

ATTACHMENT C

Consultation Report

Brisbane City Plan 2014

Tailored amendment package – More Homes, Sooner – Low-medium density residential design

Brisbane City Council

June 2026



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

This report has been produced by:

City Planning and Design, City Planning and Economic Development Services, Brisbane City Council
Brisbane Square, 266 George Street, Brisbane QLD 4000
GPO Box 1434, Brisbane QLD 4001

Contents

Consultation Report	1
<i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i>	1
Tailored amendment package – More Homes, Sooner – Low-medium density residential design	1
Glossary	4
1 Introduction	5
2 Engagement activities	6
3 Submissions by topic	7
3.1 Low-medium density residential zone precinct structure changes	7
3.2 Key locations	8
3.3 Building heights	12
3.4 Small lot homes	18
3.5 Dual occupancies	23
3.6 Multiple dwellings	25
3.7 Subdivision in the Low density residential zone	30
3.8 Levels of assessment	33
3.9 Minimum site requirements within key locations	34
3.10 Minimum site requirements outside of key locations	36
3.11 Amenity, character and environmental matters	40
3.12 Infrastructure networks	50
3.13 General and other comments	59
3.14 Consultation and process for amendments	75
4 Conclusion	78

Glossary

The following terms are used in this report and have the following meaning.

Term	Meaning
CR zone	Character residential zone
Impervious area	Areas formed or covered by materials that prevent the infiltration of water into the ground below and prevent planting in-ground.
LDR zone	Low density residential zone
LMR zone	Low-medium density residential zone
MDR zone	Medium density residential zone

1 Introduction

Statutory public consultation of the proposed citywide *Tailored amendment package – More Homes, Sooner – Low-medium density residential design* (the proposed amendment) to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) was undertaken between 20 February and 20 March 2026. Consultation on the proposed amendment was conducted concurrently with a related amendment: Planning Scheme Policy amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014*– Car parking for multiple dwellings. All consultation activities for the two proposed amendments were combined to ensure the community was aware of and able to comment on both. A separate consultation report has been prepared and published for *More Homes, Sooner – Car parking for multiple dwellings*.

Council received a total of 517 submissions. 140 of the submissions supported the proposed amendment, 74 supported the proposed amendment in part, 287 opposed the amendment and 16 neither supported nor opposed the proposed amendment but provided comments.

An overview of matters raised by submitters includes:

- the proposed LMR zone precinct structure
- key locations
- building heights
- small lot home requirements
- dual occupancy requirements
- multiple dwelling requirements
- subdivision in the Low density residential zone
- levels of assessment
- minimum site requirements (within key locations)
- minimum site requirements (outside key locations)
- amenity, character and environmental matters
- infrastructure networks
- general and other comments
- consultation and process for amendments

Note: Submission reference numbers are allocated for identification purposes only and do not represent the total number of submissions received.

It is important to note that the proposed amendment may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government during the Minister's consideration period.

2 Engagement activities

Council held the following community consultation events (for both proposed amendments) during the public notification period:

Talk-to-a-Planner session – over phone	27 February 2026
Talk-to-a-Planner session – over phone	3 March 2026
Talk-to-a-planner session – in person (Brisbane City Hall)	4 March 2026
Talk-to-a-Planner session – over phone	6 March 2026
Talk-to-a-Planner session – over phone	10 March 2026
Talk-to-a-Planner session – over phone	13 March 2026
Talk-to-a-Planner session – over phone	17 March 2026

Council notified the proposed amendment in the following manner:

Newspaper notification	A digital public notice appeared in <i>The Courier-Mail</i> on 20 February 2026.
Council website	Web pages providing detail of the proposed amendment were published and maintained from 20 February 2026.
Email	An email was sent to City Plan updates subscribers on 20 February 2026.

3 Submissions by topic

Information about submissions and how Council has considered and responded to submissions is provided in the tables below. Submissions are arranged by topic. A single submission may address multiple items of interest in the proposed amendment and may appear against multiple topics.

3.1 Low-medium density residential zone precinct structure changes

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-021, MHS-045, MHS-049, MHS-101, MHS-137, MHS-140, MHS-141, MHS-143, MHS-144, MHS-145, MHS-159, MHS-160, MHS-161, MHS-167, MHS-178, MHS-400, MHS-454, MHS-522	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment to the LMR zone precinct structure for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing from three zone precincts to two zone precincts will reduce confusion between all the different precincts. • It will support more housing choice that is needed in well serviced areas. • Simplifying the structure will reduce red tape and provide greater flexibility for housing in appropriate locations. • It will help unlock additional housing supply, diversity and affordability in a practical way without pushing growth further out to areas where new infrastructure is required. It will also create a broader mix of housing options to allow more people to live locally, building a more dynamic and inclusive community. 	Support noted.	No change
MHS-155, MHS-166	<p>Submitters support changes to the zone precincts in part but suggests replacing the 2 or 3 storey mix zone precinct with a more flexible 'up to 4 storeys precinct' and allowing the market and performance-based assessment to guide built-form outcomes while ensuring amenity and design quality. Limiting height to 2-3 storeys in significant parts of the LMR zone restricts opportunities to meaningfully address the housing supply challenge.</p>	Residential development and built form outcomes within the proposed 3 or 4 storey mix zone precinct of the LMR zone are proposed to be tailored to respond to a site's proximity to centres and high-frequency public transport, either within or outside Key Locations. This is proposed to ensure a diversity of housing types that is responsive to a site's location and circumstances	No change
MHS-004, MHS-033, MHS-463	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restructuring of zone precincts (and their associated policy settings) negatively impacts the inner city suburbs. 	While a mix of housing types is supported within the zone, areas within Key Locations are proposed to support more apartments (multiple dwellings), and areas outside of Key Locations are proposed to support more small lot housing.	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These changes are too blunt, risk overdevelopment, and will create significant amenity, infrastructure, and character impacts—particularly in Morningside, Norman Park, Bulimba, Hawthorne and Balmoral, where LMR pockets sit close to established low-density housing and traditional character streets. • Concern is that the practical outcome will be a rapid change in neighbourhood identity without adequate guardrails. • The citywide approach to changing minimum lot sizes and effective height uplift will intensify stressors, including impacts on street parking and congestion. Inner-east suburbs are particularly vulnerable, due to having small areas of LMR zoned land dispersed within low density and traditional character neighbourhoods. • A broad-brush change to minimum lot sizes and effective height uplift will intensify these stressors quickly, before infrastructure and neighbourhood planning can keep pace. • Requests the re-structure of the LMR zone precincts be reconsidered. • Requests suburb-level mapping and plain English guidance before adoption so residents can understand what changes apply, where, and why. 	<p>This approach is proposed to minimise fragmentation of well-located land, create inclusive communities and thriving businesses, while optimising use of infrastructure networks, services and facilities.</p> <p>Minimum site requirements and design controls have been carefully considered, ensuring development outcomes are suitably scaled, sited and designed, while facilitating increased housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone.</p> <p>The identification of key locations is site specific, based on walking distance criteria and service frequency of public transport which may change over time. As such, no mapping will be prepared to identify key locations. Development applications will be required to demonstrate that a site aligns with the key location criteria at the time of lodgement.</p>	

3.2 Key locations

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-049, MHS-103, MHS-113, MHS-131, MHS-133, MHS-160, MHS-260, MHS-262, MHS-272, MHS-344, MHS-396, MHS-446,	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment and changes relating to key locations for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased housing supply within walkable catchments to centres and public transport: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ supports the walkability of suburbs and aligns with transit oriented development principles; 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the description of walking distance and key locations to provide improved clarity on how this is to be determined.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-452, MHS-455, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-518, MHS-529	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ helps to support local businesses; ○ facilitates efficient use of existing infrastructure; ○ limits urban sprawl. ● The logical, graduated approach to increased density will deliver a broader mix of housing that helps to improve housing diversity and affordability in established suburbs. 		
MHS-021, MHS-103, MHS-134, MHS-154, MHS-182, MHS-202, MHS-276, MHS-329, MHS-331, MHS-332, MHS-339, MHS-349, MHS-350, MHS-352, MHS-384, MHS-386, MHS-393, MHS-400, MHS-426, MHS-436, MHS-462, MHS-463, MHS-518, MHS-519, MHS-536	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment and make the following comments and suggestions for change to key locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key location definition should be broadened, with less prescriptive requirements on distance, applicable zones and frequency. ● Key locations should be limited to public transport criteria (not centres), to better support reduced reliance on private vehicles and avoid worsening on-street parking issues/ congestion near centres (particularly smaller centres where public transport may be limited). ● Key locations definition is too complex (such as the headway between bus services) and needs mapping to support it. ● Request that Council review the actual 'usability' of public transport in key locations. 	<p>The proposed key location definition and its application in the proposed amendment is intended to facilitate housing close to shops and public transport to support convenient access for residents' daily needs, improve travel choice, assist in reducing reliance on private vehicles and contribute to more accessible, liveable and well-connected neighbourhoods.</p> <p>As a site's location either within or outside of a key location is a category of assessment trigger, the definition of key location is required to be unambiguous and include measurable criteria, such as walking distances to specific centre zones and frequency of public transport.</p> <p>The identification of key locations is site specific, based on walking distance criteria and service frequency of public transport which may change over time. As such, no mapping will be prepared to identify key locations. Development applications will be required to demonstrate that a site aligns with the key location criteria at the time of lodgement.</p> <p>It is anticipated that public transport service frequency will increase over time in response to population growth and as part of planned enhancements associated with preparation for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.</p>	No change
MHS-071, MHS-125, MHS-168, MHS-186, MHS-193, MHS-275, MHS-311, MHS-323, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-356, MHS-364, MHS-376, MHS-385, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-389, MHS-402, MHS-403, MHS-411, MHS-447, MHS-466, MHS-472, MHS-513	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment and changes relating to key locations for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do not support the public transport criteria and the increased density supported in these areas which does not account for local character. ● There is no consideration of existing character/built form of an area, such as areas with character values or a predominantly low-rise built form. ● Do not support the inclusion of centres, as it facilitates additional density in inappropriate locations, including in areas such as Manly. ● It is too broad and lacks certainty in regard to potential development outcomes. ● There is no mapping to support identifying key locations. 		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key locations are not broad enough to significantly increasing housing supply in well-located areas. • Significant portions of the proposed LMR extension area fall outside of the key location distance. • A broader and fairer dispersal of development changes would limit the concentration impact. 	<p>It is considered appropriate to include proximity to higher order centres within the key location definition as these areas are often focal points for communities, providing a range of services and facilities, including employment opportunities and are often co-located with high-frequency public transport.</p> <p>Development proposals within key locations will still be required to be designed to respond to any relevant overlays and neighbourhood plans, including the Traditional building character overlay.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the description of walking distance and key locations to provide improved clarity on how this is to be determined.</p>	
MHS-021, MHS-071, MHS-074, MHS-103, MHS-134, MHS-160, MHS-182, MHS-202, MHS-214, MHS-260, MHS-262, MHS-276, MHS-329, MHS-344, MHS-349, MHS-350, MHS-396, MHS-446, MHS-452, MHS-455, MHS-457, MHS-463, MHS-467, MHS-518, MHS-529, MHS-536	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to key locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the criteria through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include other zones and destinations in key locations, such as Neighbourhood centre zone, Specialised centre zone, major hospitals, industrial precincts (e.g. Port of Brisbane), major hospitals and tertiary education facilities; ○ Broaden definition to capture other areas with comparable levels of accessibility and amenity (such as areas with significant commercial activity but not located in a centre zone); ○ Increase walking distance, with suggestions including 500m, 600m, 750m, 800m; ○ Specify walking distances based on the actual capacity of public transport (e.g. 800m to train stations, 400m to bus stops). ○ Use a direct radius, rather than walking distance, to simplify development assessment; 	<p>The proposed key location definition and its application in the proposed amendment is intended to facilitate housing close to shops and public transport to support convenient access for residents' daily needs, improve travel choice, assist in reducing reliance on private vehicles and contributing to more accessible, liveable and well-connected neighbourhoods.</p> <p>A 400m walking distance is an established and widely used benchmark in planning practice, reflecting a comfortable and generally accepted walking distance for most people to access public transport, shops and local services and is considered suitable for key locations in the context of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>The use of a direct radius would not simplify distance calculations as an agreed centre point for each centre would be required. A radial distance could also potentially result in land separated by waterways or</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>Table 5.6.1- Reconfiguring a lot</p> <p>Table 9.3.6.3.B of the Dual occupancy code</p> <p>Table 9.3.14.3.B of the Multiple dwelling code</p> <p>Table 9.4.10.3.B Part 1 of the</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have consideration for locations with multiple routes and services; ○ Reduce required frequency from 20 minutes to 30 minutes on weekdays and from 30 minutes to 60 minutes on weekends; ○ Increase service frequency criteria to 15 minutes, weekdays and weekends; ○ Align the key location methodology with the SEQ Regional Plan's 'High Amenity Areas'; ● Refine the methodology/concept, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Simplify the bus frequency criteria; ○ Create a public, downloadable overlay/map identifying key locations/public transport stops that meet the key location criteria; ○ Distinguish between major transport locations and ordinary, frequent public transport stops; ● Key locations depends on the frequency of service, yet frequency depends on population growth/demand. ● Consider the accessibility of public transport stops/stations. ● Rather than applying an arbitrary 400m walking distance to the new provisions, they should be applied via specific consideration to meaningful local features within relevant precinct plans. ● Specific drafting suggestions to clarify walking distance. ● Make the walking distances consistent for key locations in LDR, LMR and for rooming accommodation uses. 	<p>major roads being inadvertently included in a key location.</p> <p>The key location definition does not require that one service route has to have a specific headway interval, rather the frequency of public transport at the stop/station. This could be achieved through multiple routes passing the one stop.</p> <p>No changes have been made to service frequency criteria or to align the definition with Shaping SEQ's High Amenity Areas.</p> <p>The identification of key locations is site specific, based on walking distance criteria and service frequency of public transport which may change over time. As such, no mapping will be prepared to identify key locations. Development applications will be required to demonstrate that a site aligns with the key location criteria at the time of lodgement.</p> <p>The proposed amendment is a citywide amendment which uses the key location definition to identify suitable areas for specific housing types in the 3 or 4 storey mix zone precinct of the LMR zone. Application of key locations to other zones is outside of the scope of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>Future amendments to City Plan may consider the use of key locations for other purposes, such as in precinct plans, where it is considered appropriate. Such localised planning may be more appropriate to consider planning controls in proximity to other destinations, such as major hospitals and tertiary institutions.</p>	<p>Subdivision code</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		In response to submissions, changes have been made to the description of walking distance and key locations to provide improved clarity on how this is to be determined.	

