



Response to Public Notification Submissions

Development Application Number: A006919185

Project Address: 34–36 Premier Street, Oxley QLD 4075

Applicant: Andrade Properties QLD Pty Ltd

Date: 29 May 2026

*Prepared in response to public notification submissions
for consideration by Brisbane City Council*

1. Introduction

This report has been prepared to provide a consolidated planning response to public notification submissions lodged in relation to the development application for an increase in rooming accommodation occupancy at 34 and 36 Premier Street, Oxley. The proposal seeks approval for a Material Change of Use to intensify the existing lawful rooming accommodation from 5 persons to 10 persons per dwelling within the existing built form.

A total of 20 submission files were received during the notification period.

The purpose of this report is to assist Council by:

- (i) identifying the principal issues raised during public notification;
- (ii) consolidating repeated concerns into common issue categories; and
- (iii) responding to those matters by reference to the relevant planning framework and the supporting planning report lodged with the DA application.

This response has been prepared having regard to the Planning Act 2016, Brisbane City Plan 2014, the Rooming Accommodation Code, the Low-medium density residential zone code, the Darra–Oxley district neighbourhood plan code, and the relevant secondary and overlay provisions addressed in the supporting planning material.

2. Submission Register and Issue Identification

Table 1 below provides a concise register of the submissions reviewed and the principal topics identified from each submission.

No.	Submission	Principal Issues Identified
1	07/03/2026 by unidentified person	Building suitability; access and safety; on-street parking; traffic and local amenity.
2	08/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking; access and mobility; noise; waste; overcrowding; neighbourhood character.
3	09/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking and unlawful parking in the local road environment.
4	09/03/2026 by Delice Chadburn	On-street parking; congestion; driveway access and emergency access.
5	09/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking pressure; commuter parking; traffic safety and visibility.
6	09/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking and traffic impacts; appropriateness of increased scale.
7	10/03/2026 by unidentified person	Building suitability; access and circulation; parking; traffic; residential amenity.
8	10/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking shortfall; traffic and pedestrian safety; neighbourhood character.
9	10/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking; Fire safety; limit to 5 people only
10	11/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking; traffic; local infrastructure/power supply; family amenity.
11	15/03/2026 by unidentified person	Traffic; parking; neighbourhood character; noise.
12	15/03/2026 by unidentified person	Parking and traffic impacts; appropriateness of intensity.
13	16/03/2026 by unidentified person	Traffic congestion; inadequate off-street parking; noise; rubbish; dwellings designed for fewer residents.
14	16/03/2026 by unidentified person	Traffic; congestion; community impacts; parking
15	20/03/2026 by James Martin	Parking; traffic; neighbourhood character; infrastructure capacity; precedent.

No.	Submission	Principal Issues Identified
16	20/03/2026 by unidentified person	Detailed planning objection regarding zone intent, adjoining dwelling interface, parking rate, use characterisation and amenity.
17	25/03/2026 by unidentified person	BCA/fire safety and emergency egress; uncertainty as to use; parking loss and on-street demand.
18	26/03/2026 by Brad	Parking; traffic; neighbourhood character; infrastructure capacity; precedent.
19	26/03/2026 by Mark Pickering	Parking; accommodation density; living standards; amenity/community impacts; demand/opinion matters.
20	26/03/26 by unidentified person	BCA/fire safety; building suitability; on-street parking.

3. Summary Table of Issues and Responses

The issues raised in the submissions substantially overlap. They have therefore been consolidated into the common planning topics below to avoid repetition while still responding to the substance of the public notification material.

