

Dear Brisbane City Council,

I am the owner of which is located directly opposite the proposed development site at 10–18 Kelso Street.

I wish to lodge this email as a properly made submission objecting to the application in its current form.

I am not opposed to development of the site in principle, nor am I opposed to appropriate residential growth within Chermside. I acknowledge that the site is located within an area identified for higher-density residential development and that residential redevelopment is to be expected. My concerns relate specifically to the height, scale, traffic impacts, construction impacts and interface with existing residents, particularly those of us directly opposite the site.

I request that Council carefully consider the following concerns before determining the application.

1. Traffic and Parking Impacts

Traffic and parking are already significant issues within Kelso Street, and this remains one of my primary concerns regarding the proposed development.

As the owner of, it is not uncommon for vehicles to park so close to my driveway, or directly opposite it, that entering and exiting my property becomes difficult and, at times, effectively impossible. These are not hypothetical concerns about future development impacts. They are existing issues that residents already experience on a regular basis.

Over a number of years, we have contacted Brisbane City Council on numerous occasions to highlight the traffic and parking issues occurring within Kelso Street. Despite these concerns, parking pressure remains an ongoing problem, particularly given the narrow residential nature of the street and the interaction between on-street parking, driveways and local traffic movements.

Against this existing background, I am concerned that the proposed development will substantially intensify parking and traffic pressures in the area.

In reviewing the application material, I understand that the applicant is proposing a level of parking provision that relies heavily on consultant assumptions regarding future car ownership patterns, travel behaviour and reduced parking demand, rather than simply meeting the higher parking outcomes that have traditionally applied to developments of this scale. While I acknowledge that the planning framework permits performance-based solutions, such an approach should only be accepted where the applicant has adequately demonstrated, through robust and evidence-based analysis, that the resulting outcome achieves planning outcomes that are equal to or better than those anticipated by the applicable planning provisions. In this instance, I am not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that a development of approximately 193 dwellings can operate without creating additional parking pressure on Kelso Street and surrounding residential streets or without adversely affecting the amenity reasonably expected by existing residents.

My concern is not with the consultant's modelling itself, but whether the assumptions adopted accurately reflect the reality experienced by existing residents living in Kelso Street.

In practical terms, if those assumptions prove optimistic, the consequences will be borne by surrounding residents through increased competition for on-street parking, reduced access to driveways, increased congestion and deterioration in local amenity.

Accordingly, I am concerned that:

- existing parking pressures within Kelso Street will worsen significantly;
- resident vehicle ownership may exceed the assumptions relied upon in the parking assessment;
- visitor parking demand may be underestimated;
- overflow parking may be displaced into Kelso Street and adjoining residential streets;
- access to existing residential properties, including , may become increasingly restricted;
- construction worker parking and construction traffic may create substantial additional pressure during the construction phase; and
- increased vehicle movements associated with both construction and occupation of the development may adversely affect the safety, efficiency and liveability of the local street network.

Given the scale of the proposed development, I request that Council satisfy itself that the proposed level of on-site parking is sufficient to accommodate the reasonably foreseeable demand generated by approximately 193 dwellings and, if not, require additional underground parking provision as a condition of approval so that parking demand generated by the development is accommodated on-site rather than being transferred to the surrounding neighbourhood.

I also specifically request that Council investigate appropriate parking and traffic management measures for Kelso Street as part of its assessment of this application. In my view, such measures are necessary to protect the amenity, access rights and safety of existing residents and to ensure that the impacts of the proposed development are not transferred onto the surrounding neighbourhood.

These measures should include consideration of:

- resident-only parking controls within affected sections of Kelso Street;

- restrictions on long-term non-resident, commuter and construction-worker parking;
- measures that prioritise the availability of on-street parking for local residents and their genuine visitors;
- traffic management initiatives that protect access to existing residential driveways; and
- ongoing monitoring and review mechanisms should parking impacts be greater than those presently forecast by the applicant.

In my view, any shortfall in on-site parking should not be effectively externalised onto existing residents through increased competition for on-street parking, reduced access to private driveways, increased congestion and a deterioration in residential amenity. Existing residents should not bear the burden of parking demand generated by a development of this scale.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that Council closely scrutinise the traffic and parking assumptions relied upon by the applicant and satisfy itself that the proposed parking provision is supported by robust, realistic and evidence-based analysis. If Council is minded to approve the application, I request that Council require increased on-site parking provision, a detailed construction traffic management plan, strict controls preventing construction-worker parking in surrounding residential streets, and appropriate resident-priority parking measures to protect the amenity and access rights of existing Kelso Street residents.

