

**FW: Submission for application reference: A006915607**

---

**From**

**Date**

**To**

**Cc**

 1 attachment (11 KB)

council\_submission\_indooroopilly\_v2.docx;

**SECURITY LABEL: OFFICIAL**

---

**From:**

**Sent:** Tuesday, 5 May 2026 7:38 PM

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

**Cc:** DA RECORDS <DA\_RECORDS@brisbane.qld.gov.au>

**Subject:** Submission for application reference: A006915607

---

*This email originates from outside of Brisbane City Council.*

---

Hello,

Please find attached a submission on the development application reference A006915607, covering 12 Rylatt St Indooroopilly.

If possible, please don't publicly disclose my details.

Thank you, kind regards,

5 May 2026

The Assessment Manager  
Brisbane City Council  
Development Assessment

**Re: Formal Objection — Proposed Development, Rylatt Street,  
Indooroopilly QLD 4068**

## **1. Introduction**

---

I formally object to this development application. At 11 storeys, the proposal is 120% above the 5-storey Acceptable Outcome for this precinct and is inconsistent with the Indooroopilly Neighbourhood Plan, the Multiple Dwelling Code, and the Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code. The proponent has not demonstrated compliance with the relevant Performance Outcomes (POs) or provided adequate performance-based justification for the departures sought.

I request that Council refuse the application, or require the proponent to reduce the development to no greater than 5 storeys.

## **2. Planning History**

---

In 2020, Council and the proponent agreed to reduce an earlier proposal on this site from 6 storeys to 5 storeys. That approved 5-storey development was never built. The proponent has not identified any material change in circumstances that would justify departing from that agreed outcome, let alone tripling the height to 11 storeys. A 5-storey development would still deliver approximately 50 dwellings, contributing meaningfully to housing supply.

## **3. Non-Compliance — Indooroopilly Neighbourhood Plan**

---

### **AO1 / PO1 — Height, Streetscape Character and Community Expectations**

- AO1 limits building height to 5 storeys. The proposal is 11 storeys with no adequate justification.
- PO1 requires development to contribute to a cohesive streetscape. The opposite side of Rylatt Street is 1–2 storey character housing; an 11-storey building would be visually dominant and out of scale.
- The design is bulky and monolithic with insufficient articulation to reduce visual impact.
- PO1b requires alignment with community expectations on building height. No evidence supports that 11 storeys reflects those expectations.

### **PO1 — Pressure on Community Facilities**

- The site is within the catchment of Indooroopilly State School and Indooroopilly State High School. The high school is already operating above capacity.
- The proponent has not addressed the development's impact on these oversubscribed facilities, as required by PO1.

#### **PO1 — Traffic and Parking**

- The proposed 157 car spaces falls below Council's own parking requirements.
- Traffic generated by an 11-storey building will exceed the capacity of the surrounding minor roads (Rylatt, Burton, and Shirley Streets), particularly given two nearby childcare centres and high school pedestrian movements.

#### **Code Purposes 3C, 3E and 3H**

- 3C: Development must not place disproportionate pressure on transport infrastructure or community facilities. This proposal does, for the reasons above.
- 3E: Development must complement traditional streetscape character where pre-1946 buildings are present. Rylatt Street contains pre-1946 homes; the adjacent childcare centre retains a heritage church building; and Jackson Street (sharing the same block) is a designated Special Context Sub-Precinct for its pre-1946 housing. An 11-storey tower is irreconcilable with 3E.
- 3H: Development must be consistent with precinct amenity, character, and community expectations. This proposal is not.

## **4. Non-Compliance — Multiple Dwelling Code**

---

#### **PO3, PO4 and PO13**

- PO3: Building heights must be consistent with the local area and, where they exceed the acceptable outcome, must step down sensitively toward site boundaries. At 11 storeys opposite 1–2 storey character housing, the proposed setbacks and articulation are wholly inadequate.
- PO4: Height, scale, and form must contribute to a cohesive streetscape in accordance with the neighbourhood plan. This proposal does not.
- PO13: Sites in a height transition zone (which this is) must step down toward lower-density areas, minimise overlooking and visual dominance, and maintain light and ventilation to adjoining properties. The proposal makes no meaningful concession to any of these requirements.

## **5. Non-Compliance — Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing Code**

---

#### **PO4 — Parking and Traffic Safety**

- Parking provision is below Council's standard requirements (as acknowledged by the proponent).
- The development's traffic generation will exceed the safe capacity of the surrounding minor road network.
- Road safety risks are heightened by the proximity of two childcare centres and significant school pedestrian traffic.

## **6. Conclusion**

---

This proposal fails to comply with multiple POs and AOs across three planning codes. The departures are not minor — the development is double the permitted height and incompatible with the established character, infrastructure capacity, and community expectations of this precinct.

I respectfully request that Council:

- Refuse the development application as submitted; or
- Require the proponent to reduce the development to no greater than 5 storeys, consistent with the outcome agreed with Council in 2020.
- 

Yours sincerely,