



**City Planning & Sustainability  
Development Services**

Brisbane Square, 266 George Street, Brisbane Qld 4000  
GPO Box 1434 Brisbane QLD 4001  
T 07 3403 8888  
[brisbane.qld.gov.au](http://brisbane.qld.gov.au)

*Dedicated to a better Brisbane*

11 February 2025

Hanok Developments Pty Ltd  
C/- Wolter Consulting Group Pty Ltd  
PO Box 436  
NEW FARM QLD 4005

**ATTENTION: Aidan Balaam**

**Application Reference:** A006598464  
**Address of Site:** 280 ROCHEDALE RD ROCHEDALE QLD 4123

Dear Aidan,

**RE:** Further advice

Council has reviewed the information request response received on 26 November 2024 and 27 November 2024 in response to Council's letter dated 30 September 2024 and 19 November 2024 and it is determined that the following items need to be addressed to progress the application.

**Bushfire access and egress**

1. The submitted information request response does not respond to the concerns raised in Council's letter dated 19 November 2024., regarding Bushfire access and egress. As previously noted, the proposed development is within an area mapped as high hazard within the SPP Natural hazards risk and resilience mapping and medium bushfire hazard within the *City Plan 2014* Bushfire overlay. PO18d of the Bushfire overlay code requires development to ensure that the road layout and design provides alternative egress routes considering the most likely bushfire scenarios. Bushfire Reporting has confirmed that vegetation immediately adjacent to the access road (270 & 300 Rochedale Rd) is considered high potential bushfire intensity. As the proposed development has one road for access/egress that is surrounded by hazardous vegetation, this represents vulnerability in the design of the egress system for the proposed subdivision. As one point of access/egress is proposed that is particularly vulnerable to bushfire hazard, the proposed development is not considered to comply with PO18(d) of the Bushfire overlay code. It is recommended that an alternative access route on neighbouring properties is investigated to demonstrate compliance with PO18(d) of the Bushfire overlay code.

**Note:** The proposed development cannot be supported in its current form unless Item 1 is addressed to Council's satisfaction. Subject to the bushfire access and egress being addressed, please amend the proposal and provide to address the following matters:

**Stormwater**

2. The Stormwater Quantity Management Plan prepared by ADG Engineers dated 27 November 2024 does not provide details on the detention basin sizing such as storage required, 1% AEP level, spillway level, orifice size and ensuring all storm events were modelled.

a. Provide details as would typically be provided for detention basin sizing to ensure there is adequate space provided; and

- b. Ensure the detention basin is designed to allow the existing dam to be retained with minimal disturbance as noted in item 5.
3. The proposed location of the outlet from the basin at the site boundary is not supported. The proposed location will not allow flows to be dissipated to non-scouring velocity nor are the flows at the discharge point as per existing runoff conditions, as it is a concentrated outlet versus sheet flows. Additionally, the flood impact assessment has no relevance to the issue of whether there is sufficient room to construct the necessary flow dissipation infrastructure. Equally any spillway also needs to be setback from the boundary.
  - a. Submit an amended design to discharge all stormwater (from pipe and spillway) to a long level spreader located in the Northeast corner of the site (adjacent to existing dam location) that is set back at least 3.0 metres from the boundary and from any significant vegetation to be retained and ensure no infrastructure is located within the proposed future sewer easement.

