
FW: Objection /Submission A006924087

From dalodgement <dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Date Wed 2026-03-18 3:33 PM

To CPEDS-DS-PlanningSupport <CPEDS-DS-PlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Cc DA RECORDS <DA_RECORDS@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

📎 1 attachment (89 KB)

jan's objection.pdf;

SECURITY LABEL: OFFICIAL

Sent: Wednesday, 18 March 2026 2:36 PM

To: dalodgement <dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Cc: DA RECORDS <DA_RECORDS@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Subject: Objection /Submission A006924087







To: Mr Dominic Hudson,

the subject of this development application. I respectfully request that Council refuse this application of dominant built form, in its entirety for the reasons outlined below.

1. Inconsistency with Character and Planning Controls

The proposed **five-storey, 14.5-metre** development is roughly double the height and scale of surrounding dwellings. Its visual dominance and bulk are entirely inconsistent with the established streetscape and materially conflict with:

- Traditional Building Character Overlay Code
- Low-Medium Density Residential Zone Code LMR2 Zone.
- Multiple Dwelling Code
- Landscape and deep planting requirements
- New Farm Neighbourhood Plan
- Brisbane City Plan 2014

The proposed **89% site coverage** is far outside the pattern of development in this character street. The massing directly on boundaries creates a “wall effect” that fundamentally alters the pre-1946 character, roof forms, setbacks and scale of the neighbourhood.

A reasonable outcome would be consistent with recent development in Bailey Street on a comparable lot, which integrates respectfully with the character context whilst increasing density.

2. Basement built on property boundary, Height, Bulk, Scale & Setbacks

The proposed development advertised signage nominates setbacks larger than those shown on the drawings. Developer plans submitted with the application, shows the basement level being built directly on the shared boundary with myself and 49 Villiers Street, with **NO SET BACK**. This would mean my 2 bedrooms and bathroom and front verandah, upper living dining and kitchen look directly at a 2.65 metre solid high and intrusive wall of brick. I would point out that the developer has not sought my consent for a zero -lot boundary wall, and this is not in keeping with LMR2. Significantly impacting amenity of all my property, garden areas also, creating a stressful environment as no outlook into this wall.

The proposal places substantial building mass directly on my boundary. This results in impacts:

- It is noted while this basement garage level is as stated above, plans for ground level has no setback it is not referenced on the Public display sign.
- Excessive bulk and dominance on other levels, from both the street and the surrounding 3 properties in Villiers & Charles Street.
- Significant overshadowing

- Loss of winter sunlight, as evidenced in their proposal where they provide the shadow lines (also refer point 5 below)
- Loss of solar access to my rooftop solar panels : refer point (3)

I further object to the built to boundary exit stairs and potential entry into the car parking, thus allowing many to use this entrance on my boundary impacting my use of my verandah.

The upper-level terrace, fifth storey and rooftop swimming pool intensify further overlooking, would create significant noise by large groups, and visual intrusion. Given the natural fall of the land, the height of the structure would physically and visually overwhelm my pre 1935 built character home.

3. Privacy and Direct Overlooking

As the immediate adjoining owner, the privacy impacts are severe introducing no less than 32 persons to reside in this potential unit complex based on the number of bedrooms. 5 X 3-4 bedrooms and producing potential for cars density increase to 50 cars to be accommodated, then estimated guest numbers to be in 3 figures. The greatest actual effects are notwithstanding, yet to be known.

ALL windows, balconies and open verandah along my front outlook, impacted by the proposal overlook my:

- Kitchen, direct viewing , line of sight into this much used space.
 - Bedrooms, direct viewing into these 2 bedrooms from above.
 - Bathrooms, direct viewing , bathroom windows need to be opened for ventilation
 - Living and dining areas, direct viewing into these two main areas upstairs from above also
 - Front verandah, open and exposed to privacy and overlooking impacts that are intense and distressing.
 - Side, rear and front gardens, all would be impacted as this is a small lot of 290 sq metres, where everything is used and is my only natural environment to enjoy.
-
- The fifth-storey terrace and rooftop pool allow direct downward views into private spaces. Insufficient screening and intrusive window placement would dramatically affect the amenity of my property, forcing me to keep blinds and windows closed simply to maintain basic privacy.
-
- This is not a reasonable or acceptable outcome for a compliant and major neighbouring property. Privacy has not been considered in this zero lot boundary section of the proposal to BCC.

4. Noise and Mechanical Impacts, density

City Plan requires development to protect the privacy of adjoining residents through appropriate setbacks, permanent screening, and sensitive built form design. A separation distance of 5 metres between directly facing habitable rooms is inconsistent with these

requirements presented. The development proposal includes instead the opposite to those considerations. It includes zero boundary:

- A very significant large basement exhausting system located directly on my front boundary creating impacts. See downloaded pictures of this highlighted boundary section.
- 5 Air-conditioning units running along my boundary thus creating constant noise impacts
- Rooftop plant equipment & Lift overruns with rooftop plant equipment
-

Further, the mechanical exhaust has impacts to air quality, would operate continuously, emitting noise and fumes directly toward my property. This raises genuine concerns about noise disturbance and air quality as my open verandah is within 1 -1half metre of this proposed exhaust location and at that level.

