

## 12 – 18 Thompson Street, Bowen Hills MINUTES OF MEETING – PRE2019/405

1 William Street  
Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020  
Pre-lodgement meeting #2

### Attendance and Apologies

The meeting commenced at 9:30 am

Present		
<b>EDQ representatives</b>		
Marisa Graetz	EDQ – Manager, Development Assessment	MG
Archie Venitis	EDQ – Principal Engineer, Technical Services	TB
Karina McGill	EDQ – Senior Planner, Development Assessment	KM
Sarah Hampstead	EDQ – Planner, Development Assessment	SH
Peter Richards	Deicke Richards (EDQ's design consultant)	PR
Hayley Phillips	Deicke Richards (EDQ's design consultant)	HP
<b>Applicant representatives</b>		
Leo Mewing	Mewing Planning Consultants (Applicant)	LM
Tea Tsang	Mewing Planning Consultants (Applicant)	TT
Peter Willis	Red Door Architecture (Architect)	PW
Christian Ganim	Gansons Pty Ltd, Ganboys Pty Ltd, Ganbros Pty Ltd (Land Owner / Developer)	CG

Item	
1.	<p><b>Background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First pre-lodgement meeting was held on 12 September 2019.</li> <li>• Pre-lodgement advice from this meeting was issued to LM on 3 December 2019. This included EDQ's in principle support for a 14-storey building 'Tower 1' subject to Tower 1 achieving compliant setbacks to the southern site boundary; delivery of sufficient grounds commensurate with the Tower 1 non-compliances, including a public plaza; achieving a plot ratio of 3:1 for the total master planned development site; for development on the balance of the master planned site being compliant</li> </ul>

