



**City Planning and Economic Development Services
Development Services**

Brisbane Square, 266 George Street, Brisbane Qld 4000

GPO Box 1434 Brisbane QLD 4001

T 07 3403 8888

brisbane.qld.gov.au

Dedicated to a better Brisbane

11 August 2026

Newstead Maud Pty Ltd
C/- Therefor Group Pty Ltd
PO Box 436
NEW FARM QLD 4005

ATTENTION: Emily Richards

Application Reference: A007068254

Address of Site: 17 MAUD ST NEWSTEAD QLD 4006

Dear Emily

RE: Information request in accordance with the Development Assessment Rules

Council has carried out an initial assessment of the above application and has identified that further information is required to progress the application to a decision.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there is an increase in the height of development approvals within the locality, the immediate vicinity and streetscape do not accommodate any developments or approvals of the size presented in this application. The development is inconsistent with the intended built form for the location and will result in amenity impacts to existing and future developments. The proposal also seeks an oversupply of car parking for a site located within the City Core. If the proposal is amended to suitably reduce the building height and remove excess car parking, the following technical matters must also be resolved.

The proposed development is categorised as Impact assessable and public notification is required to be undertaken for this development application in accordance with the Planning Act 2016. All submissions received regarding the development application will be considered as part of Council's assessment and further information or changes may be required following the completion of public notification and upon review of any submissions received.

Height

1. Development on this site is prescribed to feature a maximum height of 8 storeys as identified in AO6, AO7.3 and Table 7.2.14.5.3.B in the Newstead North neighbourhood plan code, AO21, AO22 of the Centre or mixed use code and AO4.1 of the Multiple dwelling code. The development is instead proposing a maximum height of 19 storeys (including the rooftop terrace).

Additionally, it is understood the rooftop terrace has been designed to comply with the definition of the 'rooftop garden' so as not to constitute a technical storey. Despite this, a review of the proposed rooftop communal space does not appear to fully comply with the definition and therefore constitutes a storey, bringing the total number of storeys proposed to 19.

Whilst there are some approved and under construction developments in the streetscape and wider neighbourhood area exceeding these acceptable outcomes, it is not apparent that the proposed height of the development will result in a cohesive streetscape or appropriate building form and character that is:

- *consistent with the anticipated density and assumed infrastructure demand;*
- *aligned with community expectations about the number of storeys to be built;*

- *designed so as not to cause a significant and undue adverse amenity impact to adjoining development; and*
- *sited to enable existing and future buildings to be well separated from each other and not to prejudice the development of an adjoining site.*

The proposed development in its current form is considered to result in undue amenity impacts and will reduce the visual prominence of Montpelier Hill (PO1 of the Newstead North Neighbourhood Plan).

- a. Reduce the height of the tower to be more consistent with the intended height for the location.
- b. Review the assessment of the 'rooftop garden' definition and ensure that all heights above the rooftop level comply with those specified in the definition.

Bedroom breakdown

2. The submitted information advises that there are 15 x 2-bedroom units, 45 x 3-bedroom units and 4 x 4-bedroom units. It is acknowledged that the submitted information notes the inclusion of multipurpose rooms. These rooms however appear to be largely enclosed and could potentially form an additional bedroom. This would also affect infrastructure charges that would be required should the development be approved.
 - a. Provide amended plans which ensure any multimedia/multipurpose rooms are open and unable to be turned into bedrooms.
3. It is also recommended that a review is conducted for additional rooms on each level. For example, penthouse 2 on levels 16/17 includes a room that is unclear in its purpose and does not have any doors. Provide amended plans to ensure access is adequately provided to each room within the development.

Carparking provision

4. The proposed development has provided 144 parking spaces, which results in an oversupply of 50 spaces above the calculated mandatory City Core maximum number of 94 spaces. It is acknowledged that the lodgement of the application included a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) report from an RPEQ that justifies the high-end product with supporting details.

Despite this, the area is known for traffic issues, and an oversupply of parking is likely to negatively impact the existing situation. The carparking provision does not comply with PO1 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing (TAPS) code in that the development is unable to ensure the efficient operation and safety of the development and its surrounds.

- a. Provide amended plans with a reduction that is compliant with AO1 of the TAPS code and the maximum carparking rates identified in the TAPS planning scheme policy.

Car parking design

It is noted that the submitted engineering reporting includes plans that are older than the architectural plans submitted. The engineering report and assessment should be re-examined to ensure that the information provided is up to date.

5. There appears to be a significant level difference between the substation levels and the ramp access levels on ground floor. This difference appears to be approximately 1.1m and result in a drop at the door to the substation. Further clarification is required to ensure the design is practical and safe.
 - a. Amend the proposed plans as required to ensure the area functions safely. Carparking changes may need to occur in order to ensure sufficient access is provided.
6. There appears to be a potential flooding concern with basement flooding via the fire door access located at approx. 3.47m AHD on the Ground level. Further information is required to ensure that the area is appropriately flood proof.
 - a. Provide finished floor levels to lobby and the fire stairwell.

