

29 September 2026

ATTENTION: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

C/- The Assessment Manager (Ryan Casey)
Brisbane City Council
GPO Box 1434
Brisbane QLD 4001

Email: DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au

CC: Ryan.Casey@brisbane.qld.gov.au

Dear Ryan,

RE: INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE FOR APPLICATION NUMBER A007002194

We refer to the Brisbane City Council's information request dated 19 May 2026 in relation to the application specified in the subject line above. The following is a response to the information requested in accordance with s13 of the *Development Assessment Rules*.

We note, in accordance with s32.2 of the Development Assessment Rules, the current period was stopped until 1 October 2026. In accordance with s32.5 of the Development Assessment Rules, the Applicant wishes to withdraw the stop the current period to allow the assessment period to commence as part of this response to the Information Request response.

In response to the information request from Council, please find attached the following documentation:

- **Appendix A:** Architectural Plans, prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd;
- **Appendix B:** Landscape Information Request Response, Prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd; and
- **Appendix C:** Landscape Concept Plans & Maintenance Manual, Prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd; and
- **Appendix D:** Traffic Engineering & Waste Management Letter, prepared by Modus Pty Ltd.

Information Request Item:

Building Height and Scale

- 1) *The proposed development seeks a performance outcome for the number of storeys, overall height, the transition to the adjoining dwelling houses, site cover, and setbacks. To achieve compliance with AO3/PO3 and AO4.1–AO4.2/PO4 of the Multiple dwelling code and OO3(g) of the Wynnum-Manly neighbourhood plan code, amend the plans to include the following:*

- a) *Show 'ground level' as defined in City Plan 2014, 1m above ground level and 11.5m above ground on all elevation and section plans.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A all sections and elevations have been updated to show natural ground line, 1m above ground level and the 11.5m above ground level.



- b) *Remove the fourth storey and reduce the overall height to not exceed 11.5m above 'ground level'.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A, building massing plan has been updated to show the portion of the building that exceed 11.5m from natural ground. As detailed on this plan it demonstrates that all of the building is 11.5m or less, other than a small portion of the roof/parapet of part of the rear of the building, more specifically a minor portion of Bed 1 and roof area of Unit 4 & 5 due to the slope of the site towards the rear of the premises.

The proposed development maintains a maximum 3 storey and 11.5m building height from the street and for majority of the built form.

- c) *An improved building height transition to the adjoining dwellings for the building elements above 2-storeys to achieve a sensitive reduction in building height to the adjoining dwelling houses.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A, each level of the building provides additional building separation to the adjoining neighbouring properties on the side boundaries, by providing greater setbacks to the boundary on each level, as well as variation in articulation and materiality combined with landscaping elements to soften the design.

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A the plans have been updated as per the following:

- Side boundary setback:
 - minimum of 1.5m on the ground floor to wall/balcony
 - maximum 3m on ground floor to wall/balcony
 - minimum of 2.51m on the upper levels to wall/balcony
 - maximum 3m on the upper levels to wall/balcony
- d) *Clearly identify where the proposed building height does not achieve AO4.1–AO4.2. Provide a visual representation of the proposed versus acceptable height transition outcomes on updated elevation plans.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A, building massing plan has been updated to provide a building height that is generally 11.5m or less from natural ground, with minor exceedance toward the rear of the building. Similarly, the proposed development provides building setbacks that are generally compliant with minor shortfalls toward the rear of the building.

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A, each level of the building provides additional building separation to the adjoining neighbouring properties on the side boundaries, by providing greater setbacks to the boundary on each level, as well as variation in articulation and materiality combined with landscaping elements to soften the design. As such the proposed development is considered to comply with PO4 of the Multiple Dwelling Code by providing a building height, scale and form that improves the amenity and achieves the intended outcomes contributing to a cohesive streetscape and built form character.

It should also be noted that weight should be given to the recently endorsed Version 37 of the planning scheme (current as of 18 September 2026), in relation to additional building height provisions to land within the Low Medium Density Residential Zone where the premises is within a key location. The proposed development is located on a premises that meets the requirements of the key locations which gives provisions for a maximum building height of 4x storeys and 14m. The current design would therefore comply with this outcome and therefore this outcome should be considered favourably by Council in their assessment of the current design.

