



**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

13 August 2026

Fernycare P/L
C/- Ken Drew Town Planning Pty Ltd
PO Box 860
HAMILTON QLD 4007

ATTENTION: Ken Drew

Application Reference: A007057614
Address of Site: 6 PLAYFIELD ST CHERMSIDE QLD 4032

Dear Ken

RE: Information request in accordance with the Development Assessment Rules

Council has carried out an initial review of the above application and has identified that further information is required to fully assess the proposal.

In particular, the proposal raises key built form and urban design issues relating to the height, podium design, reduced setbacks, traffic generation and the street interface. These matters affect the presentation of the development to Playfield Street and Hamilton Road, the relationship of the podium and tower form to adjoining sites, and the ability of the ground floor arrangement to contribute to an active, landscaped and pedestrian-focused streetscape. These issues must be satisfactorily resolved before Council is able to make a decision on the application.

It is important to note this application is impact assessable which will require public notification. Council's assessment of this application will take into consideration submissions received during the public notification period.

Building Height

- 1) The proposal exceeds the height requirement of the Chermside centre neighbourhood plan, Playfield Street sub-precinct (NPP-001d) Table 7.2.3.6.3.B. The proposal appears greater than 12 storeys but the total is unclear as the top floor level may constitute another storey if not compliant with the requirements with the Rooftop Gardens and Landscaped Greenspace policy as part of the roof top recreational spaces. Insufficient information has been provided to adequately address AO1 / PO1 of the Chermside centre neighbourhood plan.
 - a) While the proposed plans show the general height, bulk and scale of the adjoining approved building (A006508922) at 8-12 Playfield Street and that the proposal appears to be similar in height, the approved building is on a much larger site which allows for greater height under Table 7.2.3.6.3.B and relies on basement parking rather than podium parking to ensure the overall height, scale and form of the approval achieves the intended outcome for the precinct and contributes to a cohesive streetscape and built form character.
 - i. Provide further information and detailed analysis demonstrating the overall height, scale and form achieves the intended outcome for the precinct and contributes to a cohesive streetscape and built form character.

- ii. Shadow diagrams comparing a building complying with the acceptable outcomes of the applicable assessment benchmarks with the proposed development. The 'compliant' development should reflect not only the height but also the setbacks and tower site cover anticipated by the Chermside centre neighbourhood plan.
 - iii. Amended plans showing the RL(m) to the highest point of the proposed building and the highest point at RL (m) of the adjoining approved buildings.
- b) Additional information is required to confirm the top floor level is in accordance with the criteria of the Rooftop Gardens and Landscaped Greenspace policy.

Building Site GFA and Land Use

- 2) It is noted from the calculations that the proposed development GFA at 433% exceeds the required 150% which translates to a footprint that encroaches into setbacks, open space and landscaping. The proposal does not adequately allow for a sufficient breakup of the bulk and scale of the built form with landscaping elements. In its current form, the proposed development is not reflective of the intended form and character of the surrounding area and is inconsistent AO1 / PO1 of the Chermside centre neighbourhood plan.
- a) Reduce the footprint of the proposal introduce a level of building separation to mitigate the negative impacts of the built form to the adjoining neighbours both existing and future. This would also allow for landscaping along the front and side boundaries to be incorporated to aid in the modulation of the built form.
 - b) Identify location of Food and drink outlet on amended plans. Include GFA and specify if it will operate as an independent tenancy or ancillary to the building use
 - c) The upper floor level appears to show a mixture of room types including apartments. The application specifies short term accommodation and food and drink outlet. Provide clarification whether the proposal is for short term accommodation only or other residential land uses are sought. Amend plans accordingly.

Traffic Generation

- 3) The development will generate 44 vehicle trips in the peak hour and is considered a major development under SC6.31 of the TAPS PSP. To comply with PO1 and PO3 of the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code (9.4.11). Provide an amended traffic report prepared by a certified RPEQ traffic engineer demonstrating the following:
- a) How the peak hour trips will be distributed to the external road network.
 - b) Whether the peak hour trip generation will create adverse impacts on adjacent key intersections, such as the Way St / Kittyhawk Dr signalised intersection.

