




Outlook

Objection to Development Application A006954430

From

Date Sat 2026-05-09 9:52 AM

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

 1 attachment (229 KB)

Objection to Development Application A006954430.pdf;

This email originates from outside of Brisbane City Council.

Dear Assessment Manager / Team,

Please find attached and Objection to Development Application A006954430.

Regards,

8 May 2026

Brisbane City Council
City Planning and Economic Development Services
GPO Box 1434
Brisbane QLD 4001
Email: DSPlanningsupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au

RE: Properly Made Submission – Objection to Development Application A006954430

Dear Assessment Manager / Team,

I'm writing to lodge a properly made submission objecting to Development Application A006954430.

My objection is based on the proposal's significant and repeated non-compliance with the Brisbane City Plan 2014, including the relevant provisions of the Toowong–Auchenflower Neighbourhood Plan and Multiple Dwelling Code. The proposal represents a substantial departure from the intended planning outcomes for the precinct and would result in unacceptable impacts on surrounding residents, streetscape character, traffic, amenity, and flood resilience.

The grounds of objection are outlined below.

1. Excessive Height and Scale

The proposed development seeks approval for a 23-storey building with a height of approximately 76.4 metres. This is almost three times the intended eight-storey limit identified under the Toowong–Auchenflower Neighbourhood Plan.

Given the relatively small site area of approximately 1,430m², the scale and intensity of the proposal are excessive and inconsistent with the intended built form outcomes for the precinct. The development does not demonstrate compatibility with the existing or intended suburban character and amenity of the surrounding area.

2. Site Area Non-Compliance

The subject site has an area of approximately 1,430m², which is below the minimum 1,500m² threshold generally required to support consideration of increased height and density outcomes.

The proposal therefore fails to satisfy a key strategic planning requirement intended to justify any uplift in scale or intensity.

3. Excessive Site Cover and Overdevelopment

The proposed site cover of approximately 59–60% significantly exceeds the maximum 50% site cover outcome contemplated under the neighbourhood plan.

This level of site coverage contributes to excessive building bulk, reduced landscaping opportunities, diminished setbacks, and an overdeveloped outcome that is inconsistent with the intended character of the locality.

4. Setback and Overhang Non-Compliance

The proposed tower setbacks of approximately:

- 3.5 metres to Land Parade; and
- 4.5 metres to Coronation Drive

are deficient against the required 5 metre setbacks.

These reduced setbacks increase perceived bulk and reduce opportunities for meaningful landscaping and streetscape canopy outcomes.

In addition, the proposal includes building overhangs extending into the proposed verge dedication area, further demonstrating non-compliance with the planning scheme intent.

5. Traffic and Access Concerns

The proposed vehicular queue length of only six metres is substantially deficient when compared to the required 36 metres.

The application relies on low traffic generation assumptions of approximately 27 vehicle movements per hour during peak periods, which appear unrealistic given the scale of the development.

The proposal would also require the removal of:

- two on-street car parking spaces; and
- two motorcycle spaces,

further impacting the surrounding public realm and local parking availability.

6. Flood Risk and Emergency Management

The proposed basement entry level remains at RL 5.7m AHD, which is below the requested RL 6.3m AHD flood immunity level.

Rather than appropriately mitigating flood risk through design, the applicant appears to rely on an emergency management approach involving “shelter in place” arrangements on the first floor during flood events.

This approach is not an adequate substitute for appropriate flood-resilient design outcomes.

7. Amenity Impacts

The proposed development would result in significant amenity impacts on neighbouring low and medium-rise residential properties, including:

- increased overshadowing;
- loss of privacy;
- visual bulk impacts; and
- reduced solar access.

The proposal may also reduce the effectiveness and performance of existing and future rooftop solar panel installations on surrounding buildings.

8. Landscaping Deficiencies

The application proposes only approximately 5.98% natural deep planting, substantially below the acceptable outcome requirements.

The proposal relies heavily on shallow 600mm distributed planter beds rather than genuine deep planting areas and does not satisfy AO29.2 of the Multiple Dwelling Code, which requires 10% deep planting.

This represents a significant shortfall in meaningful landscaping outcomes and urban greening.

9. Unverified Wind Impacts

The application appears to rely primarily on qualitative visual assessment rather than physical wind tunnel testing to assess likely wind impacts at ground level.

Given the proposed building height and scale, physical wind testing should be required to properly assess pedestrian comfort and safety impacts.

10. Lack of Demonstrated Need

The application does not demonstrate any compelling community or economic need for a development of this scale and intensity, particularly for high-end luxury residential units.

Relevant planning and court considerations, including *Bell v Brisbane City Council*, support the principle that need and should be appropriately demonstrated where significant planning non-compliances are proposed.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Brisbane City Council refuse Development Application A006954430 in its entirety.

Alternatively, I request that Council require substantial redesign and modification of the proposal to achieve genuine compliance with the Brisbane City Plan 2014, including significant reductions in:

- height;
- bulk;
- site cover; and
- overall development intensity.

The current proposal represents a substantial and unjustified departure from the planning framework intended for this precinct and would create unacceptable impacts on the surrounding community and urban environment.

Yours faithfully,