

urbis.com.au

Level 32, 300 George Street
Brisbane QLD 4000 Australia (Yuggera Country)

Urbis Ltd
ABN 50 105 256 228



27 August 2026

The Assessment Manager
Brisbane City Council
PO Box 1434
Brisbane QLD 4001

Attention: Alexandria Wood

Delivery via email: Dsplanningsupport@brisbane.qld.gov.au

Dear Alexandria,

Response to Information Request for a Minor Change Development Application to an existing development approval at 652 Toohey Road, Salisbury QLD 4111 (Council Reference: A007007175)

In accordance with Section 13.2 of the *Development Assessment Rules* and on behalf of *Queensland Venue Co. Pty Ltd* ('the Applicant'), please find below a response to the information requested by Brisbane City Council on 24 June 2026.

The response is prepared in relation to the abovementioned Minor Change development application to an existing development approval over the site at 652 Toohey Road, Salisbury, otherwise referred to as the Salisbury Hotel.

The response is accompanied by the following supporting information:

- **Attachment A** – Standard Planning Certificate, provided by *Brisbane City Council* on 1 April 2026;
- **Attachment B** – Response to Information Request for Traffic Items, prepared by *Urbis*;
- **Attachment C** – Amended Site Plan, prepared by *Red Architecture*;
- **Attachment D** – Revised Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by *ATP Consulting Engineers*; and
- **Attachment E** – Bushfire Hazard Assessment, prepared by *Covey Associates*.

Response to Information Request

Each item from Council's Information Request has been outlined below (*in italics*) along with the respective responses to each item.

Item 1 – Previous Approvals

1. *It is noted that this change application relates to the 1989 approval (A001546131 – Old Council Ref: 420/10 1610/89 – Consent Permit for extensions to hotel, approved 14 September 1989). However, subsequent Material Change of Use approvals have also been issued over the site, including the 1998 approval (A001590155 – Old Council Ref: 253/15 2722/98 – Extensions to tavern, approved 28 August 1998) and the 2002 approval (A001641427 – Old Council Ref: DRS/USE/H02 827653 – Extension to centre activity (liquor barn), approved 20 September 2002).*
 - a. *Provide justification as to why the current minor change application is lodged against the 1989 approval, rather than the later approvals issued in 1998 or 2002.*

Response

The Applicant obtained a Standard Planning and Development Certificate on 1 April 2026 to identify historic development approvals over the site.

A copy of the Standard Planning and Development Certificate is enclosed as **Attachment A** and identifies several historical approvals, including the 1989 approval for extensions to the hotel. The development approvals listed within this document provide limited information on each development approval.

- Extension to centre activity (liquor barn), approved 20 September 2002 (Council Ref: A001641427 – Old Council Ref: DRS/USE/H02 827653)
 - A review of the development approval documents shows that the development relates to the introduction of the liquor barn retail use. No plans are attached to this approval and the conditions and the conditions provided are not relevant to the Hotel use.
- Extensions to tavern, approved 28 August 1998 (Council Ref: A001590155 – Old Council Ref: 253/15 2722/98)
 - A review of the development approval documents shows the development permit is granted for:
 - Carrying out Building Works (preliminary approval); and
 - Carrying out Operational Works (preliminary approval).
 - No site plans are attached to the Certificate that relate to this approval, and the conditions of development do not specifically refer to the Hotel use.

While it is acknowledged that subsequent approvals were issued in 1998 and 2002, including approvals relating to extensions to the tavern and the liquor barn component, having regard to the nature of the proposed minor change, the 1989 approval remains the most relevant. This development approval was selected to be the applicable approval to make the proposed minor change application as it specifically relates to the Hotel use.

Notwithstanding this, we are happy to make any updates or take recommendations from Council on any suitable methods to consolidate the approvals in the most appropriate way.

Item 2 – Car Parking

2. *The submitted 'Minor Change Letter – Transport' states that a total of 165 on-site car parking spaces are provided (135 for the Tavern/Hotel and 30 for the Bottle-shop), with 17 Tavern/Hotel spaces proposed to be removed. However, the parking supply appears to be based on an incorrect approval, referencing the 2002 approval rather than the 1998 approval that is subject to this minor change application.*

Further, the letter does not apply the correct parking rates in accordance with Tables 13 and 14 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing (TAPS) planning scheme policy (PSP), noting that 'Hotel' is not classified under the 'Centre Activities' activity group. The assessment also fails to consider the existing short-term accommodation at the southern end of the site.

a. Provide updated Traffic Report that addresses the discrepancies mentioned above.

Response

In response to Item 2, an updated Traffic Report has been prepared by *Urbis*. The traffic report reflects surveys and actual counts of car parking spaces on the site.

As noted above Council do not have complete information on development approval and car park space condition history. Therefore, the amount of spaces surveyed on site and what is in the latest provided development approval may not align.