Built Form – Podium Carpark

- 4) It is considered that the elevational treatment of the podium of the proposal appears to be an extrusion of a typical profile of consecutive floor plates. When combined with the alignment, depth and detailing to the facades, the elevations of the built form appear to visually accentuate its appearance as excessive building bulk. A further concern generated by this arrangement are the blank walls which present an inanimate façade to the street frontages. This combination of the excessive podium scale and its lack of visible activation in the podium façade are a poor urban gesture to the street and surrounding sites. This is inconsistent in addressing AO33.2 & AO33.4 / PO33 of the Centre or mixed use code.
- a) Amend the design to introduce greater / more overt modulation to visually fragment the extruded form of development currently proposed. It is considered that a more holistic approach to the overall architectural composition of the building is required in preference to the uniform floorplate layout and podium carparking. A more appropriate response would be to review the podium levels with the introduction of active uses such as short term accommodation suites and/ or spaces associated with the recreational facilities such as gym, etc. that is sleeved into the built form to the street and side boundaries.

5) It is considered the podium carparking is not in keeping with the intended character design response where development in this section of Playfield Street and Hamilton Road is occupied by units and/or commercial tenancies above ground combined with basement carparking. The introduction of a podium carparking arrangement is considered to further erode the existing relationship / interface in retaining an activated frontage facing the street to Hamilton Road as required by the criteria of AO5 / PO5 of the Chermside Neighbourhood Plan. A further concern is the built to boundary 3 storey walls impacting on future development to the west of the site and the adjacent current approved development to the north of the proposal as part of the streetscape context. The podium carparking is inconsistent with AO41.1 & AO41.3 / PO41 of the Centre or mixed use code as it is not in line with community expectations and does not contribute to a cohesive streetscape and built form character. In its current form, the podium carpark is not supported.

- a) Further review is required to revise the planning layout to accommodate sleeved active uses to the podium carparking or alternatively provide basement parking.

Ground Floor and Street Setting

6) It is considered that the proposed development along Playfield Street is dominated by carparking, pad mount transformer, boosters and services. The concerns by this arrangement presents the majority of the ground floor to this street visually / negatively impacting the amenity of the street. The proposal does not achieve or contribute to a consistent continuous streetscape character. This is inconsistent with PO55 / AO55 of the Centre or mixed use code.

- a) Revise the layout of the ground floor interface by relocating pad mount transformer and pump room internally to allow the extending of the commercial use to Playfield Street. This would achieve for a more appropriate street interface with landscaping to occupy a greater proportion of the street frontage.

Street Setbacks

7) It is considered that the street setbacks are significantly less than the required 3m to the ground floor and podium along Hamilton Road and 3m to Playfield Street. The tower component is less than the required 6m and 8m to the wall for the tower component. This is viewed as over-bearing development which is not in keeping with the intended pattern of the neighbourhood character. It is considered that the reduced setbacks to Playfield Street and Hamilton Road do not adequately address AO21 / PO21, AO24 / PO24 & AO25 / PO25 of the Centre or mixed use code. However, given the existing surrounding development there has been consideration to the contextual relationship of the built form predominantly in the street.

- a) Further review is required to increase the setbacks to Playfield Street and Hamilton Road. This should address how the proposal will appropriately integrate into the context of existing and future development. However, there has been an acceptance of reduced setbacks. It is noted further north the setbacks are 4m to the balcony / part wall with a greater setback to the main walls (approximately 6m) as evident on the approved development at 8 Playfield Street. It is further noted that there also has been an acceptance of a reduced street setback to Hamilton Road which could be taken into consideration given the approved adjacent development to the east in achieving a similar design outcome of the built form to the street frontage. It is encouraged to adopt a similar methodology of street setbacks to reflect the current existing surrounding development.

