

Application information

Application number A005490380

Property address 88 MERIVALE ST SOUTH BRISBANE QLD 4101

Submitters who lodge a properly made submission have appeal rights against Council's decision for this application. The dates in which a submission is considered properly made for this development application are published on the public notification material (property sign, letter notification and newspaper advertisement) for this application. If you require any further information about this application, you can visit <https://developmenti.brisbane.qld.gov.au> and enter in the property address or application reference number.

Appeal rights

Contact details

Applicant [REDACTED]

Preferred phone number [REDACTED]

Email address [REDACTED]

Postal address [REDACTED]

Edit

Please generate and view your submission before continuing.

[REDACTED]

MERIVALE/ GLENELG STREET DA SUBMISSION.

Kurilpa Futures is a community organisation dedicated to sustaining and enhancing qualities of life and environment throughout the Kurilpa Peninsula, including the suburbs of West End, South Brisbane and Highgate Hill.

We object to the proposal to develop the proposed site for 382 residential units, together with hotel, bar, food and drink outlets, offices and shops. Our objection is based on grounds of conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan; excessive residential density and building scale; height and site coverage; insecure proposed design; unmanageable infrastructure implications; and traffic generation and open space impacts.

The proposal would rise to approximately 100 metres high, exceeding the Neighbourhood Plan height control of 12 storeys for this site by a factor of more than 300%. Standing on the corner of Merivale and Glenelg Streets within the City Frame area between the cherished open space locations of South Bank Gardens and Musgrave Park, it would visually dominate and shadow the adjacent heritage listed Presbyterian Church, Brisbane State High School and parts of Musgrave Park itself.

The failure to supply adequate active open space for its intended approximately 800 occupants is in no way compensated for by provision of largely cosmetic, visual and insecure green treatment of its vertical fascia.

The intended residential density of 382 units on a site of 2,789 s.m. – much less than one third of a hectare - would result in a density of well over one thousand residences and two thousand persons per hectare, higher than city centre densities in areas such as New York and Hong Kong. Inevitably this would place intolerable strains on existing infrastructure of transport and open space. The 382 units would require over 500 car parking spaces (taking up seven floor of subterranean space) and would disgorge these, together with visitor and commercial user vehicles, onto the already busy adjacent metropolitan distributors of Merivale and Cordelia Streets, introducing the danger of peak hour gridlock into this sensitive area of South Brisbane, already having to balance metropolitan scale through traffic with destination flows generated by the attractors of South Bank Parklands, the Cultural Complex and the State High School.

These proposals would also result in the addition of around eight hundred new residents without adequate provision of accompanying active open space. This “greenwash” scheme for vertical gardens is thus largely cosmetic, insecure and untested. The proposal for the towering buildings to rise straight from the street frontage would generate a sense of domination and intensity that is not appropriate for this “City Frame” area lining a pedestrian access route linking the iconic South Bank Gardens and Musgrave Park.

Arrangements for selection, maintenance and watering of the proposed 1,003 trees and 20,000 plants raise questions about the impacts of increasingly frequent and extreme droughts and of fire dangers akin to the recent Grenfell Tower tragedy in London.

Both supporters and opponents of “performance based planning” will oppose this scheme. Supporters will deplore the abuse of an approach intended to promote alternative ways of fulfilling endorsed planning objectives; and opponents will point to the encouragement that it provides to complete undermining of stated plan intentions and standards.

We therefore submit that this application should be refused on grounds of:

- Noncompliance with the objectives, intentions and provisions of the South Brisbane Riverside Neighborhood Plan
- Flagrantly excessive residential densities and scale
- Excessive and unmanageable demands on transport and open space infrastructure
- Dangerously untested proposals for arboreal fascia cladding.