We are satisfied for Council to consolidate development approval parking numbers for the site within this minor change request.

Please refer to **Attachment B** which provides response to Traffic related items.

Item 3 – Car Parking

3. The minor change application proposes the removal of one PWD space, which has not been reinstated on the submitted plans.

a. Provide amended plans that clearly identify and include the PWD space proposed to be removed. The PWD space must have minimum dimensions of 2.4m (width) x 5.4m (length), with an adjoining shared area of 2.4m (width) x 5.4m (length).

Note: Ensure the total number of car parking spaces across the entire site (including the bottle shop and short-term accommodation) is clearly shown and labelled on the amended plans. The total number of spaces identified on the amended plans must align with the figures stated in the updated Traffic Report.

Response

In response to Item 3, the PWD space has been reinstated within the car parking layout for the site. Further detail is provided in the Response to Information Request for Traffic Items (refer **Attachment B**) which provides response to Traffic related items.

Item 4 – Plans

4. A site plan capturing the existing and proposed development across the entire site has not been provided. The submitted 'Existing Ariel Site Overlay Plan' is not clear in portraying the existing and proposed development across the site and does not provide detail on car parking spaces, landscaping, access points and does not include property boundaries.

a. Provide a clear and concise Site Plan that portrays the existing and proposed development across the site and includes details on car parking spaces, landscaping, access points and shows the property boundaries.

Response

In response to Item 4, please refer to **Attachment C** which illustrates the updated proposed Site Plan that portrays the existing and proposed development across the site and includes details on car parking spaces, landscaping, access points and shows the property boundaries.

Item 5 – Noise

5. *The submitted Noise Impact Assessment (ATP260245-R-NIA-01A) addressing Performance Outcome PO1 of the Centre or mixed use code has been reviewed, however further information is required to enable a comprehensive assessment of the proposal against the relevant acoustic performance criteria.*

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment considers only the noise impacts associated with the proposed extension, rather than the cumulative noise impacts generated by the entire hotel use (including both existing and proposed components). While the existing operations are established, the proposed extension is expected to increase the scale and intensity of activities on-site (e.g. external patron capacity, kids play area). Accordingly, a cumulative noise assessment is required to demonstrate that the overall development, as intensified by the proposal, complies with the relevant acoustic criteria and does not result in unacceptable impacts to surrounding premises, consistent with PO1 of the Centre or mixed use code.

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment also states that adjoining uses to the east are not sensitive receptors, however, the adjoining premises is located within an Emerging community zone, which is identified as a sensitive zone with applicable acoustic criteria under PO1 of the Centre or mixed use code. Accordingly, the assessment should consider these receivers as sensitive receptors and demonstrate compliance with the relevant noise limits at these locations. This is to include an assessment of noise impacts at multiple representative receiver heights, up to the maximum building height permitted for the land under the applicable zone and/or neighbourhood plan provisions, to account for the future development potential of the area.

- a. Provide an amended Noise Impact Assessment in accordance with the abovementioned.*

Response

In response to Item 5 of the Information Request, please refer to **Attachment D** – Revised Noise Impact Assessment.

The revised Noise Impact Assessment has been updated to address Council's request for a cumulative noise assessment. The report now considers noise emissions associated with the overall operation of the Salisbury Hotel, including both the existing hotel operations and the proposed beer garden extension and kids play area.

The revised modelling demonstrates that the cumulative operation of the development, as intensified by the proposal, will comply with the relevant acoustic criteria under PO1 of the Centre or mixed use code.

The noise report does not model the adjoining site to the east as a sensitive receptor. This is due to the following:

- The site is currently occupied by a large industrial and commercial land use that has been in operation for an extended period of time, as far back as aerial photography is recorded. The industrial site is not a sensitive receiver.

- There are no current development applications or approvals over the site for a residential use.
- The long term consideration of the site for residential structure planning is in very early stages and not determined. Given the site is within private ownership and operated as a long term and large commercial/industrial use and is unclear if and when this could occur.
- Assumption of residential uses on the adjoining site is unreasonable and unbalanced in this scenario. The subject venue has been established for many years and forms an important part of the local community and centre. It would be unreasonable to apply residential noise considerations in this scenario and we request further consideration of a performance solution via the Overall outcome and Minor change test.
- Overall outcome 2(a) of the code states:
"Development involving a new use in an existing building is appropriate for its location and does not negatively impact on the amenity of the local area or adjoining residents."
 The proposal does not involve a 'new' use but rather an extension and upgrade of the existing venue. This extension is appropriate to the scale, size and location of the venue and surrounding area. We also note that there are no existing residents who would be affected by the proposed extension.
 Furthermore, based on the Minor change test, there are no additional adverse impacts from the proposed extension. Future structure planning and development applications over the adjoining site should suitably consider existing, long established adjoining uses.

