

Please find attached my submission supporting the above development. Kind regards,

Date: 1st July, 2026

The Assessment Manager
Development Assessment
Brisbane City Council
GPO Box 1434
Brisbane QLD 4001

Re: Development Application – Material Change of Use for Multiple Dwelling (21 units) and Building Works (Demolition) at 13–19 Kent Street, Hamilton – Letter of Support

Dear Assessment Manager,

My [redacted] is the owner and occupant of [redacted] — the property directly boundary of the proposed development at 13–19 Kent Street. She is the immediately affected [redacted] and I write, as an Ascot resident, to formally express my support for this application.

I have reviewed the development application materials made available during the public notification period, including the Town Planning Assessment Report prepared by Planning Initiatives dated 25 March 2026, the Architectural Design Statement by Wallacebrice, and the Landscape Concept Plans. I understand that the proposal involves a number of departures from Brisbane City Plan 2014, and I have genuinely thought about each of them. In every case, I am satisfied that the development is an appropriate and well-considered response to this location and that the impact on my mother's property has been responsibly addressed.

My views on each of the key issues are set out below.

On 24th June 2026, I met with the developers and their representatives to discuss the proposed development in detail. The plans were explained to me and I had the opportunity to raise any concerns regarding the impact on [redacted] property. Having had those matters addressed to my satisfaction, I left that meeting supportive of the proposed development, and that position has not changed.

Building Height (6–7 Storeys in the LMR2 Zone)

I'm aware that the proposed height of 6 storeys plus basement, reaching RL27.35m AHD exceeds what the LMR2 Low-medium Density Residential zone would normally anticipate. As the property immediately to the east, hers is the most directly affected by that height.

Despite that, I consider the scale to be reasonable in this context. Kent Street and Racecourse Road are clearly in transition, with several recently approved developments nearby. This includes a 5-storey mixed-use building at 77 Racecourse Road (RL28.5m) and a 4-storey development at 12 Balowrie Street and 63–71 Racecourse Road (RL30.35m), with a further application pending to increase the latter to 7 storeys. The proposed development responds to this emerging context and, in my view, provides a genuine and sensible built-form transition between the intensifying Racecourse Road precinct to the west and lower-density residential land to the east, including

2

What also gives me comfort is that the building steps down on its eastern side to RL24.20m AHD for the eastern building component. That stepping down demonstrates a real sensitivity to the residential interface and is something I genuinely appreciate in the design.

Building Setbacks

I understand the proposal departs from the acceptable outcomes in Table 9.3.14.3.C of the Multiple Dwelling Code for setbacks along the eastern, southern, and front boundaries. For a building above 5 storeys, the code anticipates 6m side setbacks to walls and 5m to balconies; the proposal provides 4m to 6.8m to the eastern wall and 4m to terraces.

The figure that matters most to me is the actual separation between the proposed building and [redacted], which is 9 metres building-to-building. Based on her experience of living there, that's a gap more than enough to preserve her privacy, solar access, and general day-to-day amenity. When you add the deep landscape buffer along the shared boundary (which I'll come to below), I don't believe the reduced structural setback adversely affects her.

Building Separation to Her Property

To be clear, a 9-metre separation between the proposed building and [redacted] is something I'm satisfied with. The part of the building closest to [redacted] is also the lower eastern component, stepping down to RL24.20m AHD, which reduces the sense of bulk from where she lives.

The applicant has also incorporated batten screens and awnings on the [redacted] elevation to limit overlooking. Having reviewed the proposed floor plans and elevations, I don't believe there will be any unreasonable overlooking [redacted].

Deep Planting Along [redacted]

This is the issue that matters most to me, and it's the main reason I'm writing in support.

The application proposes a total deep planting area of 242.63m² (15% of the site area) with the majority concentrated along the eastern and southern boundaries, directly along the fence [redacted] with this site. The Landscape Concept Plans show a deep planting buffer approximately 4 metres wide running the full length of the [redacted]. This would be capable of sustaining large canopy trees and screening shrubs at maturity.

In practical terms, this means [redacted] a planted garden buffer rather than a building wall. When fully grown, the trees and shrubs will provide effective visual screening of the lower levels of the building, soften any noise, cast welcome shade, and give her a nice garden [redacted]. I think that's a better outcome for her amenity than a larger structural setback with no landscaping.

I am firmly of the view that the deep planting along the [redacted] overcomes the vast majority of amenity impacts from the building's height and proximity. The applicant has made a real, long-term commitment to the quality of this interface, and I'd ask Council to give that significant weight in its assessment, and to include conditions ensuring the buffer planting is properly established and maintained for the life of the development.

Orientation of Communal Open Space

I note that the communal recreation facilities including a pool, decking, a gym and wellness areas are proposed at rooftop level rather than at or near ground level, which I understand is a departure from the preferred outcomes of the Multiple Dwelling Code.

