of certain areas, required by the original DA.

**Response:** The approved development included a building exit to the undercroft, refer approved plan A100, revision DA004. The requirement to provide an escape pathway is a result of building approval compliance. A concrete path is shown, with this pathway being amended to be located within the footprint of the undercroft and outside of any rehabilitation areas. The concrete pathway will be constructed on the existing surface level which is flat, and will connect with the site's frontage to the unformed Musgrave Road.

As the concrete pathway is being constructed on natural surface, earthworks plans are not required. The landscape plans have been updated to reflect the amended alignment.

No works are proposed within the road reserve.

### **Drive-way Crossover, pedestrian access and servicing loading areas**

The driveway crossover has been reduced from 6.5m to <5m wide. There is now no independent safe pedestrian access to the site. This is not accepted. There is also no room for vehicles to pass during operational waste collection or during furniture removalist vehicles being on site – which would be for much longer periods.

- Amend the drawings to demonstrate the provision of 6.50m driveway crossover, which is to be independent of the pedestrian accessway, and include dedicated / line-marked RCV/MRV servicing loading zones to dimensions of Table 12 TAPS PSP allowing an additional 2.0m behind the RCV (10.5m long) for safe WHS practices during loading of the bulk bins.
- The driveway and servicing general surface, manoeuvring, aisles, loading bays gradients must be in accordance with Table 12 of TAPS PSP, i.e., MRV / LRV @ 1:25 (4%), Note that RCV is required to be @ 1:20 (5%).
- Demonstrate that appropriate general surface, manoeuvring, aisles, loading bays grades of 1:25 have been provided.

**Response:** refer attached traffic report (**Attachment C**) prepared by ITE Consulting for a detailed response. We note that the driveway width has been correctly dimensioned as being 6.5m wide on the architectural plans. The proposed plans balance the need to retain Council's street tree, whilst seeking to resolve on-site servicing (pump room) and vehicle access in a constrained space. The proposal includes a delineated pedestrian pathway within the driveway to facilitate pedestrian connectivity to the street.

### **Refuse storage area is inadequate, nor roofed or screened.**

The applicant is to demonstrate on amended plans that the waste storage area is clearly labelled with its size including dimensions sufficient to accommodate the 6 x 1100L bulk bins required to support the development, and location of an appropriately sized "roller" door.

**Response:** The amended plans identify the bin enclosure being roofed and screened, with dimensions noted (4.8mx3.49m). Large door greater than the width of two bins are proposed, which don't conflict with the RCV standing on the site. Refer architectural plan DA06 (**Attachment A**).

.....

Should you require any further information, we would be pleased to assist.

Your sincerely,



**Liam Donald – Principal Planner**

DTS Group QLD Pty Ltd

Email: [planning@dtsqld.com.au](mailto:planning@dtsqld.com.au)