

BCC DS

LODGED

08/05/2025

APPLICATION REF

A006769545

8 May 2025

By online lodgement portal: [Brisbane.qld.gov.au/planningandbuilding](https://brisbane.qld.gov.au/planningandbuilding)

RE: APPLICATION NUMBER DRS/USE/H02-837361: 1326 IPSWICH ROAD, ROCKLEA

Allan Van Planning have been commissioned by the applicant Timerun Pty Ltd, to prepare an application seeking a Change to Approval for a 'Minor Change' pursuant to section 81 of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) for application number DRS/USE/H02-837361 located at 1326 Ipswich Road, Rocklea.

The approval is for Short-term Accommodation comprising of 40 rooms, two (2) meeting rooms and a communal dining area (Refer to Approved Plans prepared by Husband Leith Architects). The approval DRS/USE/H02-837361 was issued by the assessment manager dated 8 April 2003 and is a 'current' approval in accordance with the Act.

The proposed change to the approval consists of alterations to the existing building to re-locate a meeting room and dining room and add 14 rooms to the building (total 54 rooms). The alterations will result in a reduction of car parking spaces, however the spaces comply with the current rate in the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*.

The proposed change is considered to meet the requirements for a 'minor change' and a full assessment for the criteria from **schedule 2** of the *Planning Act 2016* has been provided within the sections below.

ALLAN VAN PLANNING PTY LTD

Consultants in Town Planning and Surveying

ABN 87005163431

Brisbane: PO Box 284 Toowong DC Qld 4066

Ipswich: PO Box 5370 Brassall Qld 4305

Gold Coast: PO Box 2130 Nerang DC Qld 4211

www.allanvanplanning.com.au

1 APPROVAL DESCRIPTION

The applicant seeks to change an existing approval for a Short-term Accommodation located at 1326 Ipswich Road, Rocklea in accordance with the Proposal Plans prepared by Whitelight (Refer to **Appendix A**). The approval comprises of 40 rooms, two (2) meeting rooms and a communal dining area.

1.1 Change Detail

The proposed change to the development consists of alterations to the existing building to re-locate a meeting room and dining room and add 14 rooms to the building (total 54 rooms).

The changes at ground level involves converting and extending the dining room and meeting room 2 to accommodate 6 new rooms in the north-west part of the building. The extension at ground level will result in a reduced setback to the Ipswich Motorway slip road, however would not be out-of-context with the adjacent development.

The loss of the meeting room and dining room will be off-set with the extension of a 'multi-purpose' room in the northern part of the building, which is to be constructed over car parks 1 – 7 in the approved plan. The extension also allows for an expansion to the upper level to introduce additional rooms.

The upper level will include a minor extension above the new rooms in the north-west part of the building (adding 2 rooms and new stairs) and 6 rooms above the 'multi-purpose room' extension to create a total of 14 additional rooms in the building.

The proposed extension to the building is beyond the footprint of the existing structure and is within the front setback area for the 'secondary frontage' of the property, being the Ipswich Motorway slip road (illustrated below):



The red hatched areas have a setback less than 4m from the boundary.

As described above, the boundary is to the slip road for the Ipswich Motorway and does not have any other buildings fronting the road on either side of the road corridor.

The subject site is in a rather unique situation whereby it is on an 'island' and other nearby property is within the Industry Zone.



The nearby properties to the west at the intersection of Ipswich Road and Medway Street are both built-to-boundary, therefore a reduced 'front' boundary setback would not be out-of-context with the nearby built form:



In addition, the building itself is at a similar height to the Ipswich Motorway overpass that directly adjoins the property to the east. Therefore, the scale of the built form and extension would not create an overbearing development on the nearby street.



Overall, it is considered that the proposed extension to the building is generally consistent with the minimum design requirements of the planning scheme and should be supported.

Conditions to be changed include:

Condition – Car parking - 29 (d)

- **Parking on-the site for 40 cars;**

Proposed Change – parking on the site for 31 cars;

Refer to Proposal Plans in **Appendix A** for further details.

2 ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

This section addresses the statutory documentation relevant to the proposed development and the subject site.

2.1 Planning Act 2016

The proposal seeks a change to approval pursuant to **section 78** of the *Planning Act 2016*, being a 'minor change' (section 81). The proposed development is considered to comply with the assessment criteria for a 'minor change' as defined in Schedule 2 of the *Planning Act 2016*. An assessment is provided below:

Schedule 2 of the *Planning Act 2016*:

Minor change means a change that —

(b) for a development approval -

(i) would not result in a substantially different development; and

Applicant Response – The proposed change to the development is not considered to result in a substantially different development. The proposed change has been assessed against Schedule 1: item 4 of the Development Assessment Rules within the section below.

Overall, the proposed change results in a minor extension to the existing building and additional rooms for the purpose of short-term accommodation.

(ii) if a development application for the development, including the change, were made when the change application is made would not cause —

(A) The inclusion of prohibited development in the application; or

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not result in a prohibited development.

(B) referral to a referral agency, other than to the chief executive, if there were no referral agencies for the development application; or

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not trigger additional referral agencies.

(C) referral to extra referral agencies, other than to the chief executive; or

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not trigger additional referral agencies.

(D) a referral agency to assess the application against, or have regard to, matters prescribed by regulation under section 55(2), other than matters the referral agency must have assessed the application against, or have had regard to, when the application was made; or

Applicant Response – The proposed changes do not create additional prescribed matters for assessment by a referral agency.

(E) public notification if public notification was not required for the development application.

Applicant Response – The original development was Code Assessed and the proposed change does not result in a change to level of assessment to require public notification.

The **Schedule 1: item 4** of the **development assessment rules** describes a ‘substantially different development’ as follows:

*A change may be considered to result in a **substantially different development** if the proposed change:*

- *involves a new use; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not result in a new use on the site.

- *results in the application applying to a new parcel of land; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not include a new parcel of land.

- *dramatically changes the built form in terms of scale, bulk and appearance; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not dramatically change the scale, bulk or appearance of the approved Short-term Accommodation.

- *changes the ability of the proposal to operate as intended; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not change the ability for the approved Short-term Accommodation to operate as intended. Whilst car parking spaces are reduced, the proposed number of spaces provided exceeds the current rate for car parking in *Brisbane City Plan 2014*.

- *removes a component that is integral to the operation of the development; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not remove any integral components for the approved Short-term Accommodation to operate as intended.

- *significantly impacts on traffic flow and the transport network, such as increasing traffic to the site; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not significantly change the traffic demands of the approved Short-term Accommodation.

- *introduces new impacts or increases the severity of known impacts; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not create additional impacts or increase the severity of know impacts as a result of the development.

- *removes an incentive or offset component that would have balanced a negative impact of the development; or*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not result in offset components being applied or removed.

- *impacts on infrastructure provision.*

Applicant Response – The proposed change does not create addition impacts to infrastructure demands.

3 CONCLUSION

This report was prepared by Allan Van Planning on behalf of Timerun Pty Ltd, in support of an application seeking a change to approval pursuant to section 81 of the *Planning Act 2016* located at 1326 Ipswich Road, Rocklea.

In summary, the proposal is considered to have sufficient planning merit to justify Council's favourable consideration, and that the application is recommended for approval subject to reasonable and relevant conditions.

Kind Regards,



Dan Ebert
Allan Van Planning