Side Setbacks

8) The side setbacks reduced to built to boundary for 3 storeys including the pinch points of the tower western boundary raises concerns affecting the residential amenity impacts to the adjoining sites. It is considered this impacts ESD (Environmental Sustainability Design) performances such as breezes and daylight, etc. A further concern is the encroachment of the built form would negatively impact and prejudicing existing and future development. This does

not adequately address AO21 / PO21 and AO27.1, AO27.2/ PO27 of the Centre or mixed use code.

- a) Revise the planning layout to increase the setback distances to the side boundaries to introduce landscaping elements at ground floor. Further review of the podium and tower for a greater portion to be closer to the AO requirement of the MD Code to address building separation.

Refuse

- 9) It is noted the area for the 'Refuse' room has been stated as 20m² (as shown in the Ground Floor Areas column on the Ground Level Floor Plan). However, when scaling the 'Refuse' room on the plan, the area of the room is approx. 50.5m².
 - a) In accordance with PO63/AO63.1, AO63.2 of the Centre or mixed use code and PO8/AO8.1, AO8.2 of the Infrastructure design code, demonstrate on amended plans the dimensions of the 'Refuse' room.

Earthworks

- 10) It is anticipated earthworks will be required to facilitate the proposed development, however no concept earthworks plans have been submitted, as such assessment of the Filling and Excavation Code has not been undertaken.
 - a) Provide RPEQ certified concept earthworks plans, in accordance with the Filling and Excavation Code.
 - b) Provide RPEQ justification against any performance outcome sought.

Stormwater

- 11) It is noted the submitted engineering plans, prepared by Roofbrook, has referenced a SBSMP with regard to the on-site detention, however this SBSMP has not been submitted as a part of this application. As such assessment of this has not been undertaken.
 - a) Submit a Site based stormwater management plan, providing further details of the proposed stormwater management, including the following.
 - i. Details of the on-site detention tanks as per IDPSP Chapter 7, Stormwater Drainage, Section 7.5.
 - ii. Include location of connecting pipes and overflow arrangements.
 - iii. Include detention tank volumes and how flows will be directed towards a lawful point of discharge.
 - iv. A catchment plan, including both internal and external catchment, and which detention tank flows are directed to.
 - b) Additionally, it is noted the kerb adaptors are located on Playfield St, which shows the contours to be higher than the location of the stormwater detention tanks. As per IDPSP Chapter 7, Stormwater Drainage, Section 7.6.6, pumped systems are not permitted to directly discharge to the kerb and channel. They will need to discharge directly to either a gully pit, maintenance hole or drainage line.
 - c) Provide details on how these flows are proposed to be discharged towards a lawful point of discharge, as they will not be able to gravity drain, in accordance with the IDPSP for Stormwater Drainage.
 - d) Provide a stormwater plan which clearly identifies the extent of the overland flow present on the site and demonstrate an easement will be provided over the extent of overland flow.

Deep planting

- 12) The proposed deep planting is insufficient to offset the scale of the development and does not satisfy the requirements of PO21, PO29 and PO56 of the Centre or Mixed Use Code, or PO3, PO7, PO8, PO28 and PO29 of the Multiple Dwelling Code. City Plan requires deep planting areas to accommodate large subtropical shade trees. Due to walls located within

the deep planting area at the frontage it cannot be counted as deep planting. Deep planting areas must also have a minimum 4m width at ground level, free from any structures, with trees centrally located to support balanced root growth and long-term stability. This may require increased basement and building setbacks and relocation of underground services outside deep planting areas. The proposal currently has a 40m² shortfall in deep planting area.

- a) Provide amended plans demonstrating 10% of the site as true deep planting area for large shade trees, with a minimum dimension of 4m.

Awnings

- 13)** Awnings require to be setback 1.5m from existing and future street trees.

- a) Provide amended plans demonstrating required setbacks for awnings from street trees.

Hamilton Rd frontage

- 14)** It is not clear from the submitted plans whether the required 3.75 m verge width has been achieved along the Hamilton Road frontage. The verge will be classified as a Centre Street Minor and must provide a minimum unobstructed width of 2.4 m from the new property boundary to facilitate pedestrian wayfinding and safe movement.