From my perspective as [redacted], the rooftop location is actually preferable. A ground-level communal area positioned along the [redacted] would bring a lot more noise and activity [redacted]. Up on the roof, that activity is well removed from the sensitive residential interface, and the impact on her property is substantially reduced. I actively support this design decision.

Landscaping to the Kent Street Frontage

The proposed street-level landscaping being at-grade planting, raised planters, and feature trees integrated into the central entry between the two building components will be a genuine improvement to the Kent Street streetscape. The existing buildings on the site are unremarkable and add little to the street. We look forward to seeing a well-presented and well-landscaped new building in their place.

Removal of Street Trees

If any street trees along the frontage are impacted by the new driveway crossover, I'd encourage Council to impose conditions requiring equivalent replacement planting. Kent Street's tree canopy is something residents value. I'm confident the applicant would support this and it's not a reason to oppose the development.

Building Materials in the Traditional Building Character Overlay

I understand the site falls within the Traditional Building Character Overlay and that the proposed contemporary materials of glass, metal battens, composite cladding differ from traditional timber and iron. Having reviewed the Heritage and Character Assessment by Vault Heritage Consulting, I accept their finding that the existing pre-1946 dwelling has been substantially altered and no longer contributes meaningfully to traditional building character in the street. That's consistent with what I see walking along Kent Street, which has a very mixed character and a lot of contemporary infill.

The proposed design references traditional residential character through deep eaves, generous balconies, batten screening, and a split building form that gives the development a domestic rather than monolithic feel. I think it's an appropriate and sincere design response to the overlay context, and I support it.

Shortfall in Visitor Car Parking

I'm aware the proposal provides 4 visitor car spaces against the TAPS Code requirement of approximately 5.25 spaces. In [redacted] experience [redacted] on Kent Street, on-street parking is generally available along the wide frontage, and the site is well served by public transport — including multiple bus routes on Racecourse Road and the CityCat ferry terminal about 550 metres away at Brett's Wharf. I don't consider the minor shortfall to be a real-world issue, and it doesn't affect our support.

Stormwater Discharge

4

I've noted the stormwater arrangements proposed, with discharge directed to the kerb and channel in Kent Street and no on-site detention required given the existing high impervious area of the site. A Site-Based Stormwater Management Plan has been prepared by Naxos Consulting Engineers. I'm satisfied with that technical approach and support Council imposing appropriate conditions around water quality management during construction and operation.

Driveway Width

The proposed driveway crossover is a modified Type B2 (7.85m) located at the western end of the frontage and well : . The Traffic Engineering Assessment by Colliers Consulting confirms it's fit for purpose. I accept that finding and note it has no direct impact on her.

Service Vehicle Swept Paths

I've noted the potential for service vehicle movements to conflict with visitor parking bays during waste collection. I'm satisfied this is an operational matter that can be effectively managed through conditions of approval, including scheduling requirements. It doesn't affect my support.

In Summary

and I write to confirm her support for this development application.

I have genuinely engaged with the planning issues on her behalf, including the departures from the City Plan's acceptable outcomes for building height, setbacks, and site cover. Having done so, and having considered the development in the context of what's already been approved along Racecourse Road and Kent Street, I believe the proposal is an appropriate response to this transitional location.

Most importantly, the deep planting proposed along the is, in my view, the deciding factor. A 4-metre-deep buffer of in-ground planting across the full length of the boundary representing 15% of the total site area is a meaningful, long-term commitment by the applicant to protecting her amenity. I believe it overcomes the concerns that could otherwise arise from the building's height and proximity to her property.

I encourage Brisbane City Council to approve this application, subject to reasonable conditions — and particularly a condition requiring the eastern boundary landscape buffer to be established and maintained for the life of the development.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Letter to the City Council

I am writing to you today to express my concerns about the proposed changes to the city's zoning ordinance. I am a resident of the city and I am deeply invested in the community. I believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on the city's character and the quality of life for its residents.

Introduction

I am writing to you today to express my concerns about the proposed changes to the city's zoning ordinance. I am a resident of the city and I am deeply invested in the community. I believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on the city's character and the quality of life for its residents.

I have been a resident of the city for many years and I have seen the city grow and change. I have seen the city's character and the quality of life for its residents. I believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on the city's character and the quality of life for its residents.

I am writing to you today to express my concerns about the proposed changes to the city's zoning ordinance. I am a resident of the city and I am deeply invested in the community. I believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on the city's character and the quality of life for its residents.

I am writing to you today to express my concerns about the proposed changes to the city's zoning ordinance. I am a resident of the city and I am deeply invested in the community. I believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on the city's character and the quality of life for its residents.

I am writing to you today to express my concerns about the proposed changes to the city's zoning ordinance. I am a resident of the city and I am deeply invested in the community. I believe that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on the city's character and the quality of life for its residents.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]