Table 2. Consolidated planning issues and responses

Item No.	Submission Issue Raised	Summary of Concerns	Planning Response / Proposed Solution	Reference to Code Compliance Report
1	Traffic Impacts and Road Network Operation	Submitters commonly contend that Premier Street is already congested, that parked vehicles reduce the carriageway to an effective single lane, and that the proposal would increase vehicle movements, queuing, driveway conflict and emergency access difficulty.	Those concerns have been considered in the context of the development actually proposed, namely an increase in occupancy within existing rooming accommodation buildings without any new built form, new crossover or new road interface works. The planning report states that the proposal reuses the existing dwellings, access crossovers and parking areas, and does not involve further physical changes on site other than provision of additional visitor parking. The site is also in a highly accessible location approximately 300m walking distance from Oxley Railway Station, which the planning report identifies as providing high-frequency public transport. In those circumstances, the transport planning framework does not require the application to eliminate all existing background traffic conditions in the locality; rather, the relevant test is whether the development appropriately integrates with the transport network having regard to the applicable parking and access benchmarks. The supporting report concludes that the proposal complies with the relevant transport and rooming accommodation provisions. Matters such as illegal parking behaviour in no-parking areas and day-to-day parking enforcement are operational matters for compliance and traffic management, rather than indicators that the land use itself is unacceptable in planning terms.	Section 2 Proposal; Annexure B, Rooming accommodation code AO7.2 and AO14; Section 3.6 Brisbane Planning Scheme and Planning Scheme Policies; site plans showing existing crossover reuse.
2	On-Site Parking and Overflow Parking	The most frequent concern is that the existing on-site parking provision is inadequate and that residents and visitors will rely on already constrained kerbside parking. Several submitters also assert that commuter parking currently occupies available street spaces.	Parking demand is a central assessment matter and has been specifically addressed in the supporting report. Annexure B states that the development is outside the City core and City frame and relies on AO14 of the Rooming Accommodation Code, which in turn refers to the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Planning Scheme Policy. The report concludes that, for rooming accommodation within 400m walking distance of a major public transport interchange, the applicable parking rate is a minimum 1.3 spaces per 3+ bedroom dwelling plus 0.15 spaces per dwelling for visitor parking, and that the proposal provides 3 car spaces per dwelling. On that basis, the supporting planning assessment concludes the proposal complies with the applicable parking benchmark. While submitters express understandable concern regarding existing commuter parking demand in the surrounding street network, the planning scheme assesses the proposal against the prescribed parking standards for the approved land use in its locational context. Existing public street parking pressure, by itself, does not demonstrate non-compliance where the proposal meets the relevant City Plan benchmark.	Annexure B, Rooming accommodation code PO14 / AO14; Section 2 Proposal; site plans for 34 and 36 Premier Street identifying 3 on-site car spaces per dwelling.
3	Characterisation of the Use / Whether the Proposal Operates as Multiple Dwellings	A detailed objection contends that each room functions as a self-contained or quasi self-contained unit, such that the development should be assessed as multiple dwellings with a higher parking demand. Some submitters also question whether the use may operate as short-stay, student or other accommodation.	The supporting planning report addresses this issue directly in Section 3.7. It relies on the City Plan definition of rooming accommodation and explains that the definition is satisfied where residents do not occupy a self-contained unit, or alternatively where only limited facilities are available for private use. The report records that each resident has access to a communal full kitchen and common facilities, while the individual rooms contain only limited private facilities such as a short benchtop, minimal cupboards, microwave, kettle and small sink. On that basis, the applicant's planning case is that the rooms remain rooming accommodation rather than separate dwellings. The objection seeking application of multiple dwelling parking rates proceeds from a different characterisation of the use than that advanced in the application material. For assessment purposes, weight should be given to the land use definition analysis set out in the planning report and the internal layout shown on the approved plans, which maintain shared communal facilities and do not establish a separate self-contained dwelling on each room.	Section 3.7 Definition of Rooming Accommodation; Section 2 Proposal; Ground Floor and Upper Floor Plans showing communal kitchen/common areas and limited room facilities.
4	Building Suitability, Occupancy, Fire Safety and Emergency Egress	A number of submitters question whether the buildings were designed for 10 persons per dwelling, and raise concerns regarding overcrowding, BCA/NCC compliance, fire protection, emergency services access and evacuation capability.	The planning application concerns land use approval for increased occupancy within existing lawful rooming accommodation, not a new building envelope or external building work. The supporting material records that the rooming accommodation for five persons on each lot was constructed following the approved subdivision and in accordance with the planning regulations in place at that time. The current proposal does not seek built form intensification; rather, it proposes two occupants per room within the existing five-bedroom format. The plans incorporated within the supporting material identify the dwellings as Class 1B, include notes requiring compliance with the Queensland Development Code MP 6.1, note accessible design for the ground floor accessible unit, and require smoke alarms in accordance with the NCC/AS 3786 and Queensland legislation. Accordingly, matters of detailed building certification, life-safety compliance and emergency egress are subject to the separate building regulatory framework and cannot be assumed to be deficient merely because the planning application proposes a lawful increase in occupancy. No expert evidence has been provided in the submissions to establish that the premises are incapable of complying with the applicable building requirements.	Section 1 Site History; Section 2 Proposal; Ground Floor / Upper Floor plan notes for both dwellings (Class 1B, QDC MP 6.1, AS 1428.1-2009, smoke alarms to AS 3786 / Qld legislation).