- a) Provide revised plans showing both the existing and proposed property boundaries along the Hamilton Road frontage, and clearly demonstrate:
 - i) that a 3.75 m unobstructed verge width is achieved; and
 - ii) an unobstructed 2.4m wide pathway, measured from the new property boundary

Container planting

- 15)** Container planting requires access for ongoing maintenance from the common area to ensure sustainable long-term establishment and visual amenity. Irrigation for the containerised planting is to be supplied from harvested stormwater. The design must incorporate a suitably sized irrigation tank, with its location clearly shown on the plans and integrated within the overall site design.

- a) Submit amended plans addressing the above requirements.

Noise Emissions from the Short-Term Accommodation use

- 16)** Address AO/PO3 of the Short-term accommodation code to demonstrate that the criteria can be achieved based on noise emissions from the proposed activities.

Noise Emissions from Hamilton Road

- 17)** More detailed plans are required to assess AO/PO1 of the Transport noise corridor overlay code, in terms of the construction of the balcony. A solid construction technique is required, if the development does not include an outdoor recreation space that is usable by all occupants.

Air Quality – Car Park & Cooking Emissions

- 18)** Air emissions for the proposed car parks and the presence of various restaurant/cooking venues and their location to on-site and adjacent sensitive uses, have the potential to impact on the air quality amenity of such sensitive land uses/zoning. The applicant therefore needs to demonstrate that an adequate level of air quality as per the *Centre or Mixed-Use Code* and *Multiple Dwelling Code* can be provided at the on-site sensitive uses and adjoining sensitive zonings.
- a) Submit further information demonstrating that the proposed use can comply with the acceptable outcomes as prescribed in AO3.1 – AO3.3 of the *Centre or Mixed Code* and AO20 of the *Multiple Dwelling Code*. Where compliance cannot be achieved, the applicant is to submit for approval an Air Quality Report in accordance with PO3 and

PO20 of the Codes respectively. Further guidance can be found in the *Air Quality Planning Scheme Policy*.

- b) In responding to this item, clearly indicate whether the podium level carpark is proposed be developed with mechanical ventilation.

Noise – Centre Emissions

- 19)** The proposed food and drink outlet has the potential to impact on the noise amenity of nearby sensitive land uses/zoning. The applicant therefore needs to demonstrate that an adequate level of noise amenity as per the Code can be achieved.
- a) Submit further information demonstrating that the proposed use can comply with the hours and screening as prescribed in AO1.1 – AO1.2 of the Centre or Mixed-Use Code. Where compliance with the Acceptable Outcomes cannot be achieved, the applicant is to submit a Noise Impact Assessment Report prepared in accordance with the *Noise Impact Assessment Planning Scheme Policy* demonstrating that PO1 of the Code can be achieved.

Acid Sulfate Soils

- 20)** The site is located within the *Potential and Actual Acid Sulfate Soils Overlay*. The applicant therefore needs to demonstrate that the site is not affected by, or will not disturb, actual or potential acid sulfate soils.
- a) Submit information on whether the development includes soil disturbance at or below 5m AHD and involving i) excavating or removing equal to or greater than 100m³ of soil; or ii) soil disturbance (including filling) greater than 500m³; or iii) filling equal to or greater than 0.5m average depth.
 - b) Where the above soil disturbance is involved, provide an Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) Investigation Report and Management Plan prepared by an appropriately qualified and experienced person, and prepared in accordance with relevant policies/guidance materials and technical guidelines/manuals such as:
 - State Planning Policy and SPP Guidance Materials;
 - Queensland Acid Sulfate Soil Guidelines: sampling guidelines; laboratory methods guidelines/manuals; and
 - Queensland Acid Sulfate Soil Technical Manual: Soil Management Guidelines.

Air Quality on Hamilton Road

- 21)** Address the Transport Air Quality Corridor Overlay code at AO/PO3 with a letter from a qualified air quality consultant (a full report is not required, only a letter that refers to the most up to date proposed plans).

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 A007057614.

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 black ink, appearing to read 'DH', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Dominic Hudson
Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services North
Phone: (07) 3178 0229
Email: Dominic.Hudson@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Development Services
Brisbane City Council