Item 6 – Bushfire hazard

6. *The proposed development site is mapped within a high hazard buffer area within the Bushfire overlay, triggering assessment against sections A and B of the Bushfire overlay code. Where difficult to evacuate uses are located within a bushfire prone area, the Bushfire overlay code requires development to be exposed to radiant heat levels less than 12.5kW/m² (PO1), minimises bushfire risk from build-up of fuels around buildings and structures (PO2), makes adequate provision for fire-fighting requirements, including water supply (PO6), and provides for safe and efficient evacuation and emergency services access to the site during a bushfire (PO9).*

No bushfire reporting has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development complies with the requirements of the Bushfire overlay code.

- a. *Provide a site-specific bushfire hazard assessment and management plan in accordance with the Bushfire planning scheme policy or other approved methodology. Where within a bushfire prone area, provide a radiant heat exposure assessment to demonstrate compliance with PO1 of the Bushfire overlay code. Bushfire Reporting and hazard assessment guidelines are available within the technical assessment guide for Bushfire reporting available on Council's website.*

Note: If the bushfire hazard assessment determines a hazard score of 'low', no further assessment against the code is required. If a hazard score of 'medium' or 'high' is determined, an assessment against relevant sections of the code and a Bushfire Management Plan are required.

- b. *Provide an assessment against the relevant sections of the Bushfire overlay code, based on the findings of the Bushfire reporting.*

Response

In response to Item 6 of the Information Request, please refer to **Attachment E** – Bushfire Hazard Assessment.

The Bushfire Hazard Assessment has been prepared in response to Council’s request and assesses the proposed extension against the relevant provisions of the Bushfire overlay code and Bushfire planning scheme policy. The assessment confirms that, although part of the site is mapped within the Bushfire overlay, the bushfire hazard affecting the proposed works is generated by vegetation within Wilcox Park located to the south of the site. Due to the proximity of the proposed beer garden extension to Wilcox Park, the overall fire hazard risk to the beer garden deck extension is low.

Notwithstanding, the assessment identifies the relevant vegetation as open forest vegetation and, having regard to the vegetation community, slope and aspect, determines a total hazard score of 12, corresponding to a Medium bushfire hazard level. Based on this hazard rating, a 50m safety buffer is required. The proposed works maintains the existing Asset Protection Zone setback of more than 75m to the nearest unmanaged vegetation, and more than 90m to the proposed outdoor roof structure, thereby exceeding the required safety buffer.

The assessment also confirms that the proposal does not result in the need for additional access or firefighting water supply provisions. Existing access arrangements provide two sealed, two-way routes to Toohey Road and Fairlawn Street, and the site is serviced by existing reticulated water supply and hydrant infrastructure. The Bushfire Hazard Assessment further confirms that any permanent roof structures proposed as part of the beer garden extension are to be constructed to BAL-12.5 in accordance with AS 3959:2018.

An assessment of the relevant sections of the Bushfire overlay code has been prepared by Covey and is attached within **Attachment E**.

Overall, the proposed development achieves the relevant bushfire requirements, with the identified mitigation measures considered appropriate to manage bushfire risk having regard to the site context and proposed works.

Item 7 – Infrastructure charges and credits

7. *Sufficient information has not been provided to enable the accurate calculation of applicable infrastructure charges and any demand credits. The submitted plans do not provide adequate detail to determine the extent of impervious area. Further information is therefore required to enable a proper calculation of infrastructure charges.*
 - a. *Provide accurately measured and scaled plans identifying all proposed impervious areas, including roofed structures, hardstand areas, and other impervious surfaces, with corresponding areas clearly labelled.*
 - b. *Provide details of the existing impervious area on the site, demonstrated through surveyed plans and/or appropriately scaled and annotated aerial imagery.*

Response

In response to Item 7 of Council’s Information Request, please refer to **Attachment C** which provides the additional impervious area Site Plan detail.

Summary

This response addresses all the items raised in Council's Information Request. On this basis, the information request has been fully responded by the Applicant, bringing Part 3 of the DA Rules to an end.

If you have any questions regarding the above or attached material, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned or **Hannah Knarr (Senior Consultant)**, or **Anmol Chhina (Consultant)** on 07 3007 3800.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "DJ", followed by a horizontal line.

David Janson
Associate Director
+61 7 3007 3590
+61 401 200 911
djanson@urbis.com.au

Attachment A

Certificate of Development

Attachment B

Response to Information Request for Traffic Items

Attachment C

Amended Site Plan

Attachment D

Revised Noise Impact Assessment

Attachment E

Landscape Concept Report

urbis.com.au

Level 32, 300 George Street
Brisbane QLD 4000 Australia (Yuggera Country)

Urbis Ltd
ABN 50 105 256 228