### **Ecological values**

4. Whilst some positive changes have been made to retain additional non-juvenile Koala habitat trees, it is noted the extent of earthworks and development footprint area is substantial and have not been reduced as previously requested in Council's information request. A reduction in earthworks along the northern and southern boundaries in conjunction with appropriate placement of the development footprint is required to facilitate further retention of koala habitat trees and the safe movement of koalas in accordance with PO7 & PO8 of the Biodiversity areas overlay code, and PO2, PO4, PO5 and PO16 of the Rochedale urban community neighbourhood plan. Additionally, it is identified that Tree 109 is a large significant tree and is considered a keystone structure within the landscape which must be retained through exclusion of earthworks from its TPZ. It is also noted from the Tree Retention and Removal Plans, some of the tree locations are inconsistent compared to the previously lodged assessment material.
  - a. Submit amended plans demonstrating a reduction in development footprint area locations and extent of earthworks for the proposed lots. Development footprint area must contain all infrastructure associated with the development, including earthworks, building envelopes, effluent disposal areas, level spreaders and any required bushfire setbacks;
  - b. Provide an amended Tree Retention and Removal Plan (TRRP) which demonstrates further retention of koala habitat along the northern and southern boundaries, and exclusion of earthworks from the TPZ of Tree 109. The Tree Plan must clearly indicate accurately surveyed locations (i.e. accurate to  $\pm 100$  mm; handheld GPS locations not accepted) of all trees on site, and within 6 m of site boundaries to ensure accurate assessment of the proposal;
  - c. An assessment undertaken by a qualified arborist (minimum AQF level 5 Arboriculture) is required where proposed works encroach into the TPZs of any trees identified to be retained. The assessment must be undertaken to inform proposed civil design (i.e. earthworks, proposed services locations etc.), and ensure accurate Tree Retention and Removal Plan and Offsets Strategy documentation is provided for assessment; and
  - d. Provide an amended Offsets Strategy which accounts for additional vegetation retention as required.
5. Regarding the existing dam on the site, a review of historical imagery confirms the presence of a waterbody at least since 1987. Artificial dams are known to play a similar role to natural wetlands when they are managed and have fringing vegetation (which provides filtration and habitat complexity) helping restore biodiversity by providing wetland habitats for native wildlife. For biodiversity planning purposes, Council adopts the Queensland Government's definition of wetlands, which can be found here: <https://wetlandinfo.des.qld.gov.au/wetlands/what-are->

[wetlands/definitions-classification/wetland-definition.html](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/wetlands/definitions-classification/wetland-definition.html). It is acknowledged that some works may be required to the existing dam to reinforce the dam and ensure ongoing safety. Works required to stabilise the dam are supported.

- a. Amend the plans to show the retention of the existing north-eastern dam and fringing vegetation.
6. It is noted an existing environmental covenant is present on the adjoining property along the eastern boundary, which requires retention of vegetation. Where any proposed earthworks will likely encroach into the TPZ of adjoining neighbouring vegetation, supporting documentation demonstrating viable long-term retention of vegetation on the adjoining site is required.
  - a. Submit amended TRRP which includes adjoining vegetation, and an assessment undertaken by a qualified arborist (minimum AQF level 5 Arboriculture) in conjunction with any required design changes to ensure no long-term impacts to neighbouring vegetation.
7. The Concept Rehabilitation Plan (CRP) includes proposed planting outcomes for the proposed detention basin however the existing wetland is to be retained as required under the Wetland overlay code.
  - a. Submit an amended CRP including the retention of the wetland as noted in item 5 and required under the Wetland overlay code, which includes details of embankment stabilisation and subsequent rehabilitation.

#### **Wastewater treatment**

8. The on-site wastewater management assessment prepared by Gilbert & Sutherland received on 26 November 2024 shows wastewater disposal areas insufficient in size as the calculations does not comply with AS/NZS1547:2012. The hydraulic loading estimate must be calculated based on 8 persons capacity and the proposed recalculation based on future house design is unacceptable, as the spatial requirements for the effluent disposal area may potentially impact the proposed lot sizes for the current development.
  - a. Submit an amended report with calculations for 8 persons capacity in accordance with AS 1547 for On-site domestic-wastewater management.

#### **Urban utilities connection**

9. It is noted that Urban Utilities Service advice notice included in the Engineering response indicates the requirement for an easement corridor for future sewer alignment. Submit amended Subdivision plan showing an Urban Utilities easement along the eastern boundary.

Should you wish to amend the application to resolve these matters it is recommended that you extend the decision period by written notice in accordance with the Development Assessment Rules.

Please phone me on the telephone number below if you have any queries regarding this matter.

Yours sincerely



Kayal Chandrasekar  
Urban Planner  
Planning Services South  
Phone: 34030086  
Email: [Kayal.Chandrasekar@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:Kayal.Chandrasekar@brisbane.qld.gov.au)  
Development Services  
Brisbane City Council