

**Our ref:** STP4828  
**Contact:** Mike Harries | [mike@steffanharries.au](mailto:mike@steffanharries.au)  
**Website:** [www.steffanharries.au](http://www.steffanharries.au)  
**Phone:** 07 3317 0042



Monday, 30 March 2026

Chief Executive Officer  
Brisbane City Council  
GPO Box 1434,  
Brisbane Qld 4001

**Attention:** Chris Dixon  
Via email: [DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au)

## RE: RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

**Multiple Dwelling (34 Units)**  
**COUNCIL REF:** A006943953  
**61 Landis Street, McDowall QLD 4053**  
**Lot 31 on RP810085**

Dear Chris,

I refer to the Information Request received from Brisbane City Council dated 19<sup>th</sup> of February 2026 in relation to the development application lodged for a Multiple Dwelling (34 Units) at 61 Landis Street, McDowall. On behalf of the applicant, Steffan Harries provides the following response in addition to the following attachments:

- **Appendix A** – Revised Proposal Plans
- **Appendix B** – Landscape Design
- **Appendix C** – Traffic Engineering
- **Appendix D** – Site Based Stormwater Management Plan
- **Appendix E** – Flood Report
- **Appendix F** – Civil designs
- **Appendix G** – Erosion Sediment Control Form

---

### Density

1. The proposal provides a development density of approximately 50 dwellings per hectare, which is not reflective of the 18 dwellings per hectare outlined in (2)(d) of the Emerging community zone code and is not commensurate with suburban living generally as anticipated in the Low density residential zone or appropriate for the site's location within the city and its local context (overall outcomes (2)(b) and (2)(c) of the Emerging community zone code and overall outcome 3 of the McDowall neighbourhood plan).

- a. Provide amended plans significantly reducing the development density and scale to be appropriate for the Emerging community zone and context of the site.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, revised proposal plans. To address the concerns raised by Council, the originally proposed 34 dwellings has been reduced to 27 dwellings. This overall reduction has reduced the proposed density to 33 dwellings per hectare down from the originally proposed 41 dwellings per hectare. As shown in the below table, the proposed density of 34 dwellings per hectare, in line with recent approvals nearby which all have a greater dwelling density. Given this, the proposed development is in line with the community expectations for the site with more dense developments already occurring within proximity of the site.

**Table B – Local Approved Multiple Dwellings**

Site Address	BCC Zone	Dwelling Count	Total Site Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Dwelling Density (dph)	MCU Reference ID
67 Landis Street, McDowall	EC	45	10,135	44.4006	P&EC – 3971/19
906 Hamilton Road, McDowall	EC	37	9,961	37.1449	P&EC – 839/20
902 Hamilton Road, McDowall	EC	83	20,270	40.9472	P&EC – 1468/24
112 Beckett Road, McDowall	EC	22	5,883	37.3959	A004036835
36A Boulting Street, McDowall	EC	30	8,349	35.9324	A004220432
111-123 Soames Street, Everton Park	EC	48	13,481	35.6057	A003975587
11 Tuckeroo Street, McDowall	EC	23	5,371	42.8226	A003585315

Further to the above, a number of other relevant matters have been identified to support the additional density on the site in the original lodgement material. These matters have not changed since the lodgement of the application and should be a key consideration in the assessment of this application. because it aligns with As the site is well located and highly serviced, it represents a good opportunity for well placed density to occur.

## Height

2. The proposed height of 3 storeys and 10m fronting De Mille Street is inconsistent with the surrounding Low density residential area comprised of 1-2 storey Dwelling houses and does not comply with the overall outcomes of the Emerging community zone code which require development to be up to 2 storeys in height (overall outcome 2d) and appropriate for the site's location within the city and its local context (overall outcome 2b). The McDowall neighbourhood plan also requires development in the Emerging community zone to have a built form no greater than 2 storeys for this site (overall outcome 3(f)(ii))
  - a. Provide amended plans showing the built form presenting as 2 storeys where seen from De Mille Street, with any 3<sup>rd</sup> storey component located towards the middle of the site so as to have the appearance of 2 storeys when viewed from De Mille Street. This could be achieved by removing the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey where forward (south) of the central stair well.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. To address the concerns raised, all dwellings have been reduced to 2 storeys in height.

