
FW: Submission re Proposed Devt. to Existing Buildings (new, semi-detached) at 34 & 36 Premier St., Oxley, 4075

From dalodgement <dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Date Thu 2026-03-26 9:28 AM

To CPEDS-DS-PlanningSupport <CPEDS-DS-PlanningSupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Cc DA RECORDS <DA_RECORDS@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

SECURITY LABEL: OFFICIAL

Sent: Wednesday, 25 March 2026 4:43 PM

To: dalodgement <dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Cc: DA RECORDS <DA_RECORDS@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

Subject: Submission re Proposed Devt. to Existing Buildings (new, semi-detached) at 34 & 36 Premier St., Oxley, 4075

This email originates from outside of Brisbane City Council.

Response to Proposed Development, being in fact a doubling of the allowed number of residents.

These dwellings at 34 & 36 Premier St., Oxley, 4075 are recently completed existing buildings which are being occupied only from March, 2026. They were originally intended for an overall total of 10 residents. (5 at 34, 5 at 36).These are described as Lot 2 & Lot 1

SP349626

Rooming Accommodation

3403 8888.

Number 34 now has just 1 door for 5 occupants, so everyone has to enter & exit via the same door. #36 likewise has one door only for 5 residents under existing conditions. There was no mention when the studios at #34 were advertised that there was very soon to be an application to double the permitted level of occupancy.

Doubling the occupancy would mean that 10 people would be using the one door on each side, that is an overall occupancy of 20 for 34 & 36 combined with just 2 doors.

I think this may contravene fire regulations.

The 5 residents at #34 now share 2 washing machines & 2 small clothes lines. They also share one rubbish bin and one recycling bin.

From experience at a similar property I am most concerned that these facilities are not adequate for a doubled occupancy, if allowed.

Premier St. already has other share housing dwellings (rooming accommodation) and the parking on the street is restricted both in space and time. There is already limited space available. It would seem that if the occupancy at 34 and 36 is allowed to double, then the owners of other similar properties will also request permission to double their number of residents. This would result in overcrowding in my opinion and not be in line with the original intention when these developments were approved.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this proposal, to which I object for the above reasons.