5	Residential Amenity – Noise, Waste, Activity, Privacy and General Disturbance	Submitters raise concerns regarding increased noise, rubbish, waste generation, comings and goings, loss of quiet enjoyment and amenity impacts on adjoining residents. Some submissions also express concern regarding privacy and the intensity of occupation adjacent to dwelling houses.	Amenity impacts are relevant planning matters and are addressed in the supporting report. Annexure B responds to PO8 of the Rooming Accommodation Code and states that the common kitchen and dining areas are indoors, that the balcony is of limited scale and is not expected to be used by large groups, and that house rules limit use of common areas so as not to disturb other tenants. The report further notes an existing solid fence along the shared boundary, enclosed garages, acoustic treatment/screening for air-conditioning equipment where necessary, and screening of bins, plant and service elements from adjoining sites and the public realm. Importantly, the proposal does not introduce additional building bulk, additional overlooking opportunities or a changed setback relationship, because no external built form changes are proposed. In planning terms, the relevant question is whether the development is likely to create unreasonable amenity impacts having regard to the applicable code framework. On the material provided, the proposal is assessed as satisfying the amenity provisions of the Rooming Accommodation Code and as remaining within the expectations of the Low-medium density residential zone for alternative housing types in accessible urban locations.	Annexure B, Rooming accommodation code PO8 / AO8.1–AO8.3; PO9 / AO9; PO10 / AO10.1; Section 2 Proposal; Low-medium density residential zone code overall outcomes.
6	Neighbourhood Character, Intensity, Adjoining Dwelling Interface and Precedent	Several submissions argue that the proposal is inconsistent with the family-oriented or low-density character of Premier Street, represents over-intensification, may adversely affect adjoining dwelling houses, and could set a precedent for similar development in the locality.	These concerns go to the broader merits of whether increased rooming accommodation occupancy is appropriate in the locality. The supporting planning report expressly places the proposal within the Low-medium density residential zone and the Oxley residential sub-precinct, and concludes that the development assists urban consolidation, housing diversity and better use of existing infrastructure in a location close to public transport. It also records that the proposal is impact assessable because the site adjoins a dwelling house, thereby enabling full public notification and merits assessment. However, the development before Council is not a new or enlarged building; it is an intensification of use within existing approved built form. As confirmed in the report, no change is proposed to building height, setbacks or site layout. Consequently, the proposal does not create new built form dominance or a worsened streetscape outcome. Concerns regarding precedent should be afforded limited weight, as each application must be assessed on its own facts, the applicable planning controls and the evidence before Council. The relevant question is whether this particular proposal, on this site, is acceptable within the planning framework. The supporting report concludes that it is consistent with the applicable Rooming Accommodation Code, zone provisions and neighbourhood plan outcomes.	Section 1 Site Location & Background Review; Section 2 Proposal; Annexure B, Low-medium density residential zone code overall outcomes; Darra–Oxley district neighbourhood plan code; concluding recommendation in Section 5.
7	Infrastructure Capacity, Stormwater and Servicing	Some submitters raise concerns about infrastructure strain, including drainage, waste collection, utilities and general servicing capacity. One submission refers to power outages and perceived limits of the local power grid.	The supporting report indicates that the site is already serviced and that the scope of the application does not involve further civil works. The report states that infrastructure is unaffected by the proposal, that existing crossovers and service connections are to be reused, and that the subject lots are already connected to sewer, water and stormwater. The prescribed secondary code review similarly records that no further infrastructure, stormwater or landscape works are required for the proposal because the existing built form and services remain in place. In those circumstances, generalised assertions that local infrastructure may be strained are not supported by technical evidence in the submission material. Concerns about broader network utilities such as power supply reliability are not matters demonstrated by the planning evidence before Council and should therefore be afforded limited weight.	Section 1.1 Site Characteristics (Infrastructure); Section 3.2 / 3.3; Annexure B, Prescribed Secondary Codes (Infrastructure design code, Stormwater code, Transport, access, parking and servicing code).
8	Matters of Limited or No Planning Weight	A small number of comments refer to matters such as perceived social undesirability of the proposed living arrangement, personal opinions as to whether there is genuine demand, generalised concerns about health and wellbeing, and criticism of the development model in emotive terms.	Council’s assessment must be directed to relevant planning matters under the statutory framework. While such comments are acknowledged, subjective views about the desirability of a housing model, generalised commentary about who may wish to live in the accommodation, or unsupported assertions about broader social outcomes are not determinative planning considerations unless supported by relevant planning or technical evidence. Similarly, concerns regarding parking enforcement or commuter behaviour in the local road network fall more appropriately within operational traffic management and compliance functions. Those matters should therefore be afforded limited weight relative to the code-based planning issues addressed elsewhere in this report.	Planning Act 2016 assessment framework read with Conde Compliance Report issue responses; relevant code-based matters addressed in Sections 2, 3.6, 3.7 and Annexure B.

4. Conclusion

The submissions raise a consistent set of issues centred on parking, traffic, amenity, intensity of occupation and neighbourhood character. Those matters are relevant and have been properly considered. However, when assessed against the planning framework and the supporting material in Code Compliance Report.pdf, the proposal remains one for intensification of existing lawful rooming accommodation within the existing built form on a site in close proximity to high-frequency public transport.

The application material concludes that the proposal satisfies the applicable Rooming Accommodation Code, the Low-medium density residential zone code and the relevant neighbourhood plan and secondary code provisions. In particular, the proposal relies on existing approved building form and access arrangements, provides on-site parking assessed as compliant for the relevant land use in this location, and does not involve additional height, bulk or boundary encroachment.

For these reasons, the matters raised in the public submissions, while acknowledged, do not establish that the proposal would result in unacceptable planning outcomes. Council may therefore be satisfied that the issues raised through public notification have been appropriately responded to and can continue its assessment on the basis of the planning merits of the application.