- e) *Amended shadow diagrams showing the shadow cast by a building designed in accordance with all acceptable outcomes versus the shadow cast by the proposed building. Provide the comparison at each time (summer and winter solstice) on the same plan and show the shadows in context with the open space and habitable rooms on adjoining sites.*



Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A an updated shadow diagram plans have been provided to show the comparison at each time (summer and winter solstice) on the same plan and shows the shadows in context with the open space and habitable rooms on adjoining sites.

Setbacks, Separation, and Site Cover

- 2) *The proposal seeks performance outcomes for front and rear setbacks, adjoining building separation, car parking separation, and site cover under the Multiple dwelling code. Specifically, the proposal does not achieve AO3/PO3, AO6/PO6, AO7.1/PO7 (setbacks), AO14.1/PO14 (building separation), or Table 9.3.14.3.E (car parking separation). Site coverage of 72% is also proposed, in lieu of 45% as per AO8/PO8. Accordingly, submit amended plans showing the following:*

- a) *A minimum front setback of 4m to balconies on the upper levels.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A the plans have been updated to provide a minimum front setback from the upper levels to the current front boundary of 4m. We note, in complying with other information request items, the property is required to provide a verge widening to achieve a 3.75m wide verge, therefore the front boundary setback to the new front boundary property boundary becomes 3.809m to the upper levels.

- b) *A minimum 4.5m rear setback to the unit balconies and a minimum 6m rear setback to the ground level car parking area.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A the plans have been updated as per the following:

- Rear boundary setback:
 - a minimum of 4.5m on the ground floor
 - a minimum of 5.08m on the upper levels
 - a minimum of 5.809m to the ground floor car parking area

In relation to the rear boundary setback to the ground floor car parking area, the minor shortfall of 191mm is considered appropriate in this instance as the overall design in relation to core lift location, car parking layout, deep planting, etc., works efficiently based on the current siting of the building on the property. We note the rear boundary interfaces with a long residential driveway and therefore do not create any further amenity issues and will be appropriately planted out in the deep planting space to screen the car parking area.

As such, we considered this minor shortfall of 191mm setback appropriately in this instance and should be considered acceptable by Council in this instance.

- c) *Increase the separation distances to the adjoining dwellings.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A, each level of the building provides additional building separation to the adjoining neighbouring properties on the side boundaries, by providing greater setbacks to the boundary on each level, as well as variation in articulation and materiality combined with landscaping elements to soften the design.

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A the plans have been updated as per the following:

- Side boundary setback:
 - minimum of 1.5m on the ground floor to wall/balcony
 - maximum 3m on ground floor to wall/balcony
 - minimum of 2.51m on the upper levels to wall/balcony
 - maximum 3m on the upper levels to wall/balcony



- d) *Clearly identify where the building height above ground level alters the corresponding side boundary wall setback requirement on each level, to demonstrate compliance with the intended setback outcomes on each level given the sloping nature of the site.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A all sections the plans have been updated to show the relevant building height/storeys in relation to the proposed setbacks to the side boundaries. The plans provide a clear illustration of the building stepping in/setbacks increasing on the upper levels. As previously mentioned, the building provides a variation in articulation and materiality combined with landscaping elements to soften the design.

- e) *Provide a site context plan showing adjoining and adjacent buildings, including the location of private open space and windows, and demonstrate design responses to address building separation issues, including consideration of measures such as increased setbacks, offset balconies, placement of private open space, screening, and other suitable design treatments.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A provides a site context plan and street elevation plan showing adjoining and adjacent buildings in relation to the proposed development and interface of building and landscape elements.

Side Boundary Planting

- 3) *A continuous 1.5m planting width is to be provided along the full length of both side boundaries to support the establishment of shade trees to enhance privacy between adjoining sites, mitigate perceived building bulk, and improve solar shading to the building elevations in accordance with AO28.2/PO28 of the Multiple dwelling code.*
- a) *Provide amended drawings demonstrating 1.5m wide planting areas along the entire length of both side boundaries, incorporating appropriate screen and shade tree planting. The revised landscape treatment should improve privacy, enhance residential amenity, and contribute positively to the site's microclimate.*

Applicant Response

As detailed within the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B, the plans have been amended to provide a 1.5m wide landscape buffer zone at natural ground level for a large majority of both side boundaries. Please refer to the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B for further details.

