

8 April 2026

Chief Executive Officer
Brisbane City Council
C/- Laura Urbina, Senior Urban Planner
Planning Services North

GPC Job Reference: 25.2426

Dear Laura,

RE: SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

11 AMISFIELD AVENUE, NUNDAH QLD 4012 (APPLICATION REFERENCE: A006881302)

1. INTRODUCTION

The applicant has undertaken public notification in accordance with Chapter 1, Part 4 of the Development Assessment Rules (version 3.0), made under section 68 of the *Planning Act 2016*, for the development application seeking a Development Permit for a Material Change of Use for a Multiple dwelling (8 units).

Public notification was undertaken between 12 March 2026 and 1 April 2026. A Notice of Compliance with Public Notification Requirements was issued to Council on 2 April 2026.

Following the completion of the notification period, Council received a total of four (4) submissions. Of these, three (3) submissions are properly made, comprising one (1) submission in support of the proposal and two (2) submissions opposing the proposal. Broadly, the opposing submissions raise concerns regarding building height and setbacks, amenity impacts, parking, traffic and servicing, stormwater and construction-related matters. The supporting submission generally supports the proposal, while requesting that parking demand be carefully considered.

This letter provides a summary response to the key issues raised during public notification.

2. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Submission Item	Applicant's Response
Built form, height, setbacks and	Concerns were raised regarding the proposed height, side and rear setbacks, and the extent to which the proposal aligns with the intended character of the locality. The application is to be assessed within Queensland's performance-based planning framework, where compliance may be

<p>neighbourhood character</p>	<p>demonstrated by achieving the relevant performance outcomes, rather than only through strict adherence to acceptable outcomes. In this context, the proposed development is considered to deliver a built form outcome consistent with the strategic intent for increased residential density in accessible urban locations and within a locality already characterised by multiple dwelling development. The design incorporates articulation, setbacks and built form modulation supported by generous landscaping treatments to reduce visual bulk and appropriately manage interfaces with adjoining development.</p> <p>The proposal is in keeping with the maximum building height broadly anticipated for the Union Street precinct and represents a built form outcome consistent with the intensity of development envisaged within the locality. Further, the dwelling density of the proposal is modest in comparison to similar development in the surrounding area, demonstrating that the density will not translate into inordinate operational and traffic demands.</p> <p>Importantly, the impact assessment process is required to be carried out having regard to any relevant matters called upon by the applicant in support of the proposed development. Accordingly, broader strategic policies – including housing supply and the regional activity centre network – are to be considered in assessing whether the development represents an appropriate planning outcome.</p>
<p>Privacy, noise, lighting, emissions and residential amenity</p>	<p>Submitters raised concerns relating to overlooking, light spill, vehicle noise, refuse noise, rooftop activity and general impacts on the amenity of adjoining properties. These matters are acknowledged. The proposed development has been designed having regard to the relationship with adjoining sites, including the provision of setbacks, screening, landscaping and separation to minimise potential amenity impacts.</p> <p>Matters such as detailed lighting, waste management, acoustic treatment and building services are capable of being addressed through the detailed design process and, where necessary, through reasonable and relevant conditions of approval.</p> <p>Architecturally, the building has been specifically modulated with recessed upper levels to maximise access to natural sunlight for the adjoining building at 7-9 Amisfield Avenue.</p> <p>Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable amenity impacts having regard to the urban context of the site and its Medium density residential zoning.</p>
<p>Refuse storage and servicing</p>	<p>Concerns were raised regarding the location of the refuse area and the potential for associated odour and noise impacts. Waste storage and collection arrangements form part of the overall detailed design and operational management of the development and can be appropriately conditioned, if required, to ensure an acceptable outcome for nearby residents. There is no reason to conclude that the proposed development cannot be serviced in a manner that protects adjoining amenity, including any additional screening, acoustic protection or operational management arrangements which may be required to achieve this.</p>

Stormwater, earthworks and tree protection	<p>Submissions raised concerns regarding stormwater runoff, excavation impacts and the possible effect on adjoining vegetation. These matters are acknowledged and will be appropriately addressed through the detailed engineering design phase, including any operational works approvals that may be required. The development application does not indicate that stormwater or earthworks outcomes cannot be managed in accordance with Council's requirements. To the extent necessary, these matters can be addressed through standard engineering and construction conditions to ensure impacts on adjoining vegetation and structural components are avoided and/ or appropriately mitigated throughout both construction and operation of the development.</p>
Traffic, access and driveway safety	<p>Concerns were raised in relation to driveway location, sightlines, and vehicle and pedestrian safety. The proposed driveway utilises the site frontage in a constrained cul-de-sac context and has been located having regard to the frontage configuration and operational needs of the development. The scale of the proposal is modest and is not expected to generate traffic volumes that would result in unacceptable safety impacts. Importantly, existing sightlines within the verge area be maintained, ensuring pedestrian safety is not unduly compromised.</p>
Car parking, visitor parking and accessible parking	<p>Concerns were raised regarding visitor parking being located within a secured area, the possibility of increased on-street parking demand, and the absence of a dedicated PWD parking space. A supportive submission also raised parking as an issue for consideration.</p> <p>The application provides on-site parking to support the development and the arrangement of those spaces is to be assessed against the relevant City Plan provisions, having regard to the characteristics of the site and development. Within this context, the proposed location and operation of visitor parking complies with the relevant assessment benchmarks under the Transport, access, parking and servicing code and represents an acceptable planning outcome. Furthermore, there is not requirement for the development to provide any PWD parking spaces.</p> <p>The proposed carparking arrangement provides for a greater parking rate to adjacent developments at 2-4, 3 and 7-9 Amisfield Avenue. As the development is located in close proximity to multiple high-frequency transport nodes and Major Centre, the proposed on-site parking rate is considered an acceptable and context-appropriate planning outcome.</p> <p>These matters are capable of being assessed and, if necessary, refined through conditions of approval.</p>
Construction impacts	<p>Concerns were raised regarding construction traffic, dust, noise, vibration and the management of building works within the cul-de-sac environment. These are common construction-phase matters for urban infill development and can be managed through standard construction management requirements imposed as conditions of approval. They do not, in themselves, warrant further detail being provided prior to issuing of a development approval.</p>

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that Council continue its assessment of the development application on its planning merits, having regard to the submitted material and the matters raised in the properly made submissions.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Simon Grice', written over a horizontal line.

Simon Grice
Director