3.3 Building heights

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-007, MHS-010, MHS-028, MHS-042, MHS-044, MHS-049, MHS-092, MHS-093, MHS-114, MHS-115, MHS-117, MHS-118, MHS-122, MHS-123, MHS-127, MHS-128, MHS-133, MHS-134, MHS-135, MHS-136, MHS-141, MHS-142, MHS-145, MHS-159, MHS-167, MHS-177, MHS-215, MHS-218, MHS-225, MHS-270, MHS-273, MHS-281, MHS-285, MHS-316, MHS-318, MHS-319, MHS-383, MHS-408, MHS-409, MHS-430, MHS-446, MHS-451, MHS-452, MHS-454, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-480, MHS-481, MHS-482, MHS-483,	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendments to building heights for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will enable greater housing diversity to create genuinely inclusive communities while increasing affordability. • Increased height will allow for greater housing supply in existing, well-located residential areas that are close to services and employment hubs and makes efficient use of existing infrastructure. • Increased height in key locations will limit potential impacts to the amenity and character of outer suburbs. • Increased height in key locations can minimise car dependency and make better use of existing infrastructure. • Increased height may assist in achieving site cover and deep planting requirements while enabling greater yield and higher quality design. • Increased heights, particularly from 2-3 storeys to 3 storeys, provides more certainty and enhances development feasibility. • Increased height would be similar to other cities which have a sense of shared place in an urban setting with greater housing diversity, as opposed to the existing low-medium density areas predominantly comprising of detached housing. 	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-484, MHS-485, MHS-486, MHS-487, MHS-488, MHS-489, MHS-490, MHS-491, MHS-492, MHS-493, MHS-494, MHS-495, MHS-496, MHS-497, MHS-498, MHS-499, MHS-500, MHS-501, MHS-502, MHS-503, MHS-504, MHS-505, MHS-506, MHS-507, MHS-508, MHS-509, MHS-510, MHS-517, MHS-522, MHS-524, MHS-529, MHS-536, MHS-537, MHS-538	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased heights will support growth while respecting local character, creating more activated, walkable precincts. 		
MHS-021, MHS-035, MHS-050, MHS-070, MHS-156, MHS-208, MHS-214, MHS-272, MHS-276, MHS-329, MHS-331, MHS-332, MHS-339, MHS-344, MHS-352, MHS-384, MHS-386, MHS-436, MHS-450, MHS-519	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendments to building heights, making the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports building heights of 3-4 storeys within 400m of a train station but not along residential avenues or adjacent to the waterfront. Supports the increase to 4 storeys, however considers the 14m height limit to be too restrictive as it will increase construction costs, lessen density, restrict design flexibility (i.e. for subtropical design, rooftop spaces and 'Queenslander' style architecture) and decrease the quality of the outcome. Supports the increased height but suggests it be increased to 5 storeys within 500m of train and bus stations, with any development above this limit made impact assessable. It will not result in a meaningful increase to housing supply. Areas with established multiple dwellings could support further increased heights. 	<p>The support and comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed increase to building heights for multiple dwellings in the LMR zone up to a maximum of 4 storeys and 14m where within a key location and on a minimum site size of 800m² is considered provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density).</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes transition requirements where proposed multiple dwellings adjoin a dwelling house. This requires the fourth storey to be set back 10m from the common boundary of the adjoining lot, to reduce bulk and maintain amenity. While this will constrain some sites, this is considered an appropriate outcome to ensure the amenity of any adjoining dwelling houses (including character houses).</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the 3 storey and 11.5m height as a code assessable outcome. Does not support the increase to 4 storeys and 14m for multiple dwellings in a key location as, outside of the luxury market, it is not feasible and will not improve housing affordability. Furthermore, it will lock in lower density outcomes in well-located areas and constrain our ability to manage growth. • Concerned about impacts to character houses. Suggests limiting heights to 2 storeys (9.5m) where adjoining a character house and not allowing 4 storey (14m) multiple dwellings in proximity to character houses. • Recommends Council strengthen rear and side boundary transition controls where taller built form meets lower intensity neighbourhoods. • Suggests increasing building heights only in proximity to key public transport hubs and not in proximity to centres. • Supports 4 storeys only within the existing Low-medium density residential (Up to 3 storeys zone precinct) area. • Any height increase should mandate a recessed upper storey (by at least 3m) to protect the privacy and solar access of existing dwellings. • Any height increase should mandate acoustic treatment for new buildings to prevent noise impacts on the street. • 4 storey buildings are unlikely to be developed due to existing streetscape heights and limited availability of sites that could be developed. 	.	
MHS-033, MHS-038, MHS-045, MHS-091, MHS-094, MHS-101, MHS-151, MHS-153, MHS-155, MHS-157, MHS-161, MHS-166, MHS-169, MHS-175, MHS-186, MHS-193, MHS-222, MHS-223, MHS-293, MHS-306,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed increased building heights for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will negatively impact on residential amenity through overlooking, overshadowing, noise, loss of vegetation and loss of views. • Proposed heights will impact houses in the LDR zone, particularly in Manly due to the topography and the location of the LMR zoning. • Opposed to increased height in Sandgate along the waterfront and the associated loss of views. 	<p>A variety of residential zones are applied across the city, providing for development at different densities, scales and building heights. The majority of residential zoned land in the city is included in the Low density residential zone, which has a maximum building height of 2 storeys and 9.5m and is not changed under the proposed amendment.</p> <p>The proposed increase to building heights for multiple dwellings in the LMR zone up to a maximum of 4</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-310, MHS-312, MHS-321, MHS-322, MHS-330, MHS-333, MHS-340, MHS-348, MHS-354, MHS-358, MHS-362, MHS-368, MHS-374, MHS-376, MHS-377, MHS-379, MHS-380, MHS-385, MHS-389, MHS-391, MHS-392, MHS-399, MHS-420, MHS-435, MHS-436, MHS-442, MHS-465, MHS-534	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will detrimentally impact streetscape character and traditional building character. • Apartment buildings of 3-4 storeys are incompatible with existing dwellings of 1-2 storeys, particularly character properties. • It will negatively impact on environmental values. • The proposed building transitions are insufficient. • Opposed to the increase in height to 4 storeys in key locations. • Increased heights unfairly benefits developer profits. • Developers will ask for relaxations and go up to 6 storeys. • Opposes limiting building heights for short-term accommodation in the 3 or 4 storey zone precinct. • Opposes building transition requirements. • Increased heights will block sunlight access to solar panels on adjoining dwelling houses • Existing development has exceeded maximum heights and maximum heights should be strictly enforced. • Opposes the proposed drafting as it is unnecessarily restrictive and excludes many well-located infill sites. • Increased height will lead to increase density and there is concern that existing infrastructure (stormwater, roads, public transport, community facilities, health, education) will be insufficient for the uplift. • Opposes limiting short-term accommodation to lower heights in areas otherwise intended for 4-storey development – align maximum height for short-term accommodation with the residential allowance in the 3-4 storey precinct. • Opposes as two storeys should be the maximum building height in residential areas. • Oppose apartments of up to 14m being built on minimum 120m² lots. • Increased building heights will reduce the community feel of Sandgate. 	<p>storeys and 14m is only applicable where within a key location and on a minimum site size of 800m². This approach is considered provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density).</p> <p>Where increased building heights are proposed, this will trigger impact assessment for a development and Council will assess the proposal on its merits against the relevant performance outcomes.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes transition requirements where proposed multiple dwellings adjoin a dwelling house. This requires the fourth storey to be set back 10m from the common boundary of the adjoining lot, to reduce bulk and maintain amenity. While this will constrain some sites, this is considered an appropriate outcome to ensure the amenity of any adjoining dwelling houses (including character houses).</p> <p>Existing provisions in the Multiple dwelling code also include requirements for development to provide landscaping and deep planting, as well as requirements to minimise privacy and overshadowing impacts.</p> <p>Outside of specific view corridors identified in neighbourhood plan codes or the Key civic space and iconic vista overlay, the protection of views is not a requirement in City Plan.</p> <p>Council is undertaking precinct planning in suburban and urban renewal locations to create opportunities for new homes and jobs, working closely with the community to create precinct plans that respond to the</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
<p>MHS-024, MHS-150, MHS-173, MHS-174, MHS-188, MHS-329, MHS-331, MHS-332, MHS-339, MHS-352, MHS-376, MHS-374, MHS-384, MHS-386, MHS-389, MHS-400, MHS-420, MHS-436, MHS-462, MHS-519</p>	<p>Submitters made the following suggestions to clarify or limit the proposed amendments relating to building height:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearer height limit should be provided, such as 3 storeys, rather than a '3 or 4 storey mix'. • The 2-3 storey mix zone precinct should be maintained, alongside the new 3-4 storey mix zone precinct. • Apply a 2 storey and 9.5m height restriction to development on either side of character homes. • Buildings up to 4 storeys and 14m should be further restricted from locating in proximity to character homes (i.e. 1-2 lots over). • Maintain height limits that protect adjoining low density areas from bulk/ overlooking, particularly at boundaries, and avoid 3 or 4 storey mix outcomes bleeding into quiet streets. • Impose a restriction on development which would impact current views (as an increase to 3 or 4 storeys will affect or completely obstruct views). • Amendments to increase building heights should be through a precinct-based approach to appropriately consider local impacts. • Only allow increased building heights in areas within 800m of key public transport hubs which provide commuters with connectivity to workplaces such as the CBD. • Conduct traffic and transport modelling to justify increased height. • Maintain current height limits, with select areas that are currently zoned for up to 3 storeys increased to 5 storeys. • The proposed building heights should be limited to areas closer to or adjacent to commercial regions and not residential areas. • Suggests that current height limits should be reduced further. 	<p>local circumstances and opportunities. For more information about this program, visit Council's website.</p> <p>The 14m height limit for a 4 storey multiple dwelling in the LMR zone is considered sufficient to allow space for 2.7m ceiling heights and services between floors, particularly as the definition of storey excludes lift shafts, stairways and meter rooms. In addition, a building height of 16m is considered to be more aligned with a 5 storey, medium density outcome.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans within City Plan do provide some local variation to citywide development provisions, including building height. These are developed with local community input and reflect local circumstances.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should include stricter guidelines to ensure new developments minimise impacts (e.g. from height) on existing residents. • Only specific LMR areas should be zoned for the increased up to 4 storey heights. 		
MHS-092, MHS-093 MHS-114, MHS-115, MHS-122, MHS-123, MHS-126, MHS-128, MHS-134, MHS-142, MHS-155, MHS-166, MHS-208, MHS-224, MHS-270, MHS-272, MHS-316, MHS-396, MHS-430, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-522, MHS-536	Submitters made the following suggestions to increase the proposed building heights allowed in the LMR zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable 4 to 5 storey development across the city based on site specific circumstances rather than a blanket approach with zones to support a market led and performance-based approach to built form outcomes. • Enable 4 storey building height in more areas of the LMR zone. • Increase height to a maximum of 5 storeys only within 500m of train and bus stations, with any development above this being impact assessable. • Increase maximum height to at least 5 storeys due to construction requirements and costs. A height of 5 storeys allows for more efficient use of land and the associated development services. • The 4 storeys could be increased to 5 storeys and concerned it only applies to a limited area (LMR zone). • The proposed 14m for 4 storeys is insufficient to accommodate building requirements such as lift overrun needs, vertical clearance of disability parking spaces, structural and service elements (particularly fire requirements) and potential on-site refuse collection vehicle requirements. Suggest 4 storeys is permitted up to 16.2-16.5m and 3 storeys is up to 12.5m. • Increase maximum height to 8 storeys outside of key locations with height increased even further within key locations, especially in streets with existing multiple dwellings. • Increase the building height to 7 storeys within 800m walking distance of a rail or bus station. 		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the building height for short-term accommodation to 4 to 5 storeys. • Noted that similar locations in other local government areas allow for 8-9 storeys, which is more feasible. • Brisbane needs at least 8 storeys in LMR zones outside key locations and additional storeys within key locations, as the housing crisis is so severe. • Requests further height flexibility to account for construction compliance requirements (i.e. 2.7m ceiling heights, ducted air conditioning, fire sprinkler systems, mechanical ventilation and hydraulic services) and improve design outcomes. • Minimum site area and frontage width for 4 storey development should be reconsidered. • Neighbourhood plans should not limited the proposed building heights. 		