## Design

3. The development provides two Units 1 and 22 visible and parallel to the street frontages of Landis and De Mille Street, however they are not parallel to and facing the street (AO11.1, and AO12.3 of the Multiple dwelling code) and present facades as a single mass with no articulation, eaves, balconies, awnings and minimal roof, window and material variation that create a finer grain (AO9.3 and AO10.1 of the Multiple dwelling code) that would contribute to the streetscape and facilitates better casual surveillance and street activation. The built form includes wall lengths of 27m with no substantial variation in building line of +/- 2m, no rooftops expression, eaves or climatically appropriate separation (AO9.1 and AO10.1 of the Multiple dwelling code) which does not provide a human scale consistent with the form and character of the neighbourhood streetscape or a building form that is contextually and climatically responsive.

Variation in built form can include different elements of the building in plan and elevations, fluctuating roof forms, expression of entries, balconies and outdoor living areas and modulate the elevation to include awnings, sun shading, screening, variation in materials, finishes and textures

Further, units 16, 23 and 34 include highly visible facades facing communal spaces but do not include design elements to reduce the bulk and scale of the development and address climatically appropriate forms. These units should provide dual aspect dwellings or respond to orientation so that the facades reflect a human scale to the public areas and positively contribute to internal spaces through shading and opportunities for cross ventilation.

- a. In accordance with PO9-PO12 of the Multiple dwelling code, provide amended plans showing the following:
  - i. Multiple dwellings orientated towards the street frontages;

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. Given the constraints of the site in relation to access and flooding, providing dwellings along the frontage is not possible for the site. To address these concerns, the townhouses closest to the street have been redesigned to provide the front door and additional openings addressing the frontage of the site where possible.

- ii. Provide a better transition to low density residential zone and pedestrian route and communal spaces that promotes a climatically responsive form and create a human scale with the inclusion in rooftop variation similar to internal street, greater building separation such as centrally locating the communal areas, greater variation in materials;

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The dwelling density has been reduced with the heights reduced to not exceed 2 storeys.

- iii. Provide unit 1 and 22 with a street address with pedestrian access, façade form and material articulation that contributes to streetscape similar to the internal street facades;

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. A dedicated pedestrian access has been provided throughout the development, with increased material articulation provided where possible.

- iv. Units 16, 23 and 34 that front public communal spaces to provide variation in roof form, eaves, material variation and awnings and shading devices to reduce the bulk of building form.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The overall bulk of the built form has been reduced with less units proposed in a row. Additionally, articulation has been provided through different roof forms and other architectural design methods.

- v. Provide awnings with sufficient depth to provide shading to windows, vertical shading to western windows and awnings over windows to allow passive ventilation through window protection.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. Shading devices have been provided where possible.

- vi. Show the extent of privacy screening proposed to units addressing each other across internal road access.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. Screening and other privacy techniques have been incorporated into the design where possible, including but not limited to privacy film to windows and more solid appearing balustrading.

- vii. Provide greater variation and articulation in the facades to reduce the extent of homogenous uniform walls.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. Greater articulation has been provided throughout the design to address these concerns.

### **Building length and separation**

- 4. The proposed building lengths of 27m with no substantial variation in building line result in a bulk and scale which does not adhere to the expectation for development in the Emerging community zone and within the McDowall neighbourhood plan, which is to reflect a house scale and the existing pattern of development. AO9.1 of the Multiple dwelling code envisages a full building separation of 6m or a change in building line of plus or minus 2m for a length not less than 5m, for every 15m. The current plans show a 1.5m gap every approximately 27m, with limited variation and articulation.
  - a. Provide amended plans showing a built form which is reflective of a house scale for suburban living generally as anticipated in the Low density residential zone, as per (2)(c)(i) and (ii) in the Emerging community zone code. This is to be achieved by reducing the length of individual buildings and increasing the internal building separation.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. Building lengths have been significantly reduced, with variation provided in the building line.

5. The proposed internal building separation of 8.3m does not comply with AO3 and AO14.1 of the Multiple dwelling code and it is not clear how privacy will be achieved.
  - a. Provide amended plans demonstrating the proposed units and windows are offset and sufficiently separated to ensure no direct views and privacy impacts.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. A 9m building separation has been provided across the driveway area in addition to screening and other devices.

### **Pedestrian access and pathway**

6. The plans do not show a sheltered entry and waiting space for pedestrians.
  - a. In accordance with AO12.2 of the Multiple dwelling code, provide amended plans showing sheltered pedestrian entry and waiting space with lighting and the location of mailboxes. The sheltered area is to allow for sufficient standing area.