Item	
	<p>with building height, building setbacks, tower separations and other relevant provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pre-lodgement discussion note and revised plans for the masterplanned site and Tower 1 were received from LM on 13 January 2020 for consideration by EDQ prior to the meeting.</li> <li>• EDQ confirmed the engagement of Deicke Richards as the design review panellist to provide specialist design advice to EDQ on the assessment the proposed development.</li> </ul>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Master Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LM advised staging was about creating a presence on the site with the delivery of Tower 1 as the initial site anchor.</li> <li>• Cardno has been engaged by the applicant for analysis of traffic impacts and design considerations.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Post meeting note:</b> On 11/02/2020 LM advised RPS has been engaged by the applicant for landscape consulting services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CG advised significant tenant interest in day hospital in the precinct with a strong desire to be located in Stage 1 due to an identified gap in the market and an immediate need.</li> <li>• PW outlined the vision for the Master Plan which includes a DNA / health focussed design, delivering an ideal 21<sup>st</sup> century working environment for employees, and contemplating health, health innovation and wellness for all users.</li> <li>• Master Plan proposes 4 buildings over 4 stages with a range of health related and office park uses:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stage 1: Tower 1 located on corner of Thompson Street and Murray Street, with balance of site continuing to operate as is;</li> <li>○ Stage 2: Tower 2, public plaza fronting Thompson Street, driveway upgrade works to Abbotsford Road, and interim arrangement access driveway off Murray Street; and</li> <li>○ Stages 3 and 4: Towers 3 and 4, internal private road termination of Murray Street, publicly accessible open space between Towers 3 and 4 connecting Murray Street to Abbotsford Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• PW advised greenery is to be expressed through all building designs.</li> <li>• MG noted:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RE: Drawing DA-061:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Applicant to clarify commitment to m<sup>2</sup> of the plaza on Thompson Street, and the minimum committed width of the open space connection between Towers 3 and 4; and</li> <li>▪ Applicant to clarify where the sufficient grounds commitment of a minimum of 30% of the total site area is to be landscaped.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ RE: Drawing DA-062:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern with the proposed southern boundary setback of Towers 1 and 4. For compliance these are to be 6m; however where there is an existing or approved adjoining residential development a tower separation of 18m is to be achieved (NB. Applicant is to refer to the Pellicano development approval EDQ ref: DEV2019/982);</li> <li>▪ Where there is a bend in the boundary, the requisite setback is to be achieved from all angles of measurement from the boundary;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Item	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The maximum permitted horizontal dimension of a tower footprint is 50m;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Post meeting note:</b> On 20/01/2020 LM advised the proposed towers would comply with the 50m requirement; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ The Abbotsford Road setback is to be measured from the widened Abbotsford Road alignment.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RE: Drawing DA-102: Applicant to clarify the driveway and basement / undercroft access arrangements as this is not clear on the drawing. This should include indicative RL levels for clarity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• LM confirmed RE drawing DA-101 that there are no new driveway crossover works with Stage 1. These are proposed with Stage 2.</li> <li>• The ultimate Master Plan proposes vehicular access off Murray and Abbotsford Road, including slip lanes and the widening as per Council requirements. LM informed that Cardno has been engaged to prepare a traffic note on the Abbotsford Road access point.</li> <li>• General discussion about the need for this access of Abbotsford Road, applicant confirmed need to increase vehicle permeability for the site due to existing network constraints on Abbotsford Road.</li> <li>• AV advised that once the traffic note was submitted to EDQ, then EDQ would liaise with Brisbane City Council. This traffic note is to include consideration of the total number of vehicle movements for the total master planned development.</li> <li>• MG acknowledged applicant comment in Pre-lodgement discussion note regarding a desire for a car parking rate greater than permitted. The implications of this on the traffic network are to be addressed in the Cardno traffic note. MG further noted that the architectural design implications would need to be explored further, particularly where there is podium car parking.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Post meeting note:</b> EDQ not currently supportive of car parking supplied at a rate greater than the scheme provisions, particularly where this is provided in un-sleeved podiums.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• AV noted the importance of consideration for site levels and interface with Abbotsford Road; including the location of support columns for the raised Inner-City Bypass, and a possible future planned cycleway.</li> <li>• PR noted importance of ensuring CPTED principles were adhered to in the design of the development site interface with Abbotsford Road. PR requested a cross section to detail the level changes, interfaces and proposed access arrangements.</li> <li>• AV advised that an overall site servicing strategy would be required to demonstrate efficient management of the site for general servicing requirements and refuse collection.</li> <li>• PR noted:       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The undercroft of Tower 3 needs to be considered further, as it doesn't appear to provide activation and CPTED principles would need to be applied;</li> <li>○ The landscaped spaces between buildings require further resolution and need to form a cohesive narrative. The linkages should be purposeful, accessible and legible;</li> <li>○ Opportunities for outdoor seating / dining / breakout spaces should be provided in ground floor tenancies; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Item	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Post meeting note:</b> The relationship of the shape of the building footprints does not appear to be cohesive (angular vs curved). Further design resolution is recommended to finalise the masterplan.</li> <li>• MG advised that a more detailed overall site staging strategy would need to be developed for the proposed Master Plan.</li> <li>• LM confirmed desire to lodge a development application for Preliminary approval for total site masterplan, and Development permit for Stage 1.</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Tower 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main departures of the Tower 1 design from that presented to EDQ on 12 September 2019 are:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staging:</i> Proposal to stage the tower, to deliver the first podium stage (commercial car park and day hospital) prior to the tower (office/medical use).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MG raised concern with the lag between delivery of the podium and tower, with the primary concern being the potential for a multi-storey carpark inhabiting the site for an extended period of time – which is not desirable.