3.4 Small lot homes

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-007, MHS-049, MHS-116, MHS-134, MHS-146, MHS-164, MHS-215, MHS-454, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-529, MHS-536	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment for small lot homes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates increased housing supply, affordability and diversity, helping bridge the gap between detached houses and high-rise living. • Character and amenity can still be protected while accommodating for increased population growth within well-located areas. • The mid-building break requirement and allowance for terrace-style housing on lots with a width up to 9m are suitable outcomes. • Simpler development assessment process for developing small, freehold houses is particularly beneficial for small- 	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>scale developers who do not have the capacity to manage more complex planning processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandatory subtropical design principles ensure that the urgent need for housing is balanced with the preservation of Brisbane's unique architectural identity. • Makes better use of existing urban land, increases density in well-serviced areas, provides affordable entry points, eases housing pressure and supports vibrant, walkable neighbourhoods. 		
MHS-094, MHS-430, MHS-522	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment for small lot homes and provide the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site cover and setback requirements should ensure that building envelopes do not restrict the intent of the reduced lot sizes, ensuring design outcomes do not pose unnecessary expense and limit feasibility. • The development footprint plan requirement is excessive and significantly limits flexibility once approved. Minimum lot size and rectangle dimensions are enough to ensure an appropriate outcome. • Apply a condition of approval that requires sellers to notify prospective purchasers of a development footprint plan. • In areas where there are many large blocks, the concept of being able to subdivide to create small lot houses is a good use of available land, however this should include the need for off street parking. 	<p>The support and comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed minimum lot size and site cover is considered to facilitate well-designed small lot homes that fit with the local suburban character. The proposed design requirements for small lot homes are not considered to limit development feasibility.</p> <p>Development Footprint Plans (DFP) are required on very small lots (less than 180m²) to ensure the proposed lots are capable of accommodating a suitably scaled and serviced dwelling house and that they fit with the local character, climate and suburban setting. The provisions have been drafted with flexibility to ensure future small lot homes align with either a DFP approved at the subdivision stage or the requirements of the Dwelling house (small lot) code.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes requirements for on-site car parking for small lot homes to ensure they are not reliant on the provision of on-street car parking.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the Dwelling house (small lot) code.</p>	No change
MHS-004, MHS-020, MHS-045, MHS-070,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for small lot homes for the following reasons:</p>	<p>Proposed design requirements for small lot homes (less than 180m²) were prepared to ensure they are</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
<p>MHS-152, MHS-162, MHS-179, MHS-183, MHS-184, MHS-187, MHS-253, MHS-272, MHS-275, MHS-290, MHS-310, MHS-378, MHS-380, MHS-391, MHS-393, MHS-418, MHS-442</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small lot homes will not adequately address overshadowing, noise, privacy, daylight and ventilation impacts on surrounding houses. • Increasing building mass (height and site coverage) on these very small lots reduces amenity and contradicts subtropical design goals. • Less private open space and limited opportunities for landscaping and trees due to reduced setbacks, which impacts wildlife, urban heat, and mental and physical health. • Side setbacks should accommodate a 2m deep planting buffer to act as a visual and thermal shield. • 55% site cover does not allow for a sufficient amount of pervious area to help manage stormwater. • Prescriptive design criteria relating to impervious area, site cover and mid-building breaks are not realistic outcomes and significantly limits design flexibility and potential for innovative outcomes. • Lack of parking provision in small lot homes will lead to blocked driveways and poor access for emergency services. • Small lot homes will increase the number of crossovers on a street, reducing the safety of the road due to increased manoeuvring/visibility impacts. • Small lot homes will negatively impact existing streetscape character. • Built to boundary walls and reduced side setbacks are a fire risk and increase heat. Fire separation must be maintained between dwellings. • It does not make sense to build homes on smaller parcels when the birth rate is decreasing. • Small lots will not create true density. Many small lots are also located in car-dependent suburbs with poor or limited public transport, against the assumption that small lot homes will be built in well-located areas. 	<p>suitably scaled and sited to provide amenity and privacy for residents and neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Small lot homes are required to ensure access to natural light, sunlight and breezes for habitable and outdoor spaces, as well as provision of adequate space for subtropical landscaping and functional private open space.</p> <p>The proposed amendment requires impervious areas to be minimised to facilitate restoration and maintenance of soil moisture to support vegetation growth, while reducing urban heat island effects and stormwater run-off. This also ensures the protection and establishment of private open spaces and allows sufficient space for subtropical landscaping.</p> <p>As City Plan is a performance-based planning scheme alternative outcomes may be sought and Council will assess the development on its merits.</p> <p>On-site car parking is required, and provision is made for shared crossovers between two lots where suitable to minimise the number of crossovers. Small lot homes are required to provide a positive streetscape interface, including provision of clearance distances between crossovers to retain existing street trees or facilitate new street tree planting.</p> <p>The provision of built to boundary walls and shared walls will need to meet building requirements, including relevant fire separation standards. (Shared walls refer to adjoining walls that are built on each side of a common boundary between lots)</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small lot homes will not support ageing in place, as 3 storey homes with limited garage space do not meet the needs of elderly residents with limited mobility. Smaller lots will have less space for water tanks. 	<p>The proposed amendment is intended to better support the supply and diversity of homes in well-located LMR zoned areas, which will support ageing in place. Small lot homes are one of a number of housing types facilitated by the proposed amendment in the LMR zone, which also includes multiple dwellings and dual occupancies.</p> <p>There is no requirement in City Plan for dwelling houses to include water tanks, and residents can continue to install these where space is available.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the Dwelling house (small lot) code in response to other matters.</p>	
MHS-018, MHS-134, MHS-272, MHS-290, MHS-383, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-522, MHS-529, MHS-536	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to small lot homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider exploring alternative design outcomes that complement the visual appeal of Brisbane, such as character style terrace housing seen in other cities. Certain design requirements are inconsistent with current terrace home designs, including site cover, impervious area, rear setbacks and mandatory mid-building breaks. Provide example floor plans, developed with industry consultation, on common sized properties in the LMR Zone to demonstrate what outcome is being supported. Undertake industry testing of the design guidelines for terrace housing, including how modern methods of construction (including modular housing) may be accommodated and testing of any model codes/reference designs. Specify rear boundary setbacks of 1.5m for lower levels and 2m for upper levels. Increase site cover, with suggestions of 60% and 80%. Increase maximum impervious area to 80%. Remove the impervious area requirement. 	<p>Council has an existing Low-to-medium density residential Design Guide, which provide guidance about the design of low-rise townhouses and apartments.</p> <p>The proposed design requirements, including minimum lot size and maximum site cover, is considered appropriate to facilitate well-designed small lot homes, including terrace housing, that fit with the local suburban character.</p> <p>The proposed design requirements for small lot homes are not considered to limit development feasibility. Where alternative outcomes are proposed, these will be assessed on merit against the relevant performance outcomes and in consideration of a site's specific circumstances.</p> <p>Small lot homes are required to minimise impervious area to ensure the provision of adequate space for private open spaces and subtropical landscaping,</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a more flexible approach to street trees (including certainty about relocation/ replacement of street trees). • Recommendation that Council issue an early referral response under Section 57 of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> confirming no further Concurrence Agency Response to a Building Work application is required for any approved project with a Development Footprint Plan to minimise complexities in the certification process. • Clarify appropriate lawful point of discharge solutions and relevant design requirements for terrace-style housing (such as pumped stormwater solutions). • Amendments to the Dwelling house (small lot) code in Major amendment L will be a significant constraint. • Subdivision for row housing should be allowed on LMR lots in key locations. • All dwelling houses should allow for 3 storey height and built to boundary walls, regardless of lot area. • Strengthen controls for overshadowing, privacy and setbacks. 	<p>while reducing urban heat island effects and stormwater run-off.</p> <p>The retention and replacement of street trees will be assessed on a site-specific basis through the development assessment process, with reasonable and relevant conditions applied as appropriate.</p> <p>No changes are proposed to current processes relating to Council as referral agency for Building Work applications. The proposed amendment includes changes to Part 1.6 of City Plan, which identifies alternative building assessment provisions in the Dwelling house (small lot) code, including for proposed small lots less than 180m².</p> <p>The management of stormwater for small lot homes, including lawful point of discharge, will be assessed at the subdivision stage based on site-specific circumstances and the proposed development design.</p> <p>Small lot houses are supported outside of key locations in the LMR zone to provide the opportunity for housing diversity, while protecting key locations from further land fragmentation. It is difficult to deliver apartment buildings if a number of smaller lots with individual ownership need to be acquired first, slowing the delivery of increased housing supply.</p> <p>The provision for built to boundary walls or building heights up to 3 storeys for all dwelling houses is out of scope of the proposed amendment, which is focused on the LMR zone.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposed Major amendment package L also includes changes to the Dwelling</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>house (small lot) code, which is separate to this amendment package and still in draft stage. For more information about Major amendment package L, please refer to Council's website.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the Dwelling house (small lot) code in response to other matters.</p>	

3.5 Dual occupancies

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-164, MHS-318, MHS-383, MHS-400, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-522	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendments for dual occupancy uses for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for ageing in place or independent living for adult children. • The lower level of assessment supports development feasibility and the ability to deliver housing supply sooner. • Allows for a gentle increase in density with very minimal streetscape impacts. • Unlocks additional housing, particularly on smaller sites or where subdivision is not possible. • Helps bridge the gap between detached housing and high-rise living. 	Support noted.	No change
MHS-045, MHS-094, MHS-208, MHS-272, MHS-383	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendments for dual occupancy uses and make the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the requirement for a 7-10m rear setback which is inconsistent with standards for small lot dwelling houses and contemporary practice, effectively triggering assessment for these lot types. Suggest it be amended to 6m. • Minimum lot size should be 240m², not 400m², in line with expectations for dwelling houses on small lots. 	<p>The proposed minimum lot size and site cover are considered suitable to facilitate a well-designed dual occupancy use that fits with the local suburban character. These requirements have not been changed.</p> <p>In response to submissions, front and rear setbacks in the Dual occupancy code have been changed to more closely align with the standards for existing dual</p>	Change to proposed setbacks in the Dual occupancy code

