



Our ref: DEV2025/1673

26 September 2025

The Nazareth Lutheran Church of South Brisbane
C/- Bplanned and Surveyed Pty Ltd
Att: Mr Ken Burmeister
PO Box 58
CAMP HILL QLD 4152

Email: da@bplanned.com.au

Dear Mr Burmeister

S.89(1)(a) PDA development refusal

**Decision Notice to the Applicant under s89(1) of the *Economic Development Act 2012*
Refusal of PDA Development Application for Material Change of Use (Interim Use) for a
Parking Station at 15 Hawthorne Street & 19 Gibbon Street, Woolloongabba described
as Lots 6 and 7 on SP238937**

In accordance with section 85(4) of the *Economic Development Act 2012*, on 26 September 2025, the Minister for Economic Development Queensland (MEDQ) decided to refuse this Priority Development Area (PDA) development application.

The reasons for the refusal are in the Statement of Reasons enclosed with this decision notice.

If you require any further information, please contact Mr Essen Joseph, Manager, Development Assessment by telephone on (07) 3452 7196 or at essen.joseph@edq.qld.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Beatriz Gomez
Director
Development Assessment
Economic Development Queensland



Statement of Reasons

In accordance with section 89(3) of the *Economic Development Act 2012* (Qld) (**ED Act**), the application for a PDA Development Permit for Material Change of Use (Interim Use) for a Parking Station at 15 Hawthorne Street and 19 Gibbon Street, Woolloongabba, described as Lots 6 and 7 on SP238937, is **refused** for the reasons outlined below.

Decision

1. I have decided to refuse the development application under sections 85 – 87 of the ED Act.
2. I am a lawful delegate of the Minister for Economic Development Queensland and have the delegated power to decide the development application.
3. I am satisfied that the requirements in section 85(1) of the ED Act have been met and that the development application can be decided, in that:
 - a. an information request has not been made in relation to the application; and
 - b. the applicant was not required to publicly notify the application, and there were no submissions consider as part of the assessment; and
 - c. the relevant development does not relate to premises in a provisional priority development area.
4. I am satisfied having regard to 86(1) of the ED Act that:
 - a. there is no Preliminary Approval under the *Planning Act 2016* (Qld) in force for the land; and
 - b. there is no PDA Preliminary Approval in force for the relevant land; and
 - c. there is a Proposed Development Scheme for the relevant land.
5. I have decided the development application is inconsistent with the PDA Development Scheme and Proposed Development Scheme (Amendment No. 1) for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed land use conflicts with the intent for Precinct 1: Woolloongabba Core, which is to support “major development to establish a thriving precinct core, support cultural activities, major events and rich day and night activity.”
 - b. The proposed land use conflicts with the intent for Sub-area 1c – Woolloongabba Civic, which is to support development that is “high density and mixed use, concentrated in the vicinity of existing and future public transport infrastructure.”
 - c. The proposed land use conflicts with section 4.3.1 (connectivity and movement), item 2 of the PDA-wide criteria, which seeks the following outcome: “Development prioritises access and movement by active and public transport over private vehicles.”

- d. The proposed land use conflicts with provisions contained within the Transport, access, parking and servicing (TAPS) code of the Brisbane City Plan 2014, which is referenced for assessment purposes by both the PDA development scheme and the proposed development scheme. Specifically, the proposed land use conflicts with the following provisions of the TAPS code:
 - i. Purpose, item 2b: "Development enhances the potential for trip making other than by private vehicle."
 - ii. PO12: "Development in the City core and City frame as identified in Figure a provides car parking spaces at rates to discourage private car use and encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport."
 - e. The proposed development scheme maintains similar provisions to the PDA development scheme, and the proposed land use conflicts with the proposed development scheme.
 - f. The nature of conflicts with the PDA development scheme and the proposed development scheme are amplified by the existing residential uses in proximity to the site and the preferred future uses planned for the area, which will be impacted by the proposed land use.
 - g. The development application does not demonstrate a transition to an appropriate longer-term use supporting the Vision for the PDA which seeks to facilitate significant urban renewal.
 - h. The proposed land use, even on an interim basis, is not appropriate, having regard for the PDA development scheme and the proposed development scheme.
6. The development application has not adequately demonstrated technical matters including:
- a. the safety of vehicle ingress and egress from the site; and
 - b. how swept paths associated with the intended design vehicles will be managed; and
 - c. what surface treatment will be utilised to prevent erosion; and
 - d. the management of stormwater impacts; and
 - e. the management of environmental impacts; and
 - f. lighting to be installed for public safety; and
 - g. the management of light and noise impacts on adjoining residential.
7. The human rights relevant to this decision have been considered and the decision does not limit those human rights.

Material

8. In making this decision, I have relied on the following material:

- a. Development application DEV2025/1673, including supporting documents; and
- b. Assessment and Recommendation Report prepared by Economic Development Queensland; and
- c. Draft decision notice including draft Statement of Reasons.