2. Height, Scale, Bulk and Privacy

My second concern relates to the proposed height, scale and overall intensity of the development.

I acknowledge that the development site is located within the High Density Residential Zone and that the planning framework anticipates higher-density residential development in appropriate locations. I am therefore not suggesting that multi-storey residential development is inappropriate on this site or that redevelopment should not occur.

However, the planning framework does not merely permit height. The High Density Residential Zone Code also requires development to be of a height, bulk, scale and form that is tailored to its specific location, responsive to local context and site characteristics, and consistent with the applicable neighbourhood planning outcomes. Importantly, the Code requires development to appropriately respond to matters such as privacy, sunlight, breezes, landscaped character, building spacing and residential amenity expectations. The fact that a site is capable of accommodating development of up to 15 storeys does not automatically mean that every 15-storey outcome will satisfy these broader planning outcomes.

While the applicant has relied on consultant-prepared, performance-based planning assessments to justify the proposed development, I do not consider that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed building height, bulk and intensity achieve the outcomes sought by the High Density Residential Zone Code when assessed against the site's immediate context and its interface with existing residential properties, including those located directly opposite the site.

In particular, I am concerned that the proposal:

- creates a building form that will be visually dominant when viewed from properties on the eastern side of Kelso Street;
- significantly changes the character and streetscape experience currently enjoyed by existing residents;
- introduces a level of bulk and intensity that appears greater than what many local residents reasonably expected when the area was identified for higher-density development;
- increases overlooking opportunities into existing homes and private open-space areas;
- reduces privacy for residents directly opposite the site, including ; and
- may not adequately balance urban consolidation objectives with the reasonable amenity expectations of existing residents.

I understand that the applicant's consultants have concluded that these impacts are acceptable through the use of performance-based solutions and design measures. However, I respectfully request that Council independently and critically assess those conclusions and satisfy itself that the proposed development genuinely achieves the outcomes sought by the High Density Residential Zone Code, particularly those relating to privacy, sunlight, breezes, residential amenity, building spacing, landscaped character and local context.

I respectfully request that Council satisfy itself that the proposal not only supports broader urban consolidation objectives but also delivers the level of privacy, amenity, landscaped character and residential living outcomes contemplated by the planning framework for both future and existing residents. I also request that Council investigate whether the proposed building could be modified to reduce its visual dominance and privacy impacts on neighbouring residents while still delivering the residential density intended for the site.

Should Council be minded to approve the application, I request that additional conditions and design refinements be considered to improve privacy outcomes, reduce overlooking and ensure that the development integrates as sensitively as possible with existing residences in Kelso Street.

3. Shadowing and Loss of Afternoon Sunlight

I am concerned about the shadowing impacts associated with a development of this scale and height and the consequences those impacts may have for the amenity of neighbouring properties on the eastern side of Kelso Street, including

I acknowledge that the High Density Residential Zone anticipates taller residential buildings in appropriate locations and that increased development intensity will inevitably result in some degree of additional shadowing. However, the planning framework also seeks to ensure that development is designed so that existing and future residents continue to enjoy reasonable access to daylight and sunlight and are able to make appropriate use of both indoor and outdoor living spaces.

Access to sunlight contributes significantly to residential amenity, including:

- the enjoyment and usability of outdoor living spaces;
- access to natural light within homes;
- passive heating and cooling benefits;
- landscaping and garden health; and
- the overall liveability of residential properties.

I understand that the applicant's consultants have undertaken shadow analysis and concluded that the resulting impacts are acceptable. However, those conclusions rely upon performance-based planning assessments that support a development outcome at the upper end of the height range anticipated within the precinct.

As a resident...., I am concerned that the practical impact experienced by neighbouring residents may be materially greater than that suggested by the applicant's modelling and supporting assessment material.

Based on my own measurements and observations of the site, although admittedly not undertaken by a qualified expert, I anticipate that a 15-storey building in the proposed location could result in the loss of direct sunlight to parts of my property from approximately 2:30 pm onwards during parts of the year. While this estimate is not a substitute for professional shadow modelling, it highlights the importance of independently verifying whether neighbouring properties will continue to receive the reasonable access to daylight and sunlight envisaged by the planning framework. If that assessment proves to be broadly accurate, it would represent a significant reduction in afternoon and evening sunlight, being the period of the day when outdoor spaces are most commonly used and enjoyed by residents.

While I acknowledge that my observations are not a substitute for professional shadow modelling, they have reinforced my concern that the real-world impacts experienced by neighbouring residents may be materially greater than those suggested by the applicant's assessment material.