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access should be consolidated and site cover limited to 50%. • The proposal for dual occupancy has merit, particularly with an increase in multi-generational living. • Site cover and rear boundary setback requirements are inconsistent with the dual occupancy requirements across Queensland, which may trigger prolonged assessment negotiations, create delivery challenges and deter investment. • Dual occupancy should be supported on sites with a minimum area of 400m² and 12m frontage, or 10m frontage when involving a shared driveway. 	occupancies and for dwelling houses on lots under 180m ² .	
MHS-045, MHS-130, MHS-134, MHS-344, MHS-383, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-475, MHS-522, MHS-536,	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow dual occupancies on 400m² lots across the whole of the LMR zone. • Dual occupancies within key locations where meeting requirements should be accepted development, including on sites less than 600m². • Limit minimum site requirements to just minimum frontage width, such as 15m, rather than setting a minimum lot size. • Reduce minimum lot size requirement, such as to 240m² or 360m². • Change the minimum frontage width to 12m or 10m where involving a shared crossover/driveway. • Increase the front boundary setbacks to reduce streetscape and amenity impacts, such as to 3m which is similar to requirements for dwelling houses on small lots. • Mandate dual occupancies on lots less than 600m² to have tandem or basement parking to prevent on-street spillover. • Revise the rear and side setbacks. • Revise the mid-building break requirement, as this is too prescriptive and dictates the location of private open space. 	<p>The proposed minimum lot size of 400m² in the proposed LMR (3 or 4 storey mix zone precinct) where outside key locations, in combination with the minimum frontage width, front setback and car parking requirements is considered suitable to facilitate a well-designed dual occupancy use that fits with the local suburban character.</p> <p>Small lot houses and small dual occupancies are supported outside of key locations in the LMR zone to provide the opportunity for housing diversity, while protecting key locations from further land fragmentation. It is difficult to deliver apartment buildings if a number of smaller lots with individual ownership need to be acquired first, slowing the delivery of housing supply in locations of high amenity and access to public transport.</p> <p>The Dual occupancy code includes a requirement for parking to be provided in a tandem arrangement on lots less than 600m².</p> <p>Council has an existing Low-to-medium density residential Design Guide, which provides guidance</p>	Change to Dual occupancy code

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other detailed drafting changes were suggested for the Dual occupancy code to clarify the intent of the provisions and ensure appropriate development outcomes. Provide example plans/pattern book to demonstrate the outcome that is being supported. This would also allow industry to provide feedback on whether the product is desirable to the market and commercially viable. 	<p>about the design of low-rise townhouses and apartments.</p> <p>In response to submissions, the requirement for a mid-building break has been removed and front and rear setbacks have been changed to more closely align with the standards for existing dual occupancies and for dwelling houses on lots under 180m². A change has also been made to clarify that parking is to be provided in tandem for each dwelling of the dual occupancy use.</p>	
MHS-115, MHS-123, MHS-134, MHS-142, MHS-367, MHS-400, MHS-452, MHS-454, MHS-536	Submitters suggested dual occupancy uses should be supported in the LDR zone, including on corner lots, within key locations, within walking distance of centres, and on a minimum lot size between 400m ² to 800m ² .	<p>The proposed amendment is intended to support additional housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone, as well as an expansion of the areas in which smaller lots can be created in the LDR zone. Changes to support further density in the LDR zone are out of scope of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the Dual occupancy code in response to other submissions.</p>	No change

3.6 Multiple dwellings

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-035, MHS-132, MHS-134, MHS-137, MHS-164, MHS-457, MHS-467	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourages multiple dwellings within convenient walking distance to services and amenities. Supports the changes to building height transition requirements. Supports townhouse multiple dwelling developments as a potentially cheaper housing choice in the suburbs, helping bridge the gap between detached housing and high-rise living. It combats urban sprawl. 	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates more housing for the next generation. 		
MHS-021, MHS-034, MHS-045, MHS-208, MHS-349, MHS-350, MHS-426	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment and makes the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions provided regarding development requirements for rear setback, impervious area, landscaping and deep planting, active transport storage, balconies and privacy, cross-ventilation and natural light. Additional height of 4 storeys is supported provided that design standards are upheld, including quality of design, screen or opaque glazing, 10% deep planting as a minimum, subtropical rooftop gardens and consolidated access. Transition requirements should be replaced with more performance-based requirements. Questioned why the minimum width of a lot needed to be 20m in order to build to 4 storeys, when the minimum width requirement for 3 storeys is only 15m. While changes will assist housing supply and increased density, hard limits such as the road reserve requirement will restrict development and delay approvals. Impact assessment timeframes for 3 to 4 storey multiple dwellings need to be reduced, particularly as some will not be able to comply with the 14m height limit, due to high cost and poor-quality design outcome. Multiple dwelling development needs to contribute to provision for road upgrades, car parking, electric vehicle charging facilities, active transport infrastructure, public transport improvements, support for electric/autonomous tramways to reduce congestion, green space, public open space, affordable housing, community facilities and high-speed internet and mobile networks. 	<p>The proposed amendment includes changes for multiple dwellings (apartments and townhouses), to allow for increased building heights up to 4 storeys and 14m where within key locations and on a minimum lot size of 800m².</p> <p>The increase in minimum lot size and frontage width for a 4 storey multiple dwelling is considered appropriate to assist with achieving requirements along the streetscape for access, servicing, landscaping and achieving the building transitions, where required.</p> <p>No other changes are proposed to the acceptable outcomes or performance outcomes of the Multiple dwelling code as part of this proposed amendment. Proposals relating to further changes to the Multiple dwelling code are outside of the scope of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes transition requirements where adjoining a dwelling house. This requires the fourth storey to be set back 10m from the common boundary of the adjoining lot, to reduce bulk and maintain amenity. While this will constrain some sites, this is considered an appropriate outcome to ensure the amenity of any adjoining dwelling houses (including character houses). Where an alternative transition is proposed, it will be assessed on its merits against the relevant performance outcomes.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>The Multiple dwelling code includes existing requirements for setbacks, landscaping and deep planting, balconies and privacy, cross-ventilation and natural light, screening and glazing, consolidated access and subtropical rooftop gardens. The Transport, access, parking and servicing code includes requirements for bicycle parking for active transport.</p> <p>All new multiple dwellings are now required by the National Construction Code to provide the electric capacity and distribution boards to support off-street electric vehicle charging.</p> <p>References to a road reserve width in the Multiple dwelling code are existing provisions in City Plan and are not proposed to be changed as part of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>The Subtropical building design planning scheme policy provides additional guidance and greater clarity on the existing design requirements for multiple dwelling developments to best respond to Brisbane's subtropical climate and meet the community's expectations.</p> <p>Council undertakes development assessment in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	
MHS-084, MHS-175, MHS-305, MHS-363, MHS-371, MHS-420, MHS-452, MHS-457, MHS-463	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building transition requirement where adjoining a dwelling house, even if the house is also located in the LMR zone, is unnecessary and restricts development feasibility. 	<p>The proposed amendment includes transition requirements where adjoining a dwelling house. This requires the fourth storey to be set back 10m from the common boundary of the adjoining lot, to reduce bulk and maintain amenity. While this will constrain some sites, this is considered an appropriate outcome to ensure the amenity of any adjoining dwelling houses</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased scale and reduced setbacks will be overbearing and impact adjoining homes. Apartment buildings up to 4 storeys (and 14m), with reduced setbacks and a site cover up to 55% will be overpowering, result in amenity impacts to existing houses and encourage the removal of existing housing stock. Lack of private outdoor space. The minimum lot size of 800m² for four storeys seems unnecessary and will limit the delivery of housing supply, and appropriate multiple dwelling outcomes are achievable on 600m². While the amendment increases feasibility for multiple dwellings, it is not enough to support supply of community housing projects. Additional, specific mechanism that supports provision of affordable housing is needed. Suburb centres will be lost. Suburbs such as Sandgate don't have the area for these kinds of developments. Does not believe that residents of Geebung will accept multiple dwellings in their area. 	<p>(including character houses). Where an alternative transition is proposed, it will be assessed on its merits against the relevant performance outcomes.</p> <p>No changes have been proposed to site cover, setbacks or the provision of private open space for multiple dwellings as part of the proposed amendment. The proposed changes only apply to development for dwelling houses on lots less than 180m².</p> <p>The minimum lot size of 800m² for a multiple dwelling up to 4 storeys is to facilitate an opportunity for an incremental increase in density within well-located areas, while managing the interface with existing dwelling houses. This lot size is considered appropriate to assist with achieving requirements along the streetscape for access, servicing, landscaping and achieving the building transitions, where required.</p> <p>The proposed amendment is intended to support additional housing supply and diversity in well-located LMR zoned areas of the city. Increased housing supply and diversity in proximity to centres is expected to support the success of suburban centres.</p>	
MHS-045, MHS-118, MHS-134, MHS-349, MHS-350, MHS-455, MHS-457, MHS-536	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to multiple dwelling requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the setback and transition requirements applicable to the proposed 4 storeys and 14m height. Allow multiple dwellings in the LMR zone even if next to a house. 4 storeys developments in key locations should include a subtropical rooftop garden. Further review parking and manoeuvring requirements as they continue to restrict feasibility. 	<p>The maximum building height of 14m is only proposed to facilitate multiple dwellings (apartments) within key locations and on sites that are a minimum 800m² in size.</p> <p>The proposed amendment does not preclude development of multiple dwellings adjacent to dwelling houses. It includes transition requirements where adjoining a dwelling house. This requires the fourth storey to be set back 10m from the common boundary of the adjoining lot, to reduce bulk and maintain</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Multiple dwelling code to include specific provisions for the low-rise, 3-4 storey developments to encourage practical outcomes. Multiple dwellings should be permitted in the Low density residential zone. 	<p>amenity. While this will constrain some sites, this is considered an appropriate outcome to ensure the amenity of any adjoining dwelling houses (including character houses). Where an alternative transition is proposed, it will be assessed on its merits against the relevant performance outcomes.</p> <p>Rooftop gardens are supported in City Plan with the Multiple dwelling code including design criteria where one is proposed.</p> <p>No changes are included for vehicle maneuvering requirements for multiple dwelling developments in the proposed amendment. Changes are proposed to car parking rates for multiple dwellings in <i>More Homes, Sooner – Car parking for multiple dwellings</i>. Please refer to the project webpage for more information.</p> <p>Specific design requirements for low-rise 3 to 4 storey multiple dwellings are not included as part of this amendment. Development applications for low rise proposals will be assessed against existing provisions of the Multiple dwelling code.</p> <p>The proposed amendment does not include changes to support the development of multiple dwellings in the LDR zone. The proposed amendment is intended to support additional housing supply and diversity, particularly in the LMR zone.</p>	