**Response:** A separate entry has been provided to the site. It is noted that Figure s referenced in AO12.2 appears to refer to an apartment style arrangement for a multiple dwelling, which is not occurring in this circumstance. We fail to see the need to provide shelter given the layout of the proposed townhouse style arrangement. Nevertheless, the proposed development is deemed compliant with PO12.

7. The width of the pedestrian entrance and pathway is approximately 855mm wide which is not a sufficient width to allow safe and convenient access for residents and visitors and allow people to pass. There is also a concern the width is not adequate to allow cars to reverse and be seen by pedestrians, and the pathway does not provide access to each unit.
  - a. Provide amended plans showing a minimum 1.2m pedestrian prioritised pathway and entry, with measurements shown on plans and extended to access each unit.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. A 1.2m wide pathway has been provided.

### **Communal open space**

8. It is not clear from the plans submitted how communal open space will be functional, attractive and useable and cater for a range of recreational opportunities. In particular, it is unclear how the north-eastern communal open space will be separated from the traffic aisles, will include adequate facilities and will not be impacted by the adjoining refuse storage area.
  - a. Provide amended plans showing communal open space which allows for a range of passive and active recreational opportunities and flexible use for a range of uses in accordance with PO30 of the Multiple dwelling code.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The common recreational areas have been revised to include a pool, bbq area and picnic spots to address the concerns raised.

- b. Consider locating the communal open space more centrally so that it is easily accessible for all residents.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The common recreation area has been located more centrally.

### Private open space

9. The Multiple dwellings along the southern boundary have a private open space area of 20m<sup>2</sup> or less, however the landscape concept plan illustrates the area will only be used for clothes drying and planting, with no space for recreational activities. Given these are the larger 3 storey units with 5 bedrooms plus a multi-purpose room, a minimum private open space area of 35m<sup>2</sup> at ground level is expected, which is directly accessible from the main living areas of the unit and caters for the private recreational needs of future residents. In its current form, the private open space is not appropriately sized and designed for the functional use of the possible number of residents in each dwelling.
  - a. Provide amended plans designating a minimum 35m<sup>2</sup> private open space to each unit in accordance with AO31.1-AO31.2/PO31 of the Multiple dwelling code. The private open space must be separate from deep planting.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. All units achieve the 35m<sup>2</sup> requirement, with an upper floor balcony also provided.

### Landscaping

10. The proposed north-south internal aisle extends to the northern boundary with no landscaping buffer. It is noted the adjoining Multiple dwelling's private open space is directly adjoining. Further, the extent of internal private road between buildings without adjoining landscaping creates hardstand without any natural shading to manage glare and heat island effects or greenery to break up the built form.
  - a. Provide amended plans showing a minimum 1m landscape buffer and 1.8m high acoustic fence for the width of the internal aisle in accordance with AO35.2 and AO35.5/PO35 of the Multiple dwelling code.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. A setback of 3m is now proposed to this area. It is noted that a 1m wide landscape strip and retaining wall already exist along this section of the site on the adjoining lot. Given this and the proposed setback, no further treatments are deemed necessary.

- b. Provide landscaping adjoining the internal driveway to break up the hardstand area, soften the built form and provide shading in accordance with PO26-PO29 of the Multiple dwelling code.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix B**, a revised landscape plan for the site. As requested, additional landscaping has been provided along the internal driveway area.

### Plan details

11. Provide amended plans showing the following details, which are required for assessment and clarity:
  - a. Provide elevations and section drawings. The elevations are to correctly show the elevations of the development, be correctly named and illustrate and notate the ground level, the 9.5m line above ground level, and the floor and roof levels in meters RL.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

a. Notate all significant setbacks and building separation distances on the architectural plans.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

b. Notate unit numbers on the architectural plans, ensuring consistency with the landscape plan.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans and **Appendix B** a revised landscape plan. Both plans have been updated as requested.

c. For completeness and clarity, provide a second floor plan (similar to 'Ground Floor', drawing no. 1187 Rev A) showing the second floor of all units.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

d. Provide a plan showing how deep planting has been calculated.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The deep planting areas have been shown on the Site Plan.

e. Ensure there are no conflicts between architectural, landscaping and engineering plans.

