Our Ref: S25-110

Western Partners Pty Ltd

Sunshine Coast Office
P 0437 335 403

2 March 2026
Brisbane City Council
Development Services

Attention:	Angela Cleary
Brisbane City Council Reference:	A006836143
Proposal:	Development Permit for a Material Change of Use of Premises to Establish a Multiple Dwelling

RE: RESPONSE TO COUNCILS FURTHER ADVICE REQUEST ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVEMOPMENT PERMIT FOR A MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE OF PREMISES 140 & 142 FRASERS RD MITCHELTON

Information Required:
Request Item 1 – Flooding and Stormwater

a. *Remove the proposed levees and redesign the proposal so that it adequately addresses the flood overlay and waterway corridor overlay codes in the City Plan 2014 (see further below).*

Response:
The proposed surface level of the private roads and townhouses adjacent to the channel have been redesigned (lifted) to ensure that the flooded extent does not rely on the vehicle barrier located on the edge of the road adjacent the channel (water level is lower than the edge of the road). It is noted that the vehicle barrier is required from a safety perspective however is not included in the modelling.

1.1 Flood Report

b. *Provide the flood level contours at 0.25 metre intervals. This may be required to be 0.1 metre intervals depending on the hydraulic gradient for both existing and proposed scenarios. Also compare volumetric assessment of the flooding for the existing scenarios and the proposed scenarios.*

Response:
Updating mapping has been provided for all modelled events. The contouring has been provided at 0.25m contours except for the developed 1% AEP, 0.2% AEP and 1% AEP blockage events. For these events contours have been provided at 0.2m for greater clarity. Contours at less than 0.2m were considered but were to unclear. A volume comparison has been undertaken comparing the volume under the existing and developed peak water levels in the 1% AEP events. It was found that the developed case resulted in a minor loss of storage however the volume of the culverts is greater than the difference. The developed site overall would maintain the existing flood storage volume. Please refer section 4.3.1 for details.

c. *The flood level and the planning level for units 15 to 30 are indicated as one flood level and one planning level in the hydraulic assessment report, while the area is indicated at different levels on the architectural plans. These units cover the site from the upslope boundary to the downslope boundary and there is clearly a change in flood levels across this range. Provide flood level information as per the information request for assessment to proceed.*

Response:
Table 16 and 17 have been updated and TH 15-30 have been broken up into townhouses that share FFL. The flood levels and minimum habitable floor levels have been amended as per the latest revision of the plans. The minimum achieved freeboard achieved has been added to the tables. All proposed townhouses achieve greater than the minimum 0.5m required.

d. *Units south of the culvert crossing are to have planning levels that provide 500mm freeboard to the 1% AEP flood level including for culvert blockage. A severe storm impact is to be included in the assessment as per QUDM 7.2.4 as well as assessing flood impacts for the 0.5% AEP and 0.2% AEP flood events.*

Response:
A severe storm impact statement has been provided (refer section 4.4.3). The SSIS considers the new culvert crossing as well as the existing crossing at the downstream end of the site.
It is restated that the risk assessment for blockage has deemed the proposal to be low and high levels of blockage unlikely. Townhouses south of the culvert crossing have between 0.85-1.00m freeboard in the 1 in 500 year design event. In the provided 1% AEP event with 50% inlet blockage applied flows are demonstrated to be contained within the road and discharge downstream of the culvert crossing.

e. *Provide more detail on the internal culvert crossing sizing.*

Response:
Refer attached plans for culvert sizes, invert levels etc.

f. *Ensure all units and the associated retaining walls are not located within the overland flow path.*

Response:
The retaining walls for the proposed development only encroach in minor ways to the 1% AEP flood extent. The encroachment has been shown to create no additional adverse impact to neighbouring properties and the volume analysis has shown that flood storage has not been impacted.

g. *Modelling of the proposed flood levels are to include sensitivity analysis if the culverts are partially or fully block and the impact on the proposed units, downstream and upstream properties.*

Response:
Sensitivity analysis has been included. The impacts on available freeboard have been documented in table 20.

h. *Clearly state the proposed flood planning levels of the habitable, non-habitable, open space and vehicle manoeuvring in compliance with AO5.1 of the flood overlay code and AO7.1 of the stormwater code. Note as a waterway the 1% AEP is the defined flood level. This is to be consistence across all plans.*

Response:
Please refer tables 16 and 17 which document the FPL, minimum freeboard to be achieved, freeboard and minimum floor level achieved for habitable, non-habitable, vehicle manoeuvring and open space areas.

i. *Provide an easement over the 1% AEP indication extent to protect the conveyance and storage of the flooded area.*

Response:
Please refer to the attached preliminary engineering plans, which note the extent of the water level for the 1% AEP event with the waterway.

1.2 Upstream Drainage

a. *Provide evidence of the drainage that is mentioned within the Stormwater Management Plan.*

Response:
The Stormwater Management Plan notes that a drainage connection is not required for the adjoining properties, as the adjoining properties can discharge to a lawful point without the need for a piped connection through the site.

b. *Provide an upstream drainage connection that services the upstream properties to the east in accordance with PO11 of the stormwater code.*

Response:
An upstream drainage connection is not considered warranted, as the upstream property can discharge stormwater from the site to the existing waterway or to the kerb and channel on Frasers Rd, both of which are suitable lawful points of discharge. A cut-off drain has been proposed to manage any of the overland flow that may reach the eastern boundary from the adjoining site, but this upstream catchment is minimal, and there is an existing shared access road adjoining the eastern boundary, which is assumed to be able to manage the stormwater flows from this site.

c. *Provide a 1.5 metre wide easement centred over the upstream drainage connection that services the upstream properties in accordance with AO11.1/PO11 of the stormwater code.*

Response:
An easement has not been proposed, as no upstream drainage connection point has been provided to service the upstream lot.

Request Item 2 – Earthworks

a. *The submitted Site Survey and Engineering plans indicate that the fill long the Western boundary of units 35 to 43 varies from 3 metres to 2.6 metres in height with a 625mm setback. This does not align with the submitted site plans by Angelo Patrick Architect or the Stormwater Drainage plans. Ensure that the proposed earthworks are in alignment between the engineering plans and architectural.*

Response:
The earthworks plans have been updated to coordinate with the architectural drawings and relevant stormwater drainage plans.

b. *Clearly demonstrate the existing and proposed surface levels, retaining wall locations and heights on a concept earthworks plan.*

Response:
Existing contours are shown on the earthworks plans, and the proposed surface levels are included. Retaining wall locations are indicated, and heights are shown in the plan and sectional views. The drawings are considered to document all required information clearly.

c. *Provide cross- sections at regular intervals to demonstrate the extent of cut and fill and retaining wall heights, as required to provide clarity on the proposed site levels and retaining walls.*

Response:
Earthworks cross-sections have been provided at regular intervals to demonstrate extent of cut and filling and retaining walls. Cross-sections also clearly indicate the height of the retaining walls.

d. *Retaining walls over 1 metre in fill height on the boundary are not supported by Council and should be terraced in accordance with AO2.1 of the filing and excavation code.*

Response:
Retaining walls over 1 meter have been shifted back from the boundary and terraced in accordance with the filling and excavation code.

Should you require further information in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact me at the Sunshine Coast office.

Yours faithfully,

Jared Hill CPEng | RPEQ 19891

Partner | Sunshine Coast Civil Manager
Western Partners Pty Ltd