



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

17 September 2026

Sungard Fortitude Valley Pty Ltd
C/- Urbis Ltd
Level 32, 300 George Street
BRISBANE CITY QLD 4000

ATTENTION: Rachael Greene
Application Reference: A007067215
Address of Site: 725 ANN ST FORTITUDE VALLEY QLD 4006

Dear Rachael

RE: Further advice

A review of the proposed s81 Minor Change application has been undertaken. In its current form, the extent of changes proposed require further justification to demonstrate that the development can satisfy the relevant minor change test and not result in 'substantially different development'. For the development to progress as a s81 Minor Change application, the following items are to be addressed. Where the development results in substantially different development the proposed changes will require a s82 Other Change application to be submitted for assessment.

Building height

- 1) To accurately confirm the building height of both towers, provide amended architectural plans which include the following:
 - a) the RLs of the roof level, roofed structures above and lift overrun
 - b) clarification on what will be contained within the 'Services Area' as shown on the proposed architectural plan titled 'Lift Overrun'
 - c) sections demonstrating the rooftop gardens achieve the "Rooftop garden" definition as prescribed in Schedule 1 of *Brisbane City Plan 2014*.

Streetscape activation

- 2) The previous approval provided excellent streetscape activation and casual surveillance along all frontages through the provision of commercial tenancies and activated residential uses, footpath dining opportunities, and good pedestrian connectivity, both internally and externally to the site. While it is acknowledged the revised proposal has retained the ground level commercial tenancies along Ann and Mclachlan Streets, the inclusion of lift core and stairwells along Winn Street and the large, empty lobby spaces, reduce the streetscape activation as required by PO8 of the Fortitude Valley neighbourhood plan code.
 - a) Amend the ground floor layout along the Winn Street frontage, in accordance with the following:
 - i) Rotate the stairwells 90 degrees to reduce their incursion into the pedestrian areas and provide to provide a more contiguous ground plane outcome.
 - ii) Include additional commercial or residential recreation uses within the lobby areas to activate the street frontage.

Private open space

- 3) The proposed change seeks to further reduce the size of the private open spaces (balconies) provided for the residential units. The private open space for the new podium units which are

only afforded 4m² and orientated towards each other will result in privacy impacts. These spaces are not considered to be functional nor appropriately sized to enhance amenity and liveability for the residents as required by the Multiple dwelling code. Additionally, the previous approval denoted that air conditioning condensers would be placed on some balconies, however, it is unclear where these utilities will now be located.

- a) Submit amended plans showing an increase to the size of the private open spaces, ensuring a minimum dimension of 3m is achieved, excluding any area required for utilities such as air conditioning units.

Verge dedications

- 4) While the application stipulates the proposed changes do not impact the previously approved non-trunk land dedications required for the applicable verge widenings and corner truncations, these have not been clearly noted and dimensioned on the architectural floor plans. To demonstrate compliance with the Infrastructure design code, Infrastructure design PSP and the Streetscape hierarchy overlay code and maintain consistency with the approval, provide amended architectural plans with dimensions, which include:
 - a) a minimum 3.75m verge along the full length of the Winn Street frontage while

NB: This dedication must not be encumbered by any built form associated with the tower or podium.

- b) a minimum 4.75m verge along the full length of the McLachlan Street frontage
 - c) the existing verge width along Ann Street
 - d) the corners of Winn Street/McLachlan and Winn Street/Ann Street provide/maintain corner truncations as six (6) metre by six (6) metre by three (3) equal chord truncations post verge dedications.

Architectural elements

- 5) The proposed podium carpark screening lacks sufficient detail to ensure the screening adequately limits sightlines into the parking areas and reduces light-spill in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Centre or mixed used code and the Multiple dwelling code.
 - a) Provide further facade details describing the intended screening treatment to the podium parking areas.
 - b) Demonstrate on plans the screening has limited opening apertures to ensure views of the parking and light spill are limited.
- 6) The revised north-western elevation now includes greater facade depth and shading elements to limit heat load from afternoon sun and ensures the facade achieves a similar visual depth to the previously approved development. Notwithstanding, there remain parts of this facade which are overly exposed to western sun and require further shading to achieve a suitable climatic response.
 - a) Provide amended plans which show the facade along the north-western elevation includes additional slab extensions and screening.

Access to Winn Street

- 7) Clarification on the proposed Winn Street crossovers is required. The non-standard splays of the previous approval are not shown on the proposed architectural plans. Particularly, the position of the second crossover (closer to McLachlan Street) does not align with the existing right of way easements (Easement A RP 203689 and Easement B RP 203689) that services the development and sites to the east. Provide:
 - a) Confirmation the splay/cross-over arrangements are being retained as per the current approval plan (300303889-SK08-06 Issue P2).
 - b) Details of the non-standard splays on the architectural plans.

- c) RPEQ-endorsed swept path plans demonstrating sufficient splay/width of the cross-overs for the largest service vehicles manoeuvring (ingress/egress), considering Winn Street's narrow carriageway and on street parking.

Carparking layout

- 8) The proposed carparking layout is indicated within the traffic report to comply with TAPS PSP requirements and the report justifies some parking aspects with supportable performance outcomes for end aisle treatment, circulation aisle width and ramp grades to AS2890.1. However, the architectural plans do not detail the carparking layout dimensions (carparking aisle width, carpark dimensions, cross-over dimensions, bicycle parking aisle width etc).
 - a) Update the architectural plans to include the carpark layout dimensions.