- b) *Relocate the bin store to be clear of the side boundary landscaping.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Please refer to the Landscape Concept Plans & Maintenance Manual Prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix C, columnar screening trees *Elaeocarpus eumundi* (capable of a mature height of 8-10m) have been proposed where possible and additional buffering is provided by *Syzygium Lilly Pilly* hedges and underplanting.

Please refer to the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B for further details.

Deep Planting

- 4) *The proposed deep planting outcome is insufficient to balance the scale of the built form in accordance with PO3, PO7, PO8, PO28, and PO29 of the Multiple dwelling code.*

City Plan 2014 specifically requires deep planting areas to support large canopy and subtropical shade trees. Therefore, areas lacking adequate soil volume or building setbacks to sustain such trees cannot be considered true deep planting areas under the planning scheme. Deep planting areas are to have a minimum horizontal dimension of 4m x 4m at ground level, with trees positioned centrally to promote balanced root development and longterm structural stability.

Deep planting areas must be dedicated solely to planting and remain free of any structures above, within, or below, meaning basement, communal open space, and utilities infrastructure is not to encroach into deep planting.



- a) *Provide amended plans demonstrating a minimum of 10% of the site is allocated to genuine deep planting areas, each with a minimum 4m dimension, exclusively for the planting of large shade trees, and excluding services.*

Applicant Response

As detailed within the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B, the plans have been updated to include 13% Deep Planting (105.4m² of total site area). The proposed species have also been adjusted with large sub tropical shade trees *Waterhousea floribunda* proposed to the rear of the site for a bolstered landscape outcome along with the previously specified columnar screening trees.

Please refer to the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B for further details.

Frontage Planting

- 5) *A 2m wide minimum landscape width is required along the entire frontage for the development as per AO28.1/PO28 of the Multiple dwelling code.*
 - a) *Submit amended plans demonstrating a minimum 2m wide planting area for at least 50% of frontage length, excluding the driveway crossover and pedestrian access.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A and the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B, the plans provide a minimum 2m wide planting area along the frontage with the exception of the landscaped zone in front of Unit 1 patio and by relocating the booster cabinet.

This proposed planter will provide a 1m wide landscape streetscape softening and activation as well as amenity / privacy to the Unit 1 POS. Furthermore, to bolster the streetscape landscape offering 2 x new street trees have been proposed. Please refer to the Landscape Information Request Response Prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B for further details.

Access, Visitor Parking, and Private Open Space

- 6) *The proposed pedestrian and vehicular entry points are not separated in accordance with AO12.2/PO12 of the Multiple dwelling code, resulting in an interface where the visitor carpark crosses the pedestrian access path. Submit amended plans showing:*
 - a) *Safe and clearly separated pedestrian and vehicular access. This is to include relocation of the visitor car park in accordance with AO34.4/PO34 and provision of a minimum 4m x 4m deep landscape area.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A provides revised plans that demonstrate access arrangements in which a 1.051m pedestrian access is provided adjacent to the driveway of which passes in front of the visitor car parking space. The pedestrian path is proposed to be different material to the adjoining crossover/driveway to provide clear delineation between the spaces. Please refer to the Traffic Engineering and Waste Management Letter prepared by Modus Pty Ltd, included in Appendix D.

- 7) *The amenity and functionality of the front patio for Unit 1 is compromised by the location of the visitor car parking bay the building service cabinets that address Arnold Street. As a result, the space does not provide a functional outdoor area that enhances residential amenity or liveability. In accordance with PO5 and AO31.3-AO31.4/PO31 of the Multiple dwelling code provide amended plans showing:*
 - a) *The relocation of the visitor car park and reorientation of the booster/service cabinets to ensure the front patio functions as a usable and attractive private open space for Unit 1.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A and the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B, the plans provide a minimum 2m wide planting area along the frontage with the exception of the landscaped zone in front of Unit 1 patio and by relocating the booster cabinet.



This proposed planter will provide a 1m wide landscape streetscape softening and activation as well as amenity / privacy to the Unit 1 POS. Furthermore, to bolster the streetscape landscape offering 2 x new street trees have been proposed. Please refer to the Landscape Information Request Response Prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B for further details.

