

Development Application A005608649

Carry out Building Works; Carry out Operational Works; Material Change of Use – Manly Properties Pty Ltd.

297-281 Montague Road, West End

We are opposed to the proposed development at 297-281 Montague Road, West End as defined by the heading of this submission. It sets a precedent for excessive height in the Riverside South Precinct of the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan being 17 and 11 storeys higher than the two building heights prescribed for this site.

Existing Approval - We are aware of the existing approval for five residential buildings, being two 12 storey buildings and three 6 storey buildings; food and drink outlets; 602 car spaces with a site cover of 58% of the site. As objectors to the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan, we remain opposed to this level of density. The current approval is the worse example of lowest common outcome for both the developer's reputation and for the future unit owners/dwellers. It is an example of maximising the number of units without concern for the wellbeing and lifestyle of the residents or any benefit to the local community and with no attempt to achieve high quality urban design.

Current Application - Yet the current application takes this approval as a benchmark and then argues for only an 8% increase in the number of units while not addressing the increased building heights. We reject this argument as it takes a poor outcome and makes it considerably worse.

The proposal is for two buildings of 26 storeys, which includes 470 units, 741 car parks and 730 bike parking spaces, 1101 m² for food and drink outlets, a site cover of 38%, and a 4,000 m² park on the southern side of the site. As the site is 10,628 m² and within the SBRNP, the High Density Residential (HDR) part of the site enables building heights of 12 storeys; and the Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) within the SBRNP enables building heights of 6 storeys.

Performance Based Planning - The applicant is seeking a performance outcome for the additional density and height. If this application is approved, it will compound the community's rejection of the performance-based approach to planning. Instead, they will perceive it as a total disrespect of the Brisbane City Plan and an example of Council's 'laissez-faire' approach to planning of our City. Certainly, developers are overt in their interpretation of performance outcome which legitimises complete disregard of the main constraints on development, being height and density. This being the case, the community's perception is accurate and reflects a breakdown of town planning in our suburb.

Public Open Space - The application states that part of the site is to be public open space to enable of full-sized soccer field on the adjacent land in Davies Park. This contribution is approximately 3-4% of the site and is unlikely to achieve this objective

as the fig trees along the western and southern boundary of the park are growing and compromising the land for the soccer field. If the developers were serious about supporting soccer at Davies Park, the park contribution would be greater and allow for an adequate buffer along the edge of the extended field. This contribution can't be seen to justify the significant increase in height.

Other Residential Towers - The application lists 11 approved, or under construction, residential towers to justify the proposed 26 storey buildings but none of these are within the Riverside South Precinct of the SBRNP. This is a misleading and spurious argument. All the buildings on the list, above 19 storeys, are in the Kurilpa Precinct of the SBRNP which permits buildings of 20-30 storeys depending on size of the development site. The reality is that this development proposal sets a precedent for building height in the Riverside South Precinct and is totally inconsistent with the intent of the City Plan.

Proposed Park - The proposed park is along the southern boundary of the site. It will be in shade for the majority of the day during winter when solar access should be a priority. It is possible to achieve shade in summer with appropriate landscape design but the reverse is not possible. If solar access is blocked, the park will be a chilly wind tunnel at the base of the tower buildings during winter months. The park contribution must be on the northern aspect of the development so it integrates with Davies Park.

As an Entry to Davies Park - Another issue with the proposed park is that the pathway through the new park directs people to the far south-eastern corner of the existing Davies Park. This is a totally unsatisfactory outcome as there is no desire on the part of pedestrians to enter Davies Park from this point.

The application strongly promotes the benefits of new pathway connection and sight line from Montague Road through to Davies Park between the towers. This feature should have been achieved with the previous development application. It does not justify 26 storey buildings. Further, this design exists in the Woolworths complex and at 314 Montague Road. The public use of these 'links' is limited to access to the retail activities. This is because members of the local community understand these spaces to be private spaces which in effect they are.

The proposed development will create a high-rise building that will be a physical and visual barrier at the end of Vulture Street rather than a welcoming entrance to Davies Park.

Previous Proposed Use - This site was designated as a future park by former Lord Mayors Soorley and Quinn. It was designated as parkland in a previous City Plan providing a significant extension to Davies Park to subsequently meet the needs of the future increased in the population of West End. On the strength of one submission on this site, former Lord Mayor Newman removed the parkland designation from this site. He ignored the need for, and commitment to, additional

parkland in former planning schemes. Where is the integrity of our City Plan when a site can go from parkland to an overdevelopment of the site with two 26 storey towers?

We request that Council rejects this application.



Yours sincerely
Kurilpa Futures
kurilpafuturesgroup@gmail.com