
FW: Development A006835434 - 12 CHALK ST WOOLLOOWIN

From Hamilton Ward Office <hamilton.ward@bcc.qld.gov.au>

Date Wed 2026-05-20 4:06 PM

 1 attachment (109 KB)

DAPublic-A006835434-20251219-64537.pdf;

Good afternoon Team

Please see below submission sent to the Ward Office by

Could you please provide an acknowledgement response, in due course.

Kind regards

Jacqui Cooper

Senior Ward Officer

Hamilton Ward Office | **BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL**



hamilton.ward@bcc.qld.gov.au | (07) 3403 1095 | 42 Racecourse Road, Hamilton QLD 4007

Dedicated to a better Brisbane



Please Note: The Integrity Act 2009 makes it an offence for Councillors or their staff to knowingly allow lobbying activities unless the lobbyist is first registered with the State. If the purpose of your contact is a lobbying activity within the meaning of the Integrity Act 2009, you should advise that you are in compliance with all provisions of the Integrity Act 2009.

Sent: Sunday, 17 May 2026 1:51 PM

To: Hamilton Ward Office <hamilton.ward@bcc.qld.gov.au>

Subject: Development A006835434 - 12 CHALK ST WOOLLOOWIN

Dear Cr Dixon,

I am writing to share my objection to the proposed development at 12 Chalk Street Woolloowin. My submission made during the public notification period is attached above, which includes further

details as to why I object this proposal to further increase the height of the proposed towers on the site.

Broadly my objections are as follows:

- Two buildings of 12 and 14 storeys well and truly exceed the Neighbourhood Plan limit of 8 stories and would be completely incongruous with the surrounding area. These proposed towers would be far taller than any current or future buildings in the vicinity.
- Limited community support as evidenced by the number of submissions, as well as the developers conduct regarding extremely limited community consultations, no published information aside from a letterbox drop regarding the proposal and timing the notification period over the Christmas holidays.
- Potential impacts on traffic and parking in the surrounding area especially given current parking constraints and that the proposal includes no infrastructure upgrades whatsoever to the surrounding area.
- A lack of public benefit given the park has already been delivered and there is no clearly identifiable way of incorporating any further community benefit on the site and the detrimental impact to the historical significance of the site.

I would appreciate it you could please review this matter.

Whilst I acknowledge the proposed development is working its way through the planning process, the fact that the proposed development vastly differs from both the Neighbourhood and City Plans as they currently stand in my view warrants the serious attention of Councillors to ensure that integrity of planning decisions is upheld and the Community expectation that Neighbourhood plans are followed is maintained. Wooloowin as well as other inner city areas need to do their fair share to increase Brisbane's density as it continues to grow. The overall Greville development contributes to that especially with the increase in townhouses, commonly referred to as Brisbane's missing middle. It is not however a suitable location for high rise developments considering the surrounding character of the area and the associated infrastructure.

I look forward to hearing further from you on this matter.

Regards,

19/12/2025

[details removed by request]

DAPublic-A006835434-20251219-64537.pdf

Oppose

Refer attached PDF

Objection to Development Application A006835434 – 12 Chalk Street, Woolloowin

The proposed development for two residential towers of 12 and 14 storeys is close to 50% higher than the allowable height under the Lutwyche Road Corridor Neighbourhood Plan and therefore non-compliant with the plan, is inconsistent with community expectations, and would have significant impacts on already congested streets. Further reasons for my objection are set out below.

Excessive Building Height, Scale and inconsistency with current Neighbourhood plan

- The proposal for 12 and 14 storeys substantially exceeds the existing 8-storey preliminary approval and the bulk and scale of these buildings would be inconsistent with the character of the suburb.
- The proposed 12- and 14-storey development exceeds the maximum building heights specified in Table 7.2.12.4.3.B for the Sisters of Mercy precinct and is therefore inconsistent with the Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Plan does not identify any precinct or sub-precinct where residential development of 14 storeys is contemplated.
- The proposal is inconsistent with Overall Outcome 7.2.12.4.2(3)(c), which identifies Woolloowin as an established residential area primarily intended for low-density residential use.
- The proposed development conflicts with Overall Outcome 7.2.12.4.2(3)(j) of the Neighbourhood Plan, as it seeks a materially greater height and scale without demonstrating either a community need or an economic need to justify the departure. The applicant relies on PO1, noting the site's proximity to rail infrastructure and bikeways and citing a broader citywide need for additional housing. However, these factors were already known and accounted for when the Neighbourhood Plan was prepared and do not justify a substantial departure from the maximum building height nor alter the Neighbourhood Plan's identification of the area as primarily low-density residential. Reliance on generalised, citywide housing objectives does not demonstrate that community expectations for this site have changed or that a materially greater height is warranted. Accordingly, the proposal fails to satisfy PO1.
- There are no similar buildings in a large radius of the proposed site, similar to The Hudson at Albion which has been incongruous with its surroundings for many years. However, unlike that property, there are no nearby sites which would be suitable for a similar scale development. This means these towers will become a permanent anomaly in their surrounding environment. These buildings would also be taller than many of those on Lutwyche Road, a major road corridor with far higher density developments.