3.7 Subdivision in the Low density residential zone

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-005, MHS-015, MHS-032, MHS-045, MHS-049, MHS-066, MHS-067, MHS-074, MHS-081, MHS-086, MHS-103, MHS-122, MHS-134, MHS-137, MHS-138, MHS-146, MHS-207, MHS-318, MHS-383, MHS-426, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-475, MHS-514, MHS-522, MHS-536	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment for subdivision in the Low density residential zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps to limit further urban sprawl through increasing opportunities for infill development. • Supports housing affordability. • Supports increasing housing supply and diversity. • Supports the ability to age-in-place. • Supports walkability and local businesses. • It is a gentle increase to density in the LDR zone, with minimal impacts to existing character and amenity. • Makes better use of existing infrastructure and strengthens local neighbourhoods. 	Support noted.	No change
MHS-036, MHS-043, MHS-060, MHS-112, MHS-129, MHS-155, MHS-166, MHS-197, MHS-272, MHS-273, MHS-383, MHS-309, MHS-394, MHS-400, MHS-454	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment for subdivision in the LDR zone and made the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking distance should be further increased, including suggestions for 400m (consistent with key locations), 500m and 800m. • Suggests that the walking distance also be applied from public transport facilities consistent with the key location definition. • Introduce a 400m walking catchment overlay around centres and high-frequency public transport stops to clearly identify LDR zoned land that the changes apply to. • Should be expanded to allow minimum lot size of 300m² across all LDR zoned land. • Replace minimum lot size with a minimum rectangle dimension, such as 7m x 25m (or 12m x 15m for corner lots) as these lots still provide sufficient street frontage and would have limited streetscape impacts. 	<p>The proposed change to allow properties in the LDR zone within 300m walking distance of a shopping centre to be subdivided to 300m² is considered to provide an opportunity for incremental infill development in well-located areas of the LDR zone.</p> <p>Suggestions to consider changes to allow small lots in more locations are not part of the proposed amendment and would be more change to the suburban character of LDR zoned areas than was originally intended with this proposed amendment.</p> <p>The calculation of walking distance is site specific and, as such, no mapping will be prepared to identify areas within the proposed 300m walking distance.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be accompanied by design, amenity and character safeguards as well as strict maximum site cover and deep planting controls to avoid sacrificing green space and tree canopy. 	<p>The proposed amendment is not considered to conflict with the intent of the LDR zone to maintain its low density detached housing suburban identity.</p> <p>The proposed change to increase opportunities for smaller lots is considered to provide an opportunity for incremental infill development in well-located areas of the LDR zone.</p>	
MHS-002, MHS-017, MHS-022, MHS-033, MHS-046, MHS-071, MHS-104, MHS-193, MHS-204, MHS-370, MHS-375, MHS-380, MHS-397, MHS-410, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-423, MHS-444, MHS-461, MHS-468, MHS-470, MHS-512, MHS-520	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for subdivision in the LDR for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding the acceptable outcome for reduced lot sizes will only benefit developers looking to profit off subdividing lots. Conflicts with the intent for low density, and subdivision should be focussed on medium density zones. Lacks consideration of existing residents. Would materially impact privacy, access to natural light, noise levels and sense of space that residents expect in a low density area. Raised several concerns with smaller lot sizes and subdivisions within the LDR zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> will increase strain on local infrastructure and services. will alter the character and feel of streets and neighbourhoods. will increase on-street parking due to narrower driveways and fewer off-street spaces. allowing built-to-boundary walls and terrace-style housing, diminishing the area's character. will increase hard surface coverage, reducing gardens, green space, and permeable areas. will reduce gardens and open space, negatively affecting amenity and quality of life. 	<p>The minimum lot size of 300m² within the LDR zone has not been changed. Lots less than 180m², or terrace style small lot homes, are only supported in specific areas of the LMR zone, not the LDR zone.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that proposed development will be required to be assessed against any relevant overlays, which may constrain the development of specific sites in response to specific features.</p> <p>Proposals for subdivision of LDR zoned land will be assessed against the Subdivision code. The subsequent future dwelling house will be assessed against existing provisions in the Dwelling house (small lot) code. The existing provisions include requirements for design, amenity, site cover, setbacks, car parking and crossovers, access to natural light, noise and overshadowing. There are no changes to built to boundary walls, site coverage or car parking/vehicle access requirements.</p>	
MHS-032, MHS-036, MHS-043, MHS-066, MHS-067, MHS-081, MHS-103, MHS-114, MHS-115, MHS-118, MHS-123, MHS-134, MHS-138, MHS-142, MHS-166, MHS-199,	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to subdivision in the LDR zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurement of walking distance should be reviewed, as currently it is subjective and adds unnecessary complication. Suggests changing to a direct line from the centre of the lot frontage to the nearest point of the centre. Suggests a greater walking distance, ranging from 350m to 1km. 	<p>No changes are proposed to the existing requirements for rear lots, either in the LDR or LMR zones, as part of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>No expansion of the LMR zone is proposed as part of this amendment.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
<p>MHS-272, MHS-273 MHS-383, MHS-430, MHS-452, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-475, MHS-514</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be expanded to include land within walking distance of high-frequency public transport stops or stations. • Any lot in the LDR zone that is greater than 600m² and has a minimum frontage width of 20m should be allowed to subdivide. • Reduce the minimum lot size for the whole Low density residential zone to 300-350m². • Subdivision changes should be extended to more of the inner and middle-ring suburbs close to the city as they benefit from strong infrastructure and services, and many have larger residential lots suitable for duplex and townhouse style development. • Expand the reduced minimum lot sizes proposed for the LMR zone to the LDR zone, including for rear lots. • Reduce the minimum rear lot size for the Low-density residential zone and/or where within 200m walking distance to a centre zone. • Minimum lot sizes for rear lots should be based on managing amenity rather than prescriptive sizes (performance-based). • Reduce or remove the centre size requirement (such as to 1500m²) to increase subdivision opportunity. • Broaden the policy to capture other centres with comparable levels of accessibility and amenity, such as areas with significant commercial activity but not located in a centre zone. • These low density residential zoned areas should be reviewed and considered for a change of zone to the LMR zone. This would allow for greater housing diversity through a mix of small lots and multiple dwelling outcomes rather than only small lots. • Will not materially alter development outcomes if other planning controls continue to restrict scale and built form in areas well suited to increased density. 	<p>In response to other submissions, the category of assessment table for subdivision in the LDR zone has been changed to provide improved clarity on how walking distance is to be calculated.</p>	

3.8 Levels of assessment

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-215, MHS-318	Submitters support the proposed amendment to levels of assessment as a sensible and timely step to increase housing supply by making it easier and more cost effective to build new homes in well-located areas.	Support noted.	No change
MHS-021, MHS-349, MHS-350, MHS-396	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment to levels of assessment and made the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of assessment should be lowered further to reduce the regulatory burden (including excessive building/construction standards, private certification processes). The 800m² minimum lot size for 4 storey multiple dwellings should be re-considered. Appropriate developments can be delivered on smaller lots, with appropriate setback requirements to maintain amenity. 	<p>The proposed amendment allows for streamlined assessment pathways for small lot housing options, including terrace houses and dual occupancies and is considered a suitable mechanism to support the timely provision of additional housing supply in the LMR zone.</p> <p>The minimum lot size of 800m² for a multiple dwelling up to 4 storeys is proposed to facilitate an opportunity for an incremental increase in density within well-located areas, while managing the interface with existing dwelling houses. The minimum lot size will remain a level of assessment trigger for multiple dwellings.</p>	No change
MHS-019, MHS-037, MHS-077, MHS-097, MHS-125, MHS-139, MHS-153, MHS-168, MHS-172, MHS-307, MHS-311, MHS-322, MHS-323, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-356, MHS-364, MHS-366, MHS-379, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-399, MHS-402, MHS-411, MHS-422, MHS-442, MHS-459, MHS-466, MHS-472, MHS-513, MHS-533	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment to levels of assessment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced levels of assessment limit opportunities for public consultation on future developments, including for multiple dwellings, smaller lots, retirement facilities, residential care facilities. Council's proposal to streamline development assessment is concerning as faster approvals may reduce opportunities for public consultation and scrutiny of site-specific impacts, with increased risk of inadequate oversight of private developers. This undermines community confidence in the planning process. Results in less favourable rights for residents. More accepted development and less impact assessable development will result in more development without Council assessment or public notification. Proposed streamlining of decision processes would affect transparency and result in perceptions of favouritism. 	<p>Multiple dwellings applications, where meeting minimum requirements, remain code assessable development in the LMR zone. Where a development proposes alternative outcomes, such as on a smaller lot or above maximum building heights, this will trigger an impact assessable application which includes opportunity for community submissions.</p> <p>All development must follow building certification requirements to ensure construction meets the required building standards. The proposed changes to levels of assessment for a development application against City Plan do not override these building certification requirements.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerated timelines will reduce scrutiny of build quality, prioritising yield over long-term community outcomes. The risk of cutting corners will be exacerbated leading up to the Olympics, as labour shortages for residential builds will lead to reduced regulatory oversights. Impact assessment should be triggered where a development is not complying with maximum height limits or there are development footprint impacts. Meaningful community consultation must remain a core part of the development assessment process and the current system is already insufficient. 	<p>The community can stay up to date with development activity in Brisbane using Council's online system, development.i.</p> <p>Areas within key locations are proposed to support more apartments (multiple dwellings) and will continue to support dual occupancies. To facilitate increased delivery of these housing options and reduce further fragmentation of land in these well-located areas, the proposed minimum lot size for subdivision has been increased to 600m², consistent with the existing minimum lot size for a multiple dwelling.</p>	
MHS-344, MHS-383	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to levels of assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editor's notes should be included to clarify the relationship between prescribed accepted development and Building Act alternative provisions, as well as amenity and aesthetic referral provisions. Dual occupancy should be accepted development subject to identified requirements across the entire LMR zone. Trigger for impact assessment when involving reconfiguration of a lot less than 600m² and within 400m of a key location should be removed. Trigger for impact assessment for allotments with a frontage less than 6m should be removed. 	<p>The minimum lot frontage for small lots (less than 180m²) is an important assessment benchmark to facilitate well-designed small lot homes, including terrace housing, that fit with the local suburban character, while providing sufficient space for street trees, servicing of the new lots, and on-street parking opportunities.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the levels of assessment</p>	

3.9 Minimum site requirements within key locations

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-452	Submitter supports the proposed amendment for a minimum lot size of 600m ² lot in key locations to minimise further lot fragmentation.	Support noted.	No change
MHS-155, MHS-160, MHS-166	Submitters support in part the proposed amendment for the following reasons:	Areas within key locations are proposed to support more apartments (multiple dwellings) and will continue	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understands intent to limit fragmentation but doesn't believe that mandating lot sizes is the solution, and it could inadvertently restrict housing delivery. Proposed minimum 800m² site area for 4 storey, 14m high multiple dwellings seems arbitrary, with good design being achievable on sites well below this threshold. Supports intent but applying fixed minimum lot sizes within key locations risks restricting development capacity and discouraging innovation – suggests performance-based subdivision criteria addressing built-form integration, access, waste servicing and amenity. 	<p>to support dual occupancies. To facilitate increased delivery of these housing options and reduce further fragmentation of land in these well-located areas, the proposed minimum lot size for subdivision has been increased to 600m², consistent with the existing minimum lot size for a multiple dwelling.</p> <p>The increase in minimum lot size and frontage width for a 4 storey multiple dwelling is considered appropriate to assist with achieving requirements along the streetscape for access, servicing, landscaping and achieving the building transitions, where required.</p>	
MHS-085, MHS-134, MHS-188, MHS-208, MHS-344, MHS-366, MHS-383, MHS-400, MHS-452, MHS-457, MHS-463	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricting lots less than 600m² to outside of key location areas unnecessarily limits development, especially for existing lots below 600m² that cannot accommodate a multiple dwelling. Restricts infill opportunities for smaller dual occupancies and subdivisions, particularly impacting smaller developers that are unable to build larger multiple dwelling developments. The minimum lot size excludes many well-located infill sites and does not align with typical lot sizes. The requirement for a 20m frontage width is sufficient to support a 4 storey built form and allow for appropriate separation to existing properties. Three storeys is not financially feasible on a 700m² site. 600m² is insufficient to support a 3 storey development and should be a minimum of 700-800m². Believes proposed minimum frontage widths and lot sizes are too restrictive. 	<p>Residential development and built form outcomes within the proposed 3 or 4 storey mix zone precinct of the LMR zone are proposed to be tailored to respond to a site's proximity to centres and high-frequency public transport, either within or outside Key Locations. This supports a greater mix of housing options across the Low-medium density residential zone.</p> <p>The existing minimum site requirements for a multiple dwelling up to 3 storeys have been maintained, including a 600m² minimum site area and a minimum frontage width of 15m. In addition, dual occupancies will continue to be supported on a 600m² minimum site area to allow for other infill housing options where a multiple dwelling cannot be accommodated.</p>	
MHS-134, MHS-160	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow minimum lot sizes within key locations to be the same as those outside of key locations. 	<p>The existing minimum lot size of 350m² for a rear lot has been maintained, where outside of a key location. Within key locations, the minimum lot size (for a standard or rear lot) is proposed to be 600m² to</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rear lots as small as 400m² should be supported within key locations/within 200m of a centre zone. Reconsider the minimum 800m² site area for 4 storey, 14m high multiple dwellings, and/or providing a more flexible performance-based pathway. 	<p>support delivery of multiple dwellings by limiting fragmentation of land in well-located areas.</p> <p>The increase in minimum lot size and frontage width for a 4 storey multiple dwelling is considered appropriate to assist with achieving requirements along the streetscape for access, servicing, landscaping and achieving the building transitions, where required.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to parts of the proposed amendment relating to key locations.</p>	