The rooftop pool and communal areas will introduce after-hours noise inconsistent with the quiet residential character currently enjoyed.

5. Loss of Natural Light, Overshadowing , Solar access & Amenity

The development would increase the building height from 9.4 M to 14.5 metres. The proposal casts my property into shadow for extended periods, significantly reducing natural light to my dwelling, side & front garden as well as verandah. Overshadowing of this magnitude is inconsistent with amenity protection throughout the LMR2 zone intent, and should maintain reasonable amenity and sunlight access for neighbouring properties.

The applicant's own shadow diagrams demonstrate the complete negative light on my property in both summer and winter solstice. This is significantly an unacceptable impact.

- Significantly overshadow my home and gardens with negative light and loss of winter sunlight to habitable rooms, private open space and to rooftop solar panels of which I have invested in 18.
- Reduce natural light internally and externally
- Introduce light spill and night-time illumination changing a person's ability to sleep
- Permanently diminish residential amenity, and the loss of winter solar access is a recognised planning impact and is inconsistent with acceptable residential amenity outcomes

I reiterate, Loss of winter sunlight is a recognised amenity impact and is particularly significant for my property, which already sits on a divided small lot of 290 sq metres, with no boundary setbacks.

6. Landscaping and Deep Planting Deficiencies , Inadequate Unreliable Privacy screening design methods

The applicant proposes planter boxes and internal drapes from the ground floor plans, Level 1 and up apartments, as a primary privacy mitigation method. These are inadequate for the reasons. Planter boxes cannot provide permanent screening and internal drapes are not an acceptable permanent screening mechanism. Planting in planter boxes relies on residents maintaining these and will provide small and inadequate plants at best. Curtains rely on occupant behaviour, and is not a solution. Discretionary internal treatments are not thoughtful or acceptable.

With such extensive building coverage, at 89% coverage, meaningful deep planting is not realistically achievable anywhere near my boundary. The landscaping shown appears impractical due to the footprint and boundary conditions.

Footpath planting opportunities are also constrained significantly and misleading, by three poles and wires in a cluster at my boundary fence line. See and note, existing Energex and Telstra Phone Box infrastructure.

The absence of deep planting will impact strongly environmentally, in what is significant bird and other animal life experienced presently.

7. Traffic, Parking and Safety

This corner site is located close, diagonally opposite and the potential to 8 fold increase in population density, from family home of 4 to expand to 32 conservatively is a tremendous impact to street safety and parking. Traffic congestion, on street parking shortages, safety risks for children crossing, and safety of the church congregation which are elderly and would find the changes unexpected and impossible when parking is unavailable in this busy Villiers Street community.

- A Catholic primary school in Villiers Street
- A heritage church in Villiers
- An area with already high parking demand due to commuter parking just outside the 2 hour city zone, the proximity to New Farm Village and local shops and restaurants.

For a property of 607m² even with a dual home configuration, there would be an expectation of 4 cars, where as this development could see multiplication of that number. Five units will materially increase vehicle movements during and after construction. The proposal provides inadequate visitor parking (1 only), which will inevitably push more cars onto an already constrained street.

These impacts are inconsistent with the LMR2 zone intent for low to med intensity residential development.

8. Stormwater and Environmental Impacts on green space, trees, bird and animal life

Even revised landscaping plans are inadequate. My property sits on the lower side of Lot 10. Increased hard surfaces and reduced permeable area raise concerns about stormwater runoff toward my home.

The removal of mature trees will reduce neighbourhood character, shade and biodiversity and affect absorption and as a consequence, importantly air quality..

Conclusion

This proposal represents clear overdevelopment of a small corner lot for substantial monetary gains.

The scale, height and bulk are entirely inconsistent with surrounding compliant properties, including my own home, which adhere to the **9.4-metre** height limit.

As the neighbour most directly affected, the impacts on my daily life would be profound. My home — a compliant two-storey character dwelling — would be overshadowed and overlooked by a structure that rises far above the surrounding houses. The sense of privacy, sunlight, quiet enjoyment and neighbourhood character that currently exists would be permanently lost.

There is also a broader neighbourhood impact. Villiers Street is a recognised character precinct with a strong community fabric, supported by the nearby school and heritage church. This proposal undermines that context and introduces a scale of development that is simply incompatible with the immediate area and creates a very worrying precedent for further development degrading the entire zone.

For the reasons outlined in my submission above I conclude this overdevelopment is a substantial outlier with this established pattern of gracious character homes. Briefly, it:

- Conflicts with the Brisbane City Plan 2014
- Is inconsistent with character, scale and setback provisions
- Causes unacceptable privacy, noise and overshadowing impacts
- Introduces traffic and safety risks by its place in the street & density
- Fails to provide real and useful landscaping
- Represents clear overdevelopment of lot10

I respectfully request that Brisbane City Council **refuse Application A006924087** in its current form it fails to meet key performance outcomes. I respectfully ask that the site be redesigned for a genuine residential outcome consistent with its traditional Character context. Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours sincerely,