**Response:** To our knowledge no conflicts exist in the revised material.

12. The plans include limited annotations and illustrations to clearly depict areas of communal open space, visitor car parking, refuse storage (roofed, screened and enclosed), etc.

a. Provide amended plans clearly demonstrating all aspects of the development.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

### **Vehicular access**

13. Driveway access into the site cannot conflict with the existing stormwater gullies as this location is a sag and gullies cannot be moved elsewhere. Conversion of these gullies to field inlets is not supported as the lintel is what captures the majority of the minor and major flow and grates must be assumed significantly blocked as per QUDM drainage design.

a. In accordance with PO7 of the Stormwater code, relocate the driveway 15m north out of the sag towards the northern boundary between the two existing stormwater gullies which are to remain

**Response:** Driveway access has been updated as requested in the revised material.

b. Alternatively, provide a solution that ensures inlet capacity of existing lintel is not

reduced in the sag and that the lowest point of the sag (confirmed with survey) will still drain via a lintel.

**Response:** Not applicable. The crossover has been realigned.

### Stormwater

14. There is an upslope catchment of approximately 2.4ha (excluding unit site that pipes 1% AEP flows via detention) that originates from Hughes Street to the north of the site. The major flow from that catchment will pass through the site at the approximate location of the existing 375RCP.

a. In accordance with PO1, PO3 and PO4 of the Stormwater code, divert the pipe to the rear of the development and provide a minimum 3m wide flowpath (sized by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ) with swale along this pipe alignment. The swale will require an easement in favour of Council for open cut channel and underground drainage.

15. The existing 375RCP running through the site is located mid of townhouses and will be built over by the future dwellings. The layout needs to ensure this pipe is located at the rear or side boundary of any proposed building, not on the building envelope.

a. Provide plans showing a modified Easement A based on revised flood extents, extending along Landis Street flooded frontage and all flooded parts of site.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix D** and **F**, revised civil designs and stormwater management plan that demonstrate

### Erosion

16. Provide an erosion hazard assessment form completed. Please refer to the following link <https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-and-building/applying-and-post-approval/afterapproval/erosion-and-sediment-control-esc>

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix G**.

### Plan consistency

17. The submitted plans in general require amendments to be consistent within each other, for instance the site plan 1187 / A by Pembroke, does not demonstrate the bicycle parking spaces for visitors, neither provides a general legend to clearly identified the proposal.

a. The proposed site plan is to demonstrate the bicycles spaces, the width of the access consistent with the traffic report, refer to SK07 (traffic report by Modus which shows the access as 8.31m access width), site plan shows it as 7.409m.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

b. SK07/A by Modus shows the visitor bicycle spaces proposed location, where the services layout by Bravo shows the location of the new domestic and above ground fire service meter assembly.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

- c. In addition, the strip of land as shown on the road and services layout plan 3574005/A by Bravo and within townhouse B2 and B3 indicated for Stormwater Bern, is not shown on the architectural plans. The units are proposed with a share boundary /wall.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

- d. The landscaping plans 1764LC /A sheet 3 and sheet 4 shows an area highlighted in yellow, in one of the plans and in grey in the other and identified as refuse area. Proposed refuse storage outcomes and visitor bikes are unclear. Proposed plans and traffic reporting is to clearly show refuse storage locations and bicycle spaces for visitors.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix A**, a revised set of proposal plans. The requested additional detail has been provided.

- e. The access to unit B3 and manoeuvring to this end townhouse garage is significantly constrained even with the proposed wider garage door from Modus RPEQ comments on SK07/A.
- i. Plans and reporting are to be updated to a consistent outcome. The visitor parking at the front of this unit may need relocation.

**Response:** Please find both an updated Traffic Report by Modus Traffic and Transport Engineering as **Appendix C** showing access to all units is compliant.

- f. The visitor car parking space adjacent to unit 23 clash with landscaping, privacy to windows of unit 23 and retaining wall.

**Response:** Parking has been reallocated on the site to address these concerns.

- g. The location of the transformer differs between the architectural drawings and the landscape concept plans.

**Response:** This has been rectified on the revised material.

## Servicing

18. RPEQ confirmation is required for the suitability of detention tanks within the driveway (underground tank) for RCV and LRV driveway designed to cater for heavy traffic loading.

**Response:** Underground tanks are regularly utilised where RCV and LRC access is provided. Appropriate structural engineering design can be conditioned if this is a concern for Council.

19. The LRV Swept path SK09/ A by Modus, is not the 12.5m vehicle specified in the Transport, access, parking and servicing (TAPS) code. A RPEQ is to document/ justify the proposed performance outcome for the reduced sized vehicle.

**Response:** Please find both an updated Traffic Report by Modus Traffic and Transport Engineering as **Appendix C** addressing this concern.