3.10 Minimum site requirements outside of key locations

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-007, MHS-044, MHS-045, MHS-049, MHS-101, MHS-114, MHS-115, MHS-116, MHS-117, MHS-118, MHS-122, MHS-123, MHS-126, MHS-133, MHS-134, MHS-140, MHS-141, MHS-143, MHS-161, MHS-215, MHS-225, MHS-273, MHS-281, MHS-383, MHS-396, MHS-408, MHS-409, MHS-451, MHS-452, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-480, MHS-481, MHS-482,	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows for increased housing supply, particularly in areas that are close to public transport, centres and in proximity to the city. Introduces greater flexibility in delivering small lots, such as allowing freehold title to increase housing options, affordability and appeal. Allows established suburbs to grow and support increased population growth through infill development. Unlocks the 'missing middle' by supporting more low-medium density development to address the gap between low density and high density residential uses in Brisbane. Improves commercial feasibility for low-medium density development. Supports efficient use of existing infrastructure. 	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-483, MHS-484, MHS-485, MHS-486, MHS-487, MHS-488, MHS-489, MHS-490, MHS-491, MHS-492, MHS-493, MHS-494, MHS-495, MHS-496, MHS-497, MHS-498, MHS-499, MHS-500, MHS-501, MHS-502, MHS-503, MHS-504, MHS-505, MHS-506, MHS-507, MHS-508, MHS-509, MHS-517, MHS-522, MHS-524, MHS-536	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with different housing needs to create genuinely inclusive communities, whilst increasing diversity and affordability. 		
MHS-155, MHS-197, MHS-383	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support lot size but do not support the minimum lot width, especially as a trigger for impact assessment. Supports opportunities to create more housing, as long as this is accompanied by strict maximum site cover and deep planting controls to avoid sacrificing green space and tree canopy. Doesn't believe that mandating minimum lot sizes will deliver more housing as nearly all development outcomes are commercially driven. 	<p>Minimum site requirements and design controls have been carefully considered, ensuring development outcomes are suitably scaled, sited and designed, while facilitating increased housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone.</p> <p>Design and built form requirements for small lot homes require the provision of sufficient open space and the retention of existing street trees or planting of new street trees. The proposed minimum lot width of 6m is particularly important in ensuring these outcomes are achievable.</p> <p>Existing provisions in the Multiple dwelling code include requirements for multiple dwelling development to result in an appropriate bulk and scale and support the provision of landscaping and deep planting (including a minimum of 10% of the site area for deep planting).</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		In response to other submissions changes have been made to the Dwelling house (small lot) code and other parts of the proposed amendment relating to key locations.	
MHS-002, MHS-004, MHS-033, MHS-070, MHS-077, MHS-095, MHS-097, MHS-104, MHS-149, MHS-157, MHS-162, MHS-186, MHS-187, MHS-209, MHS-319, MHS-351, MHS-378, MHS-392, MHS-393, MHS-442	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment and a minimum lot size of 120m² for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only benefits developers looking to make profit by subdividing to very small lots. • It does not make sense to support small lots outside of key locations which are further from public transport, leading to more on-street parking issues. • Splitting larger lots in half does not work and the lots will be too small to function appropriately. • Concerned that 120m² will become a standard suburban lot size and erode the requirements in other zones. • Increases development risks and 'race to the minimum' outcomes. • Concerned about the 'simplified' assessment of smaller lots. • Concerned that small lots cannot appropriately accommodate a building footprint, landscaping and car parking, especially as household sizes increase. • Will lead to tree clearing and decreased opportunities for green space, which has drastic effects on wildlife, urban heat and mental health. • Proposed 120m² lot sizes results in poor design outcomes, including sub-standard private open space, reduced liveability, garage-dominated frontages, poor activation, increased neighbourhood disputes and reduced amenity. • Smaller lots cause low-rise sprawl with higher congestion and lower efficiency. They do not improve affordability but deliver luxury compact housing. 	<p>The proposed minimum lot size is considered to facilitate well-designed small lot homes that fit within the local, suburban character. In particular, small lot homes will increase housing options for Brisbane's growing demographic of 1-2 person households.</p> <p>Under the proposed amendment, the minimum lot size of 120m² is only facilitated outside of key locations within the 3 or 4 storey mix zone precinct of the LMR zone. This is to encourage an incremental increase in density and housing diversity within these well-located areas. Small lots are not supported within key locations to avoid further fragmentation of land.</p> <p>Minimum lot sizes in other residential zones are not changed by the proposed amendment.</p> <p>Development Footprint Plans (DFP) are required on very small lots (less than 180m²) to ensure the proposed lots are capable of accommodating a suitably scaled and serviced dwelling house and that they fit with the local character, climate and suburban setting. The provisions have been drafted with flexibility to ensure future small lot homes align with either a DFP approved at the subdivision stage or the requirements of the Dwelling house (small lot) code. This proposed approach provides for a simplified assessment pathway for small lot homes.</p> <p>New provisions within the Dwelling house (small lot) code include private open space, impervious area, single-width car parking spaces, maximum</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>driveway/crossover widths, pedestrian entry and privacy requirements.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the Dwelling house (small lot) code and other parts of the proposed amendment relating to key locations.</p>	
MHS-088, MHS-134, MHS-452	<p>Submitters make the following suggestions relating to rear lot sizes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum lot size of a rear lot should be more consistent with the lot sizes for street facing lots, as this requirement reduces opportunities for new housing. Allow a minimum rear lot size of 400m² where within walking distance of a centre. 	<p>The existing minimum rear lot size of 350m² is maintained under the proposed amendment where outside of key locations. Rear lot sizes are not proposed to change as they often require additional manoeuvring areas that are not achievable on lots less than 180m², particularly while maintaining an appropriate scale, streetscape interface, street tree planting, on street parking and provision of open space.</p>	
MHS-004, MHS-114, MHS-115, MHS-118, MHS-123, MHS-142, MHS-149, MHS-166, MHS-344, MHS-383, MHS-452, MHS-522, MHS-536	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change regarding minimum lot sizes outside key locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit reduced lot sizes to genuinely appropriate locations (with infrastructure capacity and strong transport access) and subject to stronger design rules at subdivision stage. Allow the reduced lot sizes (120-180m² lots) in the Emerging community zone and LDR zone. There are minimal 'off the shelf' plans for these smaller lot sizes and it may be difficult to find a builder. A pattern book/set of standard designs that are cost-effective to build and meet the requirements may assist. The level of assessment criteria for a minimum lot width of 6m is unnecessary as there are many terrace home designs available and achievable on lots less than 6m. Should be focusing on duplexes, townhouses and low-rise apartments near transport, rather than detached housing on smaller lots. Should explain the policy basis and testing behind the proposed 120m² minimum lot size, and whether the reform still improves deliverability with all of the relevant controls. 	<p>Minimum site requirements and design controls have been carefully considered, ensuring development outcomes are suitably scaled, sited and designed, while facilitating increased housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone.</p> <p>Under the proposed amendment, small lot homes and smaller dual occupancies are only facilitated outside of key locations within the 3 or 4 storey mix zone precinct of the LMR zone. This is to encourage an incremental increase in density and housing diversity within these well-located areas. Small lots and smaller dual occupancies are not supported within Key Locations to avoid further fragmentation of land.</p> <p>The amendment also supports the increased supply of multiple dwellings within Key Locations through increased building heights and minimum lot sizes.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>Suggests also strengthening the link between small lot outcomes and measurable landscaping, permeability, stormwater management and compliance checks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear design framework should be provided to aid with practical feasibility of delivering on 120m² rear lots, as this depends on meeting the new DFP requirements including compliant bin storage, bin movement paths, driveway geometry and kerbside staging. 	<p>Development Footprint Plans (DFP) are required on very small lots (less than 180m²) to ensure the proposed lots are capable of accommodating a suitably scaled and serviced dwelling house and that they fit with the local character, climate and suburban setting. The provisions have been drafted with flexibility to ensure future small lot homes align with either a DFP approved at the subdivision stage or the requirements of the Dwelling house (small lot) code. This proposed approach provides for a simplified assessment pathway for small lot homes.</p> <p>New provisions within the Dwelling house (small lot) code include private open space, impervious area, single-width car parking spaces, maximum driveway/crossover widths, pedestrian entry and privacy requirements</p> <p>Council has an existing Low-to-medium density residential Design Guide, which provide guidance about the design of low-rise townhouses and apartments.</p> <p>In response to other submissions changes have been made to the Dwelling house (small lot) code and other parts of the proposed amendment relating to key locations.</p>	