7. There is a concern with the parking safety of spaces G-16; B1-22; B2-22; B3-22 which, with aisles less than 6.20m wide have the potential to result in property damage, even at low speeds. Consider safety in design mitigation measures for these spaces.
 - a. Remove the identified car parking spaces from the plans; or
 - b. Make the identified car parking spaces 'small spaces' only and demonstrate they are suitably safe through swept paths.
8. The access aisle to the resident bicycle parking area adjacent to car space 10 on the ground floor is non-compliant. The width should be approximately 1.5m to ensure a person is able to walk through next to their bicycle and the plans indicate a width of 1m. Review the current design and consider deleting car space 10 to accommodate safe bike / walking rider access in accordance with AS2890.3. The car space may be suitable to remove altogether or change to a small parking space.
9. Provide amended plans with a pedestrian sightline splay, 2m x 2m, as per fig C of TAPS PSP, to the exit driveway.

Setbacks and privacy

10. The proposed development seeks side boundary setbacks of 3.350m to the side boundaries which is less than the 6m side boundary setbacks described in AO26 of the Centre or mixed use code. The current side setbacks proposed, combined with other performance outcomes sought, are not considered to minimise the impact of the development on the amenity and privacy of adjoining residents, or adequately consider future development in order to meet PO26 of the Centre or mixed use code.
 - a. Provide greater side boundary setbacks.
11. The proposed rear boundary setback, at 4.045m is less than the 10m rear boundary setback described as an acceptable outcome in AO25 of the Centre or mixed use code as being an acceptable outcome. The current rear setbacks proposed, combined with other performance outcomes sought is not considered to comply with the performance outcome (PO25) in that the current proposal does not support building separation to provide visual and acoustic privacy without screening and the reduced setbacks will also result in additional building bulk and shadow casting to nearby sites.
 - a. Provide a greater rear boundary setback.
12. Whilst it is acknowledged that access to natural light, daylight, breezes and views for the residents of the building is important, this needs to be balanced with the privacy of the adjoining neighbouring properties as well as future development.
 - a. Further information is required to demonstrate that the development will not have an adverse impact on existing and future adjoining development. This may require an increase to setbacks and building separation as identified in this information request or changes to the screening along the balconies at the rear of the site.

Building Separation

13. The proposed development includes habitable rooms with windows orientated to the side and rear boundaries which are less than the 24m distance described as an acceptable outcome for levels above 9 storeys and above in AO27.1 and AO27.2 of the Centre or Mixed-Use Code. It is not apparent that the design ensures privacy and amenity for adjacent sites has been protected nor is it apparent that future development has been considered for adjacent sites (PO27).
 - a. Provide greater separation between existing and future development on adjacent sites.

Bicycle parking provision

14. The proposed basement bike parking envelope widths do not appear to meet the minimum requirement of 500mm. The submitted TIA report advises that all resident bicycle parking spaces have been provided in the form of dynamic multi-tiered bicycle stackers. Further information is required for typical system utilised for the multi-tiered stackers.
 - a. provide details on the bicycle stackers to be utilised for the residential bicycle parking areas. For example, do the rack systems reduce widths by alternating heights of

bicycles to comply with the relevant standards? Alternatively, the removal of some carparks to provide additional bicycle parking space could suffice, where appropriate.

Motorcycle parking

15. No motorcycle spaces have been provided. In car parks with more than 50 spaces, 2% of the number of spaces required to comply with the requirements of TAPS planning scheme policy Table 13 and 14 are provided as marked and signed spaces for motorcycles, each measuring 2.5m by 1.35m, located immediately adjacent to major pedestrian access points.
 - a. Provide the recommended number of motorcycle parking spaces.

Verge width

16. Maude Street is classified as a City Centre Minor – CS (02) with the requirement for a minimum 3.75m wide verge. The current verge width appears to be less than the minimum requirement. As a result of this, a land dedication maybe required.
 - a. Provide amended plans to clearly show the verge width and any land dedication (if required). If verge widening is required, this may impact on building setbacks and landscape design at the ground level.

Urban Utilities (UU)

Council does not undertake water and sewer assessment of any planning applications. Contact UU on (07) 3432 2200 to discuss any water and sewer issues and whether you are required to submit an application to UU for assessment.

Responding to this request

Your response should include a summary table which outlines any changes to performance outcomes and plans that have resulted from addressing the issues outlined above. The table should also include details of any supporting documentation.

If a response is not provided within the prescribed response period of three (3) months assessment of the application will continue from the day after the day on which the response period would have otherwise ended.

Email your response to DSPlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au quoting the application reference number A007068254.

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

Yours sincerely



Abby Bannan
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services North
Phone: 31782418
Email: Abby.Bannan@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council