20. The RCV swept path SK08/A by Modus is based on a reduced turning circle from BSD / Refuse PSP requirements and required to be updated. The RCV exit path not shown on the plans.

- a. Review plans and reports. All proposed plans, reports are to be amended to provide a consistent outcome and be in accordance with PO18 and PO19 of the TAPS code.

**Response:** Please find both an updated Traffic Report by Modus Traffic and Transport Engineering as **Appendix C** addressing this concern.

## Earthworks

21. The retaining wall against the boundary to the eastern side is greater than 1m in height and is to be reduced to a maximum of 1m in height in accordance with PO2 the Filling and excavation code. If walls are required to be more than 1m in height, such walls are to be tiered and terraced.

**Response:** To address this concern, the height of the proposed retaining has been reduced along the rear or eastern boundary. The proposed walls only now marginally exceed the 1m requirement. Given the small extent of exceedance, the proposed outcome is not considered to result in a significant impact on the amenity of the adjoining premises.

22. The 3.55m high wall adjoining to the drainage easement to the south, seems excessive and does not address PO2 of the Filling and excavation code. Review the design and amend or provide an engineering justification.

**Response:** Please find attached as **Appendix F**, revised civil designs for the development. The extent of earthworks has been significantly reduced along the southern edge of the drainage corridor, to be closer aligned with the existing approval over the site.

23. The extent of fill as shown in green and over the existing gully easement (fronting De Mille Road) is not supported. Clarification is required about this represented fill.
  - a. Amend section C to show the cross section up to the property boundary to De Mille Road

**Response:** For clarification, this area is to retain the existing levels through this area. Please refer to **Appendix F**, Section C on Drawing No. 3574-003.

24. It appears section A-A on 003/A should be section C, review and amend as necessary.

**Response:** Requested amendment has been addressed in the revised material.

25. It appears a retaining wall is located through the internal driveway on the south-eastern corner of the site, as shown on the engineering plans.

- a. Provide amended engineering plans ensuring no retaining wall is located across a driveway.

**Response:** Requested amendment has been addressed in the revised material. A section of the driveway is proposed to be suspended, hence the appearance of a retaining wall in the driveway area. This section of driveway and dwelling will be suspended over this space.

## Refuse

26. The proposed plans are required to address the relevant assessment benchmarks relating to refuse.
- a. In accordance with PO32/AO32 of the Multiple dwelling code and PO8/AO8.1, AO8.2 of Infrastructure design code, provide amended plans which address the following requirements:
    - i. Clearly identify the refuse storage areas on all relevant proposal plans.

**Response:** All refuse areas have been clearly outlined on the revised material.

- ii. Demonstrate the western refuse storage area having a minimum internal size of 9.26m<sup>2</sup> (3,900mm x 2,375mm) and the eastern refuse storage area having a minimum internal size of 15.24 m<sup>2</sup> (5,200mm x 2,930mm). Note dimensions to be clearly demonstrated on the proposal plans.

**Response:** Please refer to **Appendix A**, that demonstrates both refuse storages areas are 5.2m x 3m as a minimum.

- iii. Demonstrate the refuse storage areas contained either within a dedicated room or roofed and wholly screened enclosure. Where screening is utilised to form part or all of a refuse storage area, the screening is to have a maximum of 25% openings, with a maximum opening dimension of 50mm, and are to be permanently fixed, durable and maintainable.

**Response:** Both refuse storage areas will be screened and roofed. We request Council to impose a reasonable and relevant condition.

- b. In accordance with PO1/AO1, PO18/AO18 and PO19/AO19.1, AO19.2, AO19.3 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing (TAPS) code, provide amended plans and supporting documents which address the following:
  - i. Provide updated RPEQ certified swept paths for the RCV using the correct design parameter of a kerb-to-kerb diameter of 9.757m as per BSD-3008 sheet 2 of 2.
  - ii. Provide updated RPEQ certified swept paths which demonstrate both the ingress and egress manoeuvre for the RCV.

**Response:** Please find both items addressed in an updated Traffic Report by Modus Traffic and Transport Engineering provided as **Appendix C**.

---

As per section 13.2 of the DA Rules, this letter provides a response to:

- a) all of the information requested.

Should Council have any outstanding issues associated with the information provided within this report, we formally request that Council informs us prior to making a decision.

Kind regards,



Mike Harries | Director

**Steffan Harries**

**Email:** [mike@steffanharries.au](mailto:mike@steffanharries.au)