3.11 Amenity, character and environmental matters

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-156, MHS-178, MHS-182, MHS-197, MHS-531	Submitters support in part the proposed amendment and provide the following comments regarding impacts on amenity, character and environmental values:	<p>The support and comments are noted.</p> <p><i>Brisbane's Clean, Green, Sustainable 2017-2031</i> details Council's approach to sustainable city</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure requirements for minimum provision of green space and vegetation, including established trees, are imposed to reduce urban heat island effects and positively contribute to a neighbourhood's microclimate. • Ensure that new development on sloping sites will not impact the views or sunlight access of adjoining houses. • Ensure an appropriate supply of accessible, quality open space is available in neighbourhoods with increased density and smaller housing options. • Supports height increases near public transport, but not on residential streets where they will be inconsistent with the local character and overshadow existing residences. • Supports the principle of encouraging the 'missing middle', as long as it does not come at the cost of tree canopy and is matched by strict 20% deep planting requirements. 	<p>development and environmental management. It includes Council's key sustainability achievements and future targets and commitments to support council's objectives for a cleaner, greener and more sustainable city. The establishment of 40% natural habitat cover on mainland Brisbane by 2031 is one of Council's key targets for protecting the biodiversity and natural values of Brisbane.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes design requirements for new development to ensure the protection of existing street trees or planting of new street trees. Other design requirements are included to provide adequate space for landscaping and open space for smaller homes. Existing requirements in the Multiple dwelling code include requirements for landscaping, deep planting, open space (communal or private) as well as requirements to minimise privacy and overshadowing impacts.</p>	
MHS-004, MHS-019, MHS-020, MHS-022, MHS-024, MHS-026, MHS-030, MHS-033, MHS-045, MHS-058, MHS-061, MHS-064, MHS-077, MHS-084, MHS-087, MHS-095, MHS-097, MHS-100, MHS-101, MHS-106, MHS-107, MHS-108, MHS-109, MHS-110, MHS-111, MHS-125, MHS-139, MHS-147, MHS-148, MHS-149, MHS-150, MHS-151, MHS-152, MHS-153, MHS-154, MHS-161,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns regarding impacts on amenity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overshadowing due to increased building bulk, scale and height. • Overshadowing and impacts on privacy and noise due to the increased height, site cover and reduced setbacks for houses on lots less than 180m². • Detrimental impact on privacy of existing residents through overlooking. • Increased noise due to greater density and overcrowding, particularly on narrow streets. • Decrease in natural ventilation and breezes. • Loss of sunlight/solar access. • Negative impact on lifestyle and amenity. • Loss of private outdoor space. 	<p>The proposed amendment is considered provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density).</p> <p>Detailed design requirements are proposed for residential development in the zone (including apartments, dual occupancy and small lot houses) to regulate the bulk and scale of future development through requirements for building heights, setbacks, site cover, private open space, and impervious area. These requirements work collectively to ensure that infill development provides a suitable level of amenity for existing and future residents, including access to light and breezes, privacy between dwellings, and access to private outdoor space.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-162, MHS-168, MHS-173, MHS-174, MHS-179, MHS-180, MHS-188, MHS-192, MHS-195, MHS-206, MHS-213, MHS-217, MHS-219, MHS-222, MHS-223, MHS-226, MHS-227, MHS-228, MHS-229, MHS-230, MHS-231, MHS-232, MHS-233, MHS-234, MHS-236, MHS-237, MHS-238, MHS-239, MHS-240, MHS-241, MHS-242, MHS-243, MHS-244, MHS-246, MHS-247, MHS-248, MHS-249, MHS-250, MHS-253, MHS-254, MHS-255, MHS-256, MHS-257, MHS-258, MHS-259, MHS-261, MHS-264, MHS-265, MHS-266, MHS-267, MHS-268, MHS-269, MHS-271, MHS-274, MHS-277, MHS-278, MHS-280, MHS-282, MHS-283, MHS-290, MHS-292, MHS-293, MHS-295, MHS-301, MHS-303, MHS-306, MHS-307, MHS-310, MHS-311, MHS-312, MHS-315, MHS-317, MHS-320, MHS-322,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of views and associated impacts on property value, particularly where existing apartments were specifically designed to offer views of the bay • It will result in overcrowding. • Impacts on existing homes located down slope. • It will feel enclosed if development on surrounding sites is up to 14m high. • It will make Brisbane an even worse place to live. 		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-323, MHS-327, MHS-328, MHS-330, MHS-333, MHS-334, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-340, MHS-341, MHS-345, MHS-351, MHS-355, MHS-356, MHS-359, MHS-360, MHS-362, MHS-363, MHS-364, MHS-366, MHS-368, MHS-370, MHS-371, MHS-374, MHS-375, MHS-376, MHS-377, MHS-379, MHS-381, MHS-382, MHS-389, MHS-390, MHS-391, MHS-394, MHS-397, MHS-401, MHS-402, MHS-403, MHS-404, MHS-407, MHS-410, MHS-411, MHS-413, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-418, MHS-423, MHS-425, MHS-431, MHS-433, MHS-437, MHS-438, MHS-440, MHS-444, MHS-447, MHS-448, MHS-449, MHS-450, MHS-456, MHS-458, MHS-459, MHS-460, MHS-461, MHS-464, MHS-465, MHS-466, MHS-468, MHS-469, MHS-470, MHS-472, MHS-473, MHS-474, MHS-477,			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-512, MHS-513, MHS-520, MHS-521, MHS-526, MHS-530, MHS-533, MHS-535			
MHS-004, MHS-013, MHS-019, MHS-020, MHS-022, MHS-024, MHS-027, MHS-064, MHS-079, MHS-094, MHS-097, MHS-102, MHS-106, MHS-107, MHS-111, MHS-125, MHS-139, MHS-149, MHS-150, MHS-151, MHS-154, MHS-157, MHS-161, MHS-168, MHS-171, MHS-173, MHS-174, MHS-175, MHS-176, MHS-179, MHS-193, MHS-204, MHS-206, MHS-220, MHS-271, MHS-275, MHS-283, MHS-284, MHS-289, MHS-293, MHS-294, MHS-304, MHS-307, MHS-310, MHS-311, MHS-312, MHS-317, MHS-323, MHS-327, MHS-328, MHS-333, MHS-334, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-341, MHS-345, MHS-348, MHS-351, MHS-355, MHS-356, MHS-363, MHS-364, MHS-371, MHS-374, MHS-375,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns regarding the impact on streetscape and local character, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed 3-4 storey outcomes are incompatible with the existing streetscape character of 1-2 storeys and will detrimentally impact the aesthetic value of the suburbs (including Morningside, Hawthorne Bulimba, Balmoral, Chermside Wynnum, Manly and Sandgate). • Subdivision and increased density will undermine neighbourhood character and impact the unique character of Brisbane's suburbs • Increased density represents a fundamental shift from the existing character of low density suburbs, which are defined by space, greenery and a sense of openness. • Impacts the 'coastal village' aesthetic and character of local areas, including Wynnum, Manly and Sandgate. • Without strict setback requirements on smaller lots, developments will appear as continuous walls of masonry, negatively impacting the streetscape. 	<p>The proposed amendment is considered to provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density).</p> <p>Detailed design requirements are proposed for residential development in the zone (including apartments, dual occupancy and small lot houses) to regulate the bulk and scale of future development through requirements for building heights, setbacks, site cover, private open space, and impervious area. These requirements work collectively to ensure that infill development provides a suitable level of amenity for existing and future residents, including access to light and breezes, privacy between dwellings, and access to private outdoor space.</p> <p>The only change proposed for the LDR zone is to support subdivision of sites down to a minimum of 300m² where they are within 300m walking distance of a centre of a certain size. Currently, subdivision down to a minimum of 300m² is allowed within 200m walking distance of a centre of a certain size. This is considered an incremental increase in supply of housing in the LDR zone, with much of the LDR zone unaffected by change.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-377, MHS-378, MHS-379, MHS-381, MHS-385, MHS-389, MHS-394, MHS-399, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-406, MHS-411, MHS-413, MHS-414, MHS-417, MHS-425, MHS-429, MHS-431, MHS-433, MHS-432, MHS-435, MHS-438, MHS-440, MHS-448, MHS-449, MHS-456, MHS-459, MHS-464, MHS-466, MHS-472, MHS-511, MHS-513, MHS-526, MHS-533, MHS-534			
MHS-168, MHS-182, MHS-303, MHS-307, MHS-311, MHS-323, MHS-328, MHS-333, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-341, MHS-356, MHS-364, MHS-363, MHS-370, MHS-375, MHS-376, MHS-377, MHS-380, MHS-385, MHS-397, MHS-399, MHS-402, MHS-403, MHS-410, MHS-411, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-423, MHS-429, MHS-435, MHS-444, MHS-447, MHS-461, MHS-466, MHS-468, MHS-470,	Submitters oppose the proposed amendment specifically in Wynnum and Manly for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not tailored or responsive to Wynnum and Manly's unique character. Changes will encourage further commercial activity, reducing Manly Village's 'old world charm' and current coffee and restaurant precinct. The area is over 20km from the city centre and should not be targeted for these changes. A broader and fairer dispersal of development changes (beyond the Manly Hill area) would limit the concentration impact. Concerned about the significant amount of proposed changes in the Manly and Wynnum area, due to the cumulative impacts of separate amendments. The Wynnum-Manly neighbourhood plan should continue to guide development outcomes, to avoid impacts on the area's unique character. 	The proposed amendment is considered provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density). <p>Detailed design requirements are proposed for residential development in the zone (including apartments, dual occupancy and small lot houses) to regulate the bulk and scale of future development through requirements for building heights, setbacks, site cover, private open space, and impervious area. These requirements work collectively to ensure that infill development provides a suitable level of amenity for existing and future residents, including access to light and breezes, privacy between dwellings, access to private outdoor space, as well as appropriate management of stormwater.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-472, MHS-512, MHS-513, MHS-516, MHS-520, MHS-521, MHS-532	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will result in loss of bay views. • Impacts the 'coastal village' aesthetic and character of Wynnum and Manly. • They Wynnum Manly Foreshore Master Plan is insufficient for the increased demand. • These suburbs contain low-lying coastal areas which make them particularly sensitive to development, and it will result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ increased stormwater runoff and reduced soil permeability ○ greater exposure to flooding and coastal hazards ○ higher environmental risks if intensive development occurs without site-specific flood and coastal risk assessments ○ increased pollutants entering Moreton Bay, which is designated as a 'high ecological value water area' and a 'highly protected marine park area'. • The Wynnum Creek Flood Study also indicates that infill and development up to the waterway corridor boundary can influence flood levels and extents, further highlighting the need for careful, site-specific planning. 	<p>No changes are proposed to the Wynnum-Manly neighbourhood plan as a part of this amendment. However, changes are proposed under the Wynnum Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan. See Council's website for further information about the precinct plan.</p> <p>The Flood overlay code and Coastal hazard overlay code will continue to apply to sites that are mapped within these overlays. The overlay codes include requirements to ensure that future development is compatible with or is designed to respond to and mitigate risk.</p> <p>Outside of specific view corridors identified in neighbourhood plan codes or the Key civic space and iconic vista overlay, the protection of views is not a requirement in City Plan.</p>	
MHS-365	<p>Submitter comments that recent medium density development in Manly and Wynnum, especially new units and townhouses, have improved housing diversity, supported local businesses, increased property values, and contributed to more vibrant suburbs. A mix of building heights and dwelling types is already characteristic of the area, and ongoing growth is necessary to respond to housing demand, population growth, and broader strategic planning objectives for Brisbane.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p>	No change
MHS-004, MHS-070, MHS-084, MHS-097, MHS-101, MHS-102, MHS-104, MHS-106, MHS-107, MHS-111, MHS-139, MHS-149, MHS-152, MHS-161,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns regarding environmental impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts during construction, including increased dust, noise, truck movements and blocked streets or footpaths. • Loss of mature trees. • Urban heat island impacts from reduced canopy and increased hard surfaces. 	<p><i>Brisbane. Clean, Green, Sustainable 2017-2031</i> details Council's approach to sustainable city development and environmental management. It includes Council's key sustainability achievements and future targets and commitments support council's objectives for a cleaner, greener and more sustainable city. The establishment of 40% natural habitat cover on</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-162, MHS-168, MHS-172, MHS-176, MHS-179, MHS-183, MHS-184, MHS-187, MHS-195, MHS-200, MHS-271, MHS-290, MHS-293, MHS-307, MHS-311, MHS-323, MHS-327, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-346, MHS-351, MHS-354, MHS-356, MHS-358, MHS-364, MHS-369, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-391, MHS-392, MHS-393, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-406, MHS-411, MHS-420, MHS-422, MHS-429, MHS-437, MHS-440, MHS-450, MHS-459, MHS-464, MHS-466, MHS-472, MHS-479, MHS-511, MHS-513, MHS-515, MHS-530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased opportunities for green space, including less opportunities for trees, deep planting and private open space (backyards). This has drastic effects on wildlife, urban heat and mental health. Increased building footprint and impervious areas will increase localised flooding and stormwater runoff. Worsening of existing flooding and coastal hazard issues. Significant impacts on local biodiversity and habitat connectivity. Increased runoff and reduced permeability will place additional pressure on the protected Moreton Bay ecological area. Increased density will bring more dogs to the neighbourhood which are already threatening local shorebirds. Biodiversity impacts, including on Toohey Forest, which supports an endangered koala population. Increased density and traffic will place additional pressure on already vulnerable wildlife. Negative impacts on air quality and carbon sequestration. Reduced climate resilience. Increased density will reduce the effect of vegetation on site. Loss of nature strips due to construction and additional crossovers. 	<p>mainland Brisbane by 2031 is one of Council's key targets for protecting the biodiversity and natural values of Brisbane.</p> <p>Design rules for new development will continue to require the provisions of landscaping (for multiple dwellings/apartments) and outdoor space, including on smaller lots.</p> <p>The Development Footprint Plan (DFP) will establish driveway locations on small lots less than 180m² at the subdivision stage to retain street trees where possible and support the planting of new street trees. DFPs also show pervious and impervious areas so that space is provided to accommodate landscaping and support the management of stormwater.</p> <p>Where sites are mapped in the Significant landscape tree overlay, existing requirements for the protection of significant landscape trees will continue to apply.</p> <p>Council will continue to manage and protect important vegetation and habitat within environmental reserves, including Toohey Forest.</p> <p>Overall, focusing on providing for increasing housing in established, well-located urban areas helps protect bushland and open space at Brisbane's outer edges and supports better investment in public parks and green areas.</p>	
MHS-004, MHS-019, MHS-024, MHS-058, MHS-076, MHS-077, MHS-094, MHS-106, MHS-107, MHS-111, MHS-151, MHS-154, MHS-176, MHS-179,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns regarding the impact on traditional building character, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building heights up to 3 or 4 storeys negatively impact adjoining character dwellings built before 1947. 	<p>There are no changes proposed as part of the proposed amendment to the extent of the Traditional building character overlay mapping or requirements in the Traditional building character overlay codes.</p> <p>The Traditional building character overlay works with the Character residential zone to maintain traditional</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-192, MHS-209, MHS-213, MHS-219, MHS-226, MHS-227, MHS-228, MHS-229, MHS-230, MHS-231, MHS-232, MHS-233, MHS-234, MHS-236, MHS-237, MHS-238, MHS-239, MHS-240, MHS-241, MHS-242, MHS-243, MHS-244, MHS-246, MHS-247, MHS-248, MHS-249, MHS-250, MHS-253, MHS-254, MHS-255, MHS-256, MHS-257, MHS-258, MHS-259, MHS-264, MHS-265, MHS-266, MHS-267, MHS-268, MHS-269, MHS-271, MHS-274, MHS-277, MHS-278, MHS-280, MHS-282, MHS-292, MHS-295, MHS-298, MHS-301, MHS-315, MHS-320, MHS-329, MHS-331, MHS-332, MHS-339, MHS-352, MHS-359, MHS-360, MHS-368, MHS-377, MHS-378, MHS-379, MHS-384, MHS-386, MHS-390, MHS-394, MHS-401, MHS-404, MHS-406, MHS-407, MHS-414,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-storey apartment blocks on character streets will permanently alter the streetscape and erase the heritage that makes these neighbourhoods so special. The proposal risks the demolition of more traditional Queenslander character homes. 	<p>character in streets where houses built before 1947 contribute to a collective traditional character streetscape. Any future redevelopment is to retain houses built before 1947 and new development is to be compatible in form, scale, materials and detailing.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes transition requirements where proposed multiple dwelling developments adjoining a dwelling house, including character housing. This requires the fourth storey to be set back 10m from the common boundary of the adjoining lot, to reduce bulk and maintain amenity. While this will constrain some sites, this is considered an appropriate outcome to ensure the amenity of any adjoining dwelling houses (including character houses).</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-422, MHS-432, MHS-436, MHS-453, MHS-458, MHS-460, MHS-462, MHS-469, MHS-473, MHS-474, MHS-515, MHS-519 MHS-535			
MHS-045, MHS-101, MHS-168, MHS-182, MHS-188, MHS-290, MHS-311, MHS-323, MHS-329, MHS-331, MHS-332, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-339, MHS-352, MHS-356, MHS-364, MHS-370, MHS-380, MHS-384, MHS-386, MHS-397, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-410, MHS-411, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-423, MHS-436, MHS-438, MHS-444, MHS-461, MHS-462, MHS-466, MHS-468, MHS-470, MHS-472, MHS-512, MHS-513, MHS-516, MHS-519, MHS-520 MHS-521	<p>Submitters made the following suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more localised approach which considers site specifics and suburb character would be more appropriate, rather than the blanket city-wide approach to zone changes. • Bay views and the surrounds should be protected from excessive height changing the coastal suburban landscape. • Restrict development intensity to sites over 1,200m² to avoid continuous walls of development. • New development should be limited to near train stations, not mixed in with character areas • Undertake detailed shadow and amenity impact assessments. • Strengthen requirements for tree retention, landscaping and provision of communal open spaces. • Protect character through strengthening provisions to limit building bulk, preserve streetscapes, maintain existing character and support small, local businesses. 	<p>Council is undertaking precinct planning in suburban and urban renewal locations to create opportunities for new homes and jobs, working closely with the community to create precinct plans that respond to the local circumstances and opportunities. For more information about this program, visit Council's website.</p> <p>The proposed amendment is considered provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density). It makes efficient use of existing urban land and infrastructure while requiring certain design outcomes to ensure new development fits within the local character, climate and suburban setting.</p> <p>Outside of specific view corridors identified in neighbourhood plan codes or the Key civic space and iconic vista overlay, the protection of views is not a requirement in City Plan.</p> <p>Some of the key requirements proposed for new development in the zone includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum building heights • Minimum lot sizes • Maximum site cover • Maximum impervious area • Minimum setbacks 	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum transitions (where adjoining a dwelling house) • Provision of landscaping (for multiple dwellings/apartments) • Protection of existing street trees or provision for new street trees. 	