Driveway Grade

- 8) *The submitted Traffic Engineering Report, prepared by Modus Transport and Traffic Engineering, dated 19 March 2026, states in Table 4.4 that the maximum driveway ramp grade is 1-in-4. The submitted architectural plans show a maximum driveway ramp grade of 1-in-6. Council supports a maximum driveway ramp grade of 1-in-6 in accordance with the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing (TAPS) Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). To achieve PO1 and PO15 of the TAPS code:*
- a) *Clarify the discrepancy between the submitted Traffic Engineering Report and the submitted architectural plans and confirm that the maximum driveway ramp grade will be 1-in-6.*

Applicant Response

A revised car parking layout review has been detailed within the Traffic Engineering and Waste Management Letter prepared by Modus Pty Ltd, included in Appendix D. This table demonstrates compliance with Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing (TAPS) Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) and PO1 and PO15 of the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing (TAPS) Code.

Verge and Footpath

- 9) *The existing verge along Arnold St fronting the site does not comply with the minimum width of 3.75m as per AO1/PO1 and Table 8.2.20.3.B of the Streetscape hierarchy overlay code.*
- a) *Submit revised proposal plans that clearly demonstrate a linear dedication along the Arnold St frontage to ensure a minimum verge width of 3.75m is achieved.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A and the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B, the plans have been updated to clearly demonstrate a linear dedication along the Arnold Street frontage of a minimum verge width of 3.75m. Please refer to the Landscape Information Request Response Prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B for further details.

- 10) *The Streetscape hierarchy overlay mapping identifies the verge fronting the site as Neighbourhood Street Minor, requiring a 1.2m wide footpath. However, the submitted architectural, landscape and engineering plans show a 1.8m wide footpath.*
- a) *Provide amended plans demonstrating the provision of a 1.2m wide footpath at minimum 1.3m setback from the kerb with 1-in-10 transitions to existing paths.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A and the Landscape Information Request Response prepared by LAUDink Pty Ltd, included in Appendix B, the plans have been updated to provide a 1.2m wide footpath as per the Neighbourhood minor streetscape requirements and requested by Council.

Refuse Management

- 11) *The proposed development includes a "Screened & Covered Bin Store" of sufficient size to service the number of dwelling units. However, the current design and gradient of the driveway ramp create an unacceptable level of difference between the bin store and the Finished Floor Level (FFL) of the ramp. This arrangement does not achieve compliance with AO32/PO32 of the Multiple dwelling code and AO8.1-AO8.2/PO8 of the Infrastructure design code. Accordingly:*
- a) *Provide amended architectural plans, inclusive of sectional plans to:*
- i) *Ensure a continuous, step-free, and safe pedestrian path is provided between the bin store and the driveway ramp.*
 - ii) *Modify levels and/or gradients to eliminate the step created by the ramp design*
 - iii) *Demonstrate compliant access for waste collection, including manoeuvrability of bin without the need to traverse level changes*



- iv) *Clearly annotate all relevant finished levels and gradients on the plans to confirm compliance with the applicable codes.*

Applicant Response

As detailed on the Architectural Plans prepared by Marlow Architecture Pty Ltd, included in Appendix A the plans have been updated to provide the following:

- A continuous path from the bin store to the driveway ramp which is void of steps.
- Driveway levels demonstrating the maximum allowable 1:14 grade for the 240L wheelie bins.
- to and from the bin store, therefore providing compliant manoeuvring of bins.
- The finished level and grade of the bin store, noting a 1:20 fall towards the property boundary.
- A section drawing is provided to demonstrate the interface between the ramp and bin store.

Please refer to the Traffic Engineering and Waste Management Letter prepared by Modus Pty Ltd, included in Appendix D for further details.

Refuse Advice - Green Waste Service

- 12) *Council encourages the use of its green waste service. If the development is proposing to utilise the green waste service from Council, amend the proposal plans to demonstrate sufficient storage and kerbside presentation area for the required number of 240L green waste mobile garbage.*

Applicant Response

Please refer to the Traffic Engineering and Waste Management Letter prepared by Modus Pty Ltd, included in Appendix D for further details.

Conclusion

On behalf of the Applicant, RK Pty Ltd, VMS Town Planning & Development Consultants Pty Ltd has provided all of the information requested by Council. Council should now continue the assessment of the proposed development as sufficient information has been provided addressing the matters raised in the information request.

Should you require any further assistance in relation to this matter, please contact David Fisk of VMS Town Planning & Development Consultants Pty Ltd via email at vass@vmstownplanning.com.au or by phone on 0431 499 499.

Kind Regards,

VMS Town Planning & Development Consultants Pty Ltd

vstammes

Vass Stammes
Director

