## **KEY OUTPUTS**

## PRE2023/718

**Date:** Mon 14 Oct 2024 **Time:** 9.30 – 10:30 am

Location: 1 William Street, Brisbane

Site: 44 Balaclava Street & 93 Logan Road, Woolloongabba

Topic: Finalised Woolloongabba PDA Development Scheme and Public Realm Guideline

## ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

Present		
Mark Tocchini	Planning Initiatives	Town Planner
Deb Almering	Planning Initiatives	Town Planner
John O'Neil	Carbone Developments	Landowner/ Developer
Rosie French	EDQ	Acting Director, Cross River Rail PDAs
Essen Joseph	EDQ	Manager, Cross River Rail PDAs
Hayden Jensen	EDQ	Senior Planner, Cross River Rail PDAs

Apologies		
-	-	-

## **KEY OUTPUTS**

No	Item	Action
1	PURPOSE	N
	The purpose of the meeting was to	
	<ul> <li>Discuss the key elements of the Woolloongabba PDA         Development Scheme (the 'Woolloongabba Plan') and the         Woolloongabba PDA Public Realm Guideline (the Public Realm Guideline); and     </li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Provide preliminary feedback on the proposed development, having regard for key aspects of these documents.</li> </ul>	
	Further advice and guidance will be provided in future, as the proposed	



No	Item	Action
	development design is refined.	
2	GROUND PLANE  • 'Short St' open space –	N
	The Development Scheme maps vehicular restriction at Balaclava Street / Short Street fronting the development. The purpose is to remove vehicular access / parking between Lot 1 on RP149357 and Lot 50 on RP217072, reclaiming the road reserve as open space that connects with linear open space that will be created in Logan Rd (as illustrated in the Public Relam Guideline).	
	<ul> <li>EDQ notes the proponent's aspiration to utilise the expanded open space on the corner of Logan Road / Balaclava Street for outdoor activation associated with the hotel use. This space is intended to be publicly accessible open space, and any temporary activation / events permits would need to be discussed with Brisbane City Council (BCC) in due course and would not form part of an EDQ development approval.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Post meeting, the proponent team reaffirmed its earlier statements that it is prefers the Short Street open space be provided within a road reserve, rather than changing the road reserve into crown land, designated as a park. The proponent has stated that, whilst parkland tenure does not preclude part of this area being used for such an arrangement, it does not consider it to be the best tenure in order to manage this operation.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>EDQ responds that infrastructure planning remains underway and future discussions with BCC will be required in relation to tenure matters. No particular decision in relation to tenure can be confirmed at this time.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>In principle, and putting aside the specific tenure, EDQ does not raise any specific concerns at this time about the use of the space for al fresco dining and events, subject to due consideration through the relevant approval processes.</li> </ul>	
	Access –	
	<ul> <li>Access via Logan Rd is not a preferred outcome, as part of the road reserve is planned to be reclaimed for open space and active transport purposes. Servicing in this location may create safety issues, noting this is anticipated to be a key corridor for cyclists. In the first instance, the proponent is asked to review the access arrangements, such that consolidated access is achieved for servicing via Balaclava St or via two access driveways on Balaclava St.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>The proponent acknowledged the importance of the active corridor, but emphasises that there are challenges associated with managing all residential and service vehicle access from</li> </ul>	



No	Item	Action
	Balaclava Street due to ground level differences and the location and design of the heritage building. Further review of access arrangements will be undertaken by traffic engineers and architect to investigate options.	
	<ul> <li>EDQ awaits the options investigation by the proponent, and can support a discussion of the matter with EDQ's relevant engineering personnel in attendance.</li> </ul>	
3	PODIUM	Υ
	Parking –	
	<ul> <li>The development, as currently proposed, exceeds the maximum allowable parking as per the car parking rates specified by the Woolloongabba Plan. This is a key area of non-compliance that is required to be addressed due to impacts on the transport network, as well as the implications of the car parking provision on key urban design outcomes such as the creation of active frontages.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>The proponent has expressed concerns regarding the car parking limitations and its potential impact on market feasibility.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>EDQ maintains that this a key area of non-compliance, which is required to be addressed.</li> </ul>	
	Heritage – The proponent team is commended for its approach to the preservation of the heritage building. However, the urban design response to the heritage building requires attention. This includes providing an appropriately scaled and activated frontage, as well as contemporary design measures that respond to the physical characteristics of the heritage place. Refer to section 4.3.5.1 Heritage of the Woolloongabba Plan for assessment criteria that will need to be addressed by the proposed development.	
	Activation of Logan Rd – The current Logan Rd frontage is inadequately activated, noting that approximately 50% of the frontage is taken up by a bulky podium comprised of screened car parking. Frontages with windows and occupiable space are required to achieve the activation outcomes sought by the Woolloongabba Plan.	
	As discussed at the meeting, the following development approvals contain relevant examples of car parking 'sleeved' by active uses: DEV2021/1193 (Campbell St, Bowen Hills), DEV2020/1114 (Brookes St, Bowen Hills), DEV2022/1284 (Hercules St, Hamilton), DEV2023/1402 (MacArthur Avenue, Hamilton).	
	Approved drawings can be accessed via: <a href="https://www.edq.qld.gov.au/our-approach/land-use-planning-and-infrastructure/development-applications-and-assessment/current-applications-and-approvals">https://www.edq.qld.gov.au/our-approach/land-use-planning-and-infrastructure/development-applications-and-approvals</a> .	
	Podium scale – The overall podium scale is considered excessive, relative to the urban design and heritage context of the proposed development. However, it is anticipated that a reduction in car parking	