</li> <li>▪ <b>Post meeting note:</b> On 21/01/2020 LM confirmed applicant is no longer proposing to sub-stage Stage 1. It is to be delivered in one stage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Podium height:</i> The podium element is now 5 storeys. Ground storey is lobby/servicing and retail/food and beverage. Storeys 2-4 are podium car parking. Storey 5 is a 1,500m<sup>2</sup> NLA day hospital. The compliant Bowen Hills PDA development scheme (scheme) requirement is for a 4 storey podium only.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LM advised that the need for this was being driven by a commercial need for a floor plate of 1,500m<sup>2</sup> for the proposed day hospital to make this a viable proposition.</li> <li>▪ MG questioned whether a smaller day hospital could be located initially in Tower 1 with a future expansion to Towers 2 or 3 in the future.</li> <li>▪ LM advised this would not be a feasible option due to the specialist equipment and building design requirements, and redundancies in costs incurred in Stage 1.</li> <li>▪ <b>Post meeting note:</b> EDQ is not currently supportive of a 5 storey podium. Applicant to further investigate provision of one basement level to remove one podium level of car parking, with a resultant 4 storey podium.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Side Setback (podium):</i> The side setback (to the south) is proposed as 0m for all podium levels up to storey 5 (argued by the applicant to be a podium).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This does not comply with the scheme requirements, specifically the fifth storey is not permissible as a podium, so should be a 6m setback as it is above 4 storeys.</li> <li>▪ MG noted that where there are any uses in a podium other than carparking, the side boundary setback is to be 3m.</li> <li>▪ LM drew upon advice noted in the Pre-lodgement discussion note that Brisbane City Council permits in the City Centre a podium of up</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Item	
	<p>to 20m / 4 storeys. LM noted that the proposed 5 storey podium is 18.8m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MG noted that the scheme only sets storeys and does not refer back to a maximum permissible height.</li> <li>▪ MG noted on Drawing DA-202 that the areas of open podium wall to the carpark ramp would need to be closed in to ameliorate noise and lighting impacts to adjoining sites, as well as possible fire separation requirements.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Side Setback (tower)</i>: The proposed side setback (to the south) is minimum 4.7m at the roof canopy, and a minimum of 5.0m on Storeys 6-14. This does not comply with the scheme requirements for 6m above 4 storeys.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LM noted possible inclusion of a child care centre on proposed Storey 6 which would provide an appropriate transition between podium and tower, and maximise the use of the roof of the podium.</li> <li>▪ <b>Post meeting note</b>: On 11/02/2020 LM advised applicant has increased the southern site boundary tower setback to 6.5m (however proposed day hospital storey 5 is at 3.0m).</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Podium car parking</i>: The proposal provides for screening to street frontages of the podium car parking.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MG noted that this does not meet the scheme requirement of “Any parking included in a podium must be sleeved with active uses”.</li> <li>▪ MG advised that EDQ would take the drawings away and consider in more detail with a view to providing further advice to the applicant.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Porte-cochere</i>: MG noted concern with the drop-off area/loading bay off Murray Street. More work is needed to demonstrate this is a safe design, particularly in light of the driveway crossover to proposed Tower 4 in close proximity.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Post meeting note</b>: On 11/02/2020 LM advised applicant has reduced the crossover width of the porte-cochere access and has relocated further away the Tower 4 driveway crossover.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LM raised the scheme discrepancy which require a continuous awning to the road frontages, as well as landscaping, including deep planting, along a minimum length of 50% of street frontages. LM questioned which takes priority.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Post meeting note</b>: MG confirms that the priority is to green the street through landscape treatments and provide alternative means of comfort / shelter for pedestrians. The applicant is to also reinforce the main building entries through appropriate build form design.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• MG noted that given the proposed departures, and the agreement in principle for a 14 storey Tower 1 height being based upon compliances with scheme provisions, EDQ may have to consider dropping storey(s) off the agreed in principle tower height.       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Post meeting note</b>: On 20/01/2020 LM advised:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the applicant is looking into design implications for what a level of basement parking would mean for the ground storey; and whether it would be possible to cantilever the day hospital tower footprint over part of the westerly adjoining medical centre;</li> <li>▪ geotechnical investigations were underway to inform these considerations;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Item	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the applicant will propose a 3m southern side boundary setback to the day hospital, noting that the scheme compliant setback is 6m; and</li> <li>▪ the proposed day hospital is of such a demand now that it would catalyse the development of Tower 1.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>Summary and Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EDQ confirms that the key areas for further design resolution include:           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Proposed five storey podium;</li> <li>ii. Storey 5 (day hospital) southern boundary setback;</li> <li>iii. Unsleeved podium car parking to street frontages;</li> <li>iv. Provision of car parking spaces at a greater rate than the scheme, and any resulting implications on the traffic network and the built form design (i.e. un-sleeved podium car parking);</li> <li>v. Ingress and egress to Abbotsford Road; and</li> <li>vi. Resulting support for building height for Tower 1 given non-compliances with scheme.</li> </ol> </li> <li>○ <b>Post meeting note:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MG has discussed the proposal further with the MEDQ Delegate, Beatriz Gomez, Director Development Assessment; and the EDQ DA Manager, Peita McCulloch who will take on the management of this development proposal going forward.</li> <li>▪ The above listed six points are the agreed key areas which require further resolution by the applicant and then further consideration by EDQ to determine whether the proposed scheme departures can be supported.</li> <li>▪ At this time, given the information at hand, EDQ is not able to provide explicit support or otherwise for the proposed departures, and requests another pre-lodgement meeting to further discuss the next iterations of the applicant designs and supporting technical information.</li> <li>▪ The applicant is to request another meeting at a time suitable when the design has progressed to the next iteration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• LM to provide EDQ with the Abbotsford Road Traffic Note for EDQ to consider and commence consultation with Brisbane City Council.</li> </ul>