- PO5 of the neighbourhood plan code requires development to step down to adjoining low-density areas to protect residential amenity and visual character. The proposed towers fail to provide any transition and instead dominate the adjoining town houses, the under-construction Vera apartments and the heritage listed laundry. The step down from 8 storeys is very different to 12 and 14 storeys.
- Setbacks fall well short of the neighbourhood plan requirements with no transition to the footpaths on Bridge Street. Bridge Street has heavy pedestrian and cyclist usage. This point has already been raised by council and is not addressed sufficiently in the applicant's responses.
- Overshadowing would materially reduce sunlight and privacy to neighbouring properties, resulting in unacceptable amenity impacts inconsistent with the intent of the Neighbourhood Plan. In particular to those who have recently purchased townhouses in Greville, not expecting such a large deviation from the already approved plans and there are privacy concerns for the Holy Cross School.

Limited Local Community Support and Lack of Public Benefit

- The DA process for this site has in one form or another been running for many years. The 8-storey preliminary approval itself received significant community pushback, and Council should enforce that outcome. Neighbourhood Plans carry statutory weight as an expression of local community intent. There is no evidence community expectations have changed such that a deviation from the plan of this scale should be allowed.
- The conduct of the applicant suggests they may also understand that there is significant community opposition to this proposed development.
 - There has been limited publicity, with a flyer dropped locally but no mention of the changes on the Greville website.
 - The developer cites proactive engagement in their initial submission, yet only 21 registrations of interest were received across hundreds of local residents, compared to over 100 submissions already made to council before and during the public notification period. This reflects poor engagement on behalf of the applicant.
 - The public notification period is timed such that it falls into the Christmas holiday period when engagement will naturally be lower.
- Despite seeking a 50 percent increase in height, the application provides no public benefit justification. The applicant's responses to council on this point fail to demonstrate why this significant change in building scale and height should be approved.

- There is limited opportunity for any additional community amenity to be added, as the Greville parkland was already delivered as part of the earlier 8-storey approval there is no opportunity to provide additional green or community space. This amenity was part of a compromise between the developer and the community. It is not a reasonable position to then seek further uplift after that space has already been delivered.
- The existing 8-storey preliminary approval already represents a departure from surrounding character. Council should hold firm that it is the maximum height permitted. It would be unacceptable to allow a process where an excessive scheme is lodged only to be negotiated down slightly.
- Approval of this development would set a precedent for other large-scale developments in low-density areas, undermining the intent of this and other Neighbourhood Plans.

Traffic, Transport, Infrastructure and Servicing

- The development would substantially increase traffic on surrounding roads such as Chalk and Bridge Street, which are already constrained by the rail overpass and compromised intersection design given the railway alignment.
- Emergency services access is not properly considered given the constrained road layout. These are already narrow, congested local roads with difficult turning movements.
- Since the 8-storey preliminary approval was issued, traffic congestion, parking demand, and school pick-up/drop-off pressures have worsened. The traffic assessment relied upon is outdated and does not consider local conditions or recent increases in congestion. In particular, pick-up and drop-off periods at the nearby primary school and childcare centre already cause acute congestion and safety risks, which are absent from the applicant's analysis. A new site specific Traffic Impact study must be required before any proposal of this scale is considered further. It is unreasonable to rely on an outdated traffic assessment prepared for a smaller development when the scale, yield and parking outcomes have changed.
- The amended application also proposes fewer car parks despite more dwellings, relying on informal advice from the earlier preliminary approval rather than the City Plan's parking requirements. This is unacceptable given narrow side streets already experience heavy parking pressures from commuters accessing Woolloowin Station as well as the overflow from the current Greville residents, noting that this additional strain has already been felt despite the fact a small portion of the Greville development has been completed to date.

Conclusion

This application represents overdevelopment that is inconsistent with the Brisbane City Plan, the Lutwyche Road Neighbourhood Plan, and community expectations.

This application follows a multi-year process during which the local community has consistently and strongly opposed further uplift. There is no evidence that local community expectations have shifted substantially since then given the number of objections already made confirming that opposition remains strong.

To approve this application would undermine public trust in Council's ability to uphold its own planning framework and protect community expectations.

I therefore urge Council to refuse this application.