No	Item	Action
	may assist in managing this bulk. The matter can be considered further when parking revisions are made.	
4	<ul> <li>Vertical breaks – The applicant is asked to review measures to assist in breaking up the vertical mass of the building. Distributing communal open space throughout the building may assist in this respect.</li> <li>Communal open space – The communal open space parameters outlined in the Woolloongabba Plan are likely to require the provision of open space on multiple levels of the building. Note also that the definition of 'storey' excludes a floor level with more than 80% of the level dedicated to communal open space.</li> <li>Setbacks / building separation – The proposed development, in its current form, is non-compliant with parameters for side setbacks, rear setbacks, and building separation. This results in compromised amenity for the future residents of the proposed development (in terms of access to light, ventilation, privacy, and outlook) and prejudices the ability for development to occur on adjoining sites.</li> <li>The proponent is asked to review how development may occur on adjoining sites (e.g. through a massing model) and amend the tower floor plate to address the outcomes sought by the setback and building</li> </ul>	N
5	separation provisions.  AFFORDABLE HOUSING	Υ
	<ul> <li>The proponent queried how the affordable housing requirements would be implemented and requested examples of conditions.</li> <li>On 20 September 2024, the <i>Economic Development (Affordable Housing) Amendment Regulation 2024</i> (the Amendment Regulation) was made. The Amendment Regulation sets the criteria for housing that is affordable to very low-income households, low to moderate income households, first home buyer households and key worker households, providing additional pathways for the development industry and the affordable housing sector to address the development schemes requirements for affordable housing.</li> <li>Following the making of the Amendment Regulation, EDQ will amend PDA Guideline 16 – Housing to support the implementation of the Amendment Regulation and to outline how EDQ will monitor and report against affordable housing requirements set in PDA development schemes.</li> <li>Action: EDQ to provide examples of approval conditions relating to the delivery of affordable housing. Note, however, the conditions are bespoke to other projects and were drafted prior to recent changes to the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i>.</li> </ul>	



No	Item	Action
6	EDQ Advice – General	N
	Contextual responses – An Urban Context Report is required to be submitted as part of the development application material as outlined in Schedule 7 of the Development Scheme.	
	Non-compliances – It is suggested that the proponent work with EDQ to address the non-compliances with the Development Scheme through a series of pre-application meetings. Where non-compliances have been addressed to the extent practicable, the proponent may be able to utilise section 3.2.4 of the Development Scheme, which allows a level of non-compliance to be considered, subject to a demonstration of 'sufficient grounds' to approve the proposed development despite its conflict with the Development Scheme.	
	• Impact on adjoining development potential – As per section 4.3.6 of the Development Scheme, application material will need to demonstrate that the proposed development does not prejudice the ability of adjoining sites to be developed in a manner that complies with the Development Scheme.	
	Infrastructure charges and timing of works –	
	<ul> <li>The proponent expressed concern about the current absence of a Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP) in terms of charge rates and timeframes for works, which may have an impact on project feasibility.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>EDQ advised that a DCOP is intended to be exhibited as part of a public notification process in late 2024.</li> </ul>	
	• EDQ technical advisors – As mentioned at the meeting, EDQ will procure technical advisors as part of its assessment process (including in relation to architectural, landscaping, and heritage). Costs incurred by EDQ will be passed onto the proponent through the course of preapplication meetings and will also be incorporated into the development application fee in due course. The timing of procurement will be discussed with the proponent, and work undertaken by the technical advisors will be managed to ensure efficiency.	
7	NEXT STEPS  Based on proponent comments, it is anticipated that the next meeting will focus on traffic / access due to the implications of site access on how the development is shaped. The meeting will be arranged upon request.	At proponent's discretion