3.12 Infrastructure networks

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-049, MHS-085, MHS-092, MHS-127, MHS-131, MHS-135, MHS-136, MHS-141, MHS-159, MHS-164, MHS-167, MHS-434, MHS-475	<p>Submitters support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is efficient to put density where there is existing or planned infrastructure. • The amendment maximises the value of existing infrastructure and avoids the higher costs and inefficiencies associated with urban sprawl. • Locating housing near public transport and shops creates inclusive communities, optimises infrastructure and services and contributes to thriving businesses. 	Support noted.	No change
MHS-014, MHS-034, MHS-075, MHS-156, MHS-170, MHS-182, MHS-189, MHS-212, MHS-346, MHS-395, MHS-429, MHS-450	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment and provide the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the rationale of planning for increased density in well-located areas near public transport but concerned about additional strain on existing infrastructure which is already at capacity, particularly the road, public transport and stormwater networks. • Ensure infrastructure upgrades align with population growth and further investment is required in infrastructure and services, including: roads, public transport, car parking, active transport, public open space/parks, community facilities, electric vehicle charging, high-speed internet and mobile networks. 	<p>The proposed amendment seeks to support additional housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone, through infill development that will take place over time.</p> <p>Council determines infrastructure requirements through the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). For more information about the LGIP, refer to Council's website. Council undertakes citywide reviews of the LGIP regularly and the infrastructure plan informs the development of the annual budget and future infrastructure programs.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any increase in apartments needs to ensure a sustainable provision of car parking, including suggestion for 2 spaces per unit. 	<p>All new multiple dwellings are now required by the National Construction Code to provide the electric capacity and distribution boards to support off-street electric vehicle charging.</p> <p>For more information about proposed car parking rates for multiple dwellings under More Homes, Sooner – Car parking for multiple dwellings, refer to Council's website. A separate consultation report has been prepared that summarises and responds to submissions for that amendment.</p>	
MHS-003, MHS-004, MHS-011, MHS-014, MHS-017, MHS-019, MHS-020, MHS-022, MHS-024, MHS-026, MHS-027, MHS-031, MHS-039, MHS-048, MHS-051, MHS-052, MHS-054, MHS-056, MHS-057, MHS-058, MHS-064, MHS-070, MHS-079, MHS-090, MHS-094, MHS-095, MHS-097, MHS-102, MHS-107, MHS-109, MHS-110, MHS-111, MHS-125, MHS-139, MHS-147, MHS-148, MHS-149, MHS-151, MHS-152, MHS-153, MHS-154, MHS-168, MHS-172, MHS-176, MHS-179, MHS-180, MHS-183, MHS-184, MHS-187, MHS-188, MHS-189, MHS-192,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to infrastructure are needed before increasing housing density and population, which will impact on the capacity of the infrastructure, including: roads, public transport, active transport, footpaths and bike paths, street lighting, stormwater, sewer, water, electricity, waste collection and other services such as schools, parks/open space, playgrounds, healthcare and community facilities. Council should have invested in infrastructure or produced an infrastructure plan/update the Local Government Infrastructure Plan to support this proposal. Increasing density with no proposed upgrades to infrastructure is an unfair burden on current rate-paying residents, will benefit developers and will compound risk, reduce liveability and place additional pressure on already-failing systems. 	<p>The proposed amendment seeks to support additional housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone, through infill development that will take place over time.</p> <p>Council determines infrastructure requirements through the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). For more information about the LGIP, refer to Council's website. Council undertakes citywide reviews of the LGIP regularly and the infrastructure plan informs the development of the annual budget and future infrastructure programs.</p> <p>Public transport planning and service delivery is managed by Translink (Queensland Government transport planning agency). Requests for improvements in public transport services (routes and frequency) can be provided to Translink any time via phone on 13 12 30 or online.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-193, MHS-195, MHS-200, MHS-201, MHS-206, MHS-213, MHS-219, MHS-220, MHS-226, MHS-227, MHS-228, MHS-229, MHS-230, MHS-231, MHS-232, MHS-233, MHS-234, MHS-235, MHS-236, MHS-237, MHS-238, MHS-239, MHS-240, MHS-241, MHS-242, MHS-243, MHS-244, MHS-246, MHS-247, MHS-248, MHS-249, MHS-250, MHS-252, MHS-253, MHS-254, MHS-255, MHS-256, MHS-257, MHS-258, MHS-259, MHS-264, MHS-265, MHS-266, MHS-267, MHS-268, MHS-269, MHS-271, MHS-274, MHS-275, MHS-277, MHS-278, MHS-280, MHS-282, MHS-283, MHS-284, MHS-287, MHS-289, MHS-292, MHS-295, MHS-298, MHS-301, MHS-307, MHS-310, MHS-311, MHS-315, MHS-317, MHS-320, MHS-322, MHS-323, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-340, MHS-341,			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-342, MHS-345, MHS-347, MHS-356, MHS-358, MHS-359, MHS-360, MHS-364, MHS-366, MHS-368, MHS-369, MHS-370, MHS-378, MHS-380, MHS-381, MHS-382, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-390, MHS-391, MHS-393, MHS-394, MHS-397, MHS-401, MHS-402, MHS-406, MHS-407, MHS-410, MHS-411, MHS-414, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-423, MHS-429, MHS-431, MHS-432, MHS-433, MHS-437, MHS-438, MHS-439, MHS-440, MHS-442, MHS-444, MHS-447, MHS-456, MHS-458, MHS-460, MHS-461, MHS-464, MHS-465, MHS-466, MHS-468, MHS-469, MHS-470, MHS-472, MHS-473, MHS-474, MHS-477, MHS-479, MHS-512, MHS-513, MHS-520, MHS-521, MHS-525, MHS-530, MHS-533, MHS-535			
MHS-002, MHS-003, MHS-004, MHS-011, MHS-013, MHS-014,	Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns related to the transport network and parking, including:	Council determines infrastructure requirements, including transport infrastructure, through the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). For more	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-019, MHS-020, MHS-022, MHS-024, MHS-026, MHS-027, MHS-031, MHS-033, MHS-038, MHS-039, MHS-041, MHS-046, MHS-048, MHS-051, MHS-052, MHS-053, MHS-054, MHS-055, MHS-056, MHS-058, MHS-064, MHS-070, MHS-073, MHS-076, MHS-077, MHS-080, MHS-090, MHS-094, MHS-102, MHS-104, MHS-106, MHS-107, MHS-109, MHS-110, MHS-111, MHS-125, MHS-147, MHS-148, MHS-150, MHS-151, MHS-152, MHS-153, MHS-162, MHS-168, MHS-171, MHS-172, MHS-173, MHS-174, MHS-175, MHS-176, MHS-179, MHS-180, MHS-183, MHS-184, MHS-186, MHS-187, MHS-188, MHS-192, MHS-193, MHS-195, MHS-201, MHS-205, MHS-206, MHS-209, MHS-213, MHS-216, MHS-217, MHS-219, MHS-220, MHS-226, MHS-227, MHS-228, MHS-229, MHS-230,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of capacity in and further impacts on existing infrastructure such as roads, public and active transport, further increasing traffic congestion and a lack of on-street parking. Particular concern was expressed for areas including Pallara, Balmoral, Bulimba, Morningside, Hawthorne, Sandgate, Wynnum, Manly. • The amendment assumes private vehicle ownership will decline, however Brisbane residents value the mobility and independence that owning a vehicle allows and will continue to prefer private vehicles. TMR registration statistics also show that registrations have increased since 1992. • Lack of local employment options for increased population will place additional pressure on private and public transport infrastructure. • Approving developments with no parking will force people to stay living at home for longer. • Council should consider where cars are expected to be parked during severe weather events such as storms or flooding. • Concerns that the proposed amendments will cause: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased on-street parking competition ○ Blocked driveways and issues for emergency services, particularly on narrow streets ○ Insufficient on-street car parking will impact local businesses. ○ More congestion and traffic issues, particularly on narrow streets ○ Increased conflict around schools, childcare centres, parks and local centres ○ Reduced visibility and safety for pedestrians and cyclists, due to parking at intersections and on narrow streets. ○ Increased difficulty for people to access transport. ○ Public transport issues, such as overcrowding, unreliable and delayed services. 	<p>information about the LGIP, refer to Council's website. Council undertakes citywide reviews of the LGIP regularly and the infrastructure plan informs the development of the annual budget and future infrastructure programs.</p> <p>The Australian Bureau of Statistics indicates that households located in areas with better access to transport services and local amenities are more likely to own fewer vehicles. This finding demonstrates a clear relationship between higher levels of urban accessibility and reduced reliance on private car ownership.</p> <p>Council's long term transport vision supports a shift toward greater use of public and active transport to reduce reliance on private vehicles and associated parking demand.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Brisbane residents have and will continue to have varying parking needs. The proposed amendment requires on-site parking for small lot homes, dual occupancy and multiple dwellings. It