I therefore respectfully request that Council carefully scrutinise the shadowing analysis provided by the applicant and independently satisfy itself that the proposal will continue to provide neighbouring properties with reasonable access to daylight and sunlight consistent with the amenity outcomes sought by the planning framework.

In particular, I request that Council give specific consideration to the impact on properties located on the eastern side of Kelso Street and test whether the shadow modelling adequately reflects the actual experience of neighbouring residents during the afternoon and early evening periods.

If Council identifies material adverse impacts on surrounding residences, I request that Council investigate whether modifications to the building's height, upper-level design, massing or setbacks are necessary to reduce those impacts and better protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Should Council ultimately approve the development, I request that the applicant's shadow modelling and any supporting assumptions be independently reviewed to ensure that the projected impacts on neighbouring properties have been accurately assessed and transparently communicated.

4. Construction Impacts and Protection of Existing Properties

A significant concern for me is the potential impact of demolition, excavation and construction works on nearby properties, particularly given the scale of the proposed development and the substantial excavation required to facilitate the basement levels.

I acknowledge that the planning framework anticipates intensive residential development within this precinct and that significant construction activity is often an inevitable consequence of delivering higher-density housing outcomes. My concern is therefore not that construction will occur, but rather that appropriate safeguards must be in place to protect existing residents and neighbouring properties from adverse impacts during the construction phase.

The construction of a development of this magnitude will inevitably involve:

- substantial excavation works;
- heavy vehicle and truck movements;
- vibration-generating construction activities;
- prolonged construction operations;
- movement of large quantities of material to and from the site; and
- potential risks associated with excavation, ground movement and settlement.

Given the scale of the proposed works and the close proximity of to the development site, I am concerned about the potential impact that excavation works, vibration and construction activity may have on the condition and structural integrity of neighbouring properties.

While I acknowledge that the application contains engineering and construction-related material prepared by the applicant's consultants, much of the assessment relies on future management measures and consultant assumptions regarding the effective control of construction impacts. As a directly affected, I believe that more tangible protections should be required for surrounding properties.

Accordingly, I specifically request that Council require the developer, at the developer's cost, to engage an appropriately qualified and independent building assessor to undertake

comprehensive pre-construction and post-construction property condition assessments, including formal dilapidation reports, for

Importantly, this assessment should:

- be undertaken through a physical on-site inspection and not merely a desktop review;
- comprehensively document both internal and external building conditions;
- record existing cracking, movement, settlement, structural conditions and any other relevant defects;
- include detailed photographic evidence and a written report;
- be completed prior to the commencement of any demolition, excavation or construction activities; and
- be provided to the property owner for future reference.

I further request that Council investigate and require additional property protection measures that are proportionate to the scale of the proposed development, including:

- independent vibration monitoring throughout major excavation and construction phases;
- monitoring of any movement, settlement or cracking that may arise during construction activities;
- construction vibration monitoring;
- ongoing condition monitoring during major excavation works;
- post-construction dilapidation inspections;
- developer-funded investigation of any reasonable claim of damage raised by an immediately affected neighbouring property owner;
- clear rectification processes should damage occur, including an obligation on the developer to rectify, make good or compensate for any damage reasonably attributable to the construction works; and
- ongoing communication requirements between the developer and immediately affected residents.

In my view, these measures are both reasonable and necessary given the scale of the proposed development and the direct proximity of existing homes to the construction works. Existing residents should not bear the risk of proving the source of any future damage or deterioration when practical and well-established mechanisms exist to document property conditions before construction commences.

Should Council decide to approve the development, I respectfully request that these requirements be imposed as mandatory conditions of approval.

In conclusion, while I support the principle of appropriate residential redevelopment and recognise the strategic intent to accommodate higher-density housing within this part of Chermiside, I remain concerned that the current proposal has not adequately demonstrated that its height, scale, parking provision, shadow impacts and construction-related impacts can be accommodated without unreasonably affecting the amenity of existing residents, particularly those directly opposite the site.

I respectfully request that Council carefully scrutinise the performance-based justifications relied upon by the applicant and satisfy itself that the proposed development achieves the outcomes sought by the planning framework, including those relating to residential amenity, privacy, access to sunlight, traffic and parking management, and the protection of neighbouring properties.

Should Council ultimately be minded to approve the application, I request that meaningful modifications and appropriate conditions be imposed to address the concerns outlined above.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission. I would appreciate written confirmation that this submission has been received and recorded as part of the assessment

of Development Application A007025371.

Yours faithfully,

.....