PWD spaces

- 9) A single visitor PWD carparking space and adjacent shared space is to be provided in each building in accordance with Section 7.9 of TAPS PSP.
 - a) Provide revised plans demonstrating a compliant PWD space as per AS2890.6.
 - b) Ensure dimensions are included on the plans of the space and shared area and the shared space bollard.

NB: A reduction in the visitor carparking provisions to achieve the PWDs is not supported as this would produce a non-compliant outcome with the TAPS code provisions. Accordingly, resident carparking provisions may need to be decreased for each building to provide the required PWDs.

Refuse

- 10) The size of the residential 'Waste Store' for Tower A and Tower B is based on reduction technology, however the reduction technology and compaction ratio have not been denoted on the plans. In addition, the dimensions of the waste stores have not been shown, the bins under the chutes are not segregated, the transition from the chutes to the bins have not been detailed and the waste stores are not screened. Provide amended plans which:
 - a) Demonstrate scaled reduction technology within both residential waste stores.
 - b) Ensure the compaction ratio of 3:1 is clearly denoted on the plans.
 - c) Demonstrate the waste stores are fully screened.
 - d) Demonstrate the transition from the chute to the bins.
 - e) Clearly show the separation barrier around the bins under the chutes.
 - f) Denote the dimensions (length and width) of the waste stores.
 - g) Clearly label the waste stores as 'Residential Waste Store'.
- 11) It is noted the non-residential waste stores are located within the residential waste stores. The residential and non-residential waste stores must be separate with separate access to each. In addition, the proposed changed development includes a 'Food and Drink Outlet' use, therefore, the refuse calculation for the non-residential uses must be based on the Food and drink outlet refuse generation rate.
 - a) Submit amended plans which:
 - i) Provide separation of the residential and non-residential waste stores.
 - ii) Provide separate access to each store.
 - iii) Show the non-residential waste store for Tower A has minimum internal dimensions of 7m x 1.2m.
 - iv) Show the non-residential waste store for Tower B has minimum internal dimensions of 3m x 1.2m.
 - v) Show the non-residential waste stores are within a screened enclosure.
 - vi) Clearly label the non- residential waste stores as 'Non-Residential Waste Store'.
 - b) Consider relocating the non-residential waste stores to the northeast wall of both loading bays between the columns, ensuring it does not interfere with the swept path of the Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV).

Servicing

- 12)** The provided RCV swept path analysis utilises the incorrect design vehicle (single axle vehicle), does not state the vehicle parameters utilised for the swept path (type of vehicle, design speed, kerb to kerb turning radius, lock to lock time etc), manoeuvres on gradients greater than that specified in the TAPS Planning Scheme Policy (1:8), and the naming convention for the analysis states 'B99 Swept Paths'.
- a) Provide an updated RPEQ-endorsed swept path analysis demonstrating a RCV as per BSD 3008 sheet 2 of 2 can safely and efficiently service the development., including:
 - i) State the design vehicle parameters utilised for the swept path. Ensure to utilise a 6s lock to lock time and a 9.757m kerb to kerb turning radius.
 - ii) Demonstrate the ramp gradients comply with those stated in the TAPS PSP or provide justification and certification of the proposed ramp gradients.
 - iii) Correctly label the swept path analysis.

NB: Council will not entertain the conditioning of ramp gradients.

Additional plans and documentation

- 13)** To facilitate the full assessment of the proposed changes, additional information, plans and clarification is required to understand how the development complies with the relevant assessment benchmarks of *Brisbane City Plan 2014* and site conditions.
- a) Provide amended plans which:
 - i) denote bedrooms, bathrooms, MPRs etc on all levels of the development
 - ii) the separation distances between the proposal and adjoining buildings (internally and externally) with specific identification of separation between balconies and habitable rooms/openings on each property
 - iii) the location of the basement intake and exhaust that is separated a minimum 15m from any sensitive use.

NB: Whereby adequate separation distances or setbacks cannot be achieved the proposal must not only rely on screening to protect the amenity and privacy of affected adjoining landowners.

- b) Provide the terms of easement documentation for the following easements:
 - i) Easement A RP 203689
 - ii) Easement B RP 203689
 - iii) Easement D RP 203689
- c) Provide revised 'Existing easement plan' to reflect the correct lot descriptions and easement alignments in accordance with the subsequent easement documentation.
- d) Demonstrate that no encroachments within the existing right of way easements are proposed.

NB: Several of the development's columns are noted within the existing right of way easements, and the alignment of some of the easements are changing. In its current form, the development appears to conflict with the terms of easement. Consent is required from the beneficiaries of the easements in this instance.

Noise

- 14)** The proposed change to the development has the potential to impact on the noise amenity of nearby and onsite sensitive land uses/zoning.
- a) Submit further information demonstrating that the proposed uses can comply with the hours of operation and screening requirements as prescribed in the Centre or mixed-use code.
 - b) Whereby compliance with the acceptable outcomes cannot be achieved, submit a revised noise impact assessment report prepared in accordance with the Noise impact

assessment planning scheme policy demonstrating that PO1 of the code can be achieved.

Affected Entity - Energex

15) The proposed changes must be referred to Energex to ensure the development complies with any advice agency's requirements.

Please phone me on telephone number below during normal business hours if you have any queries regarding this matter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Tyrah Zarafa', is written over a light grey rectangular background.

Tyrah Zarafa
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services
Phone: 07 31786103
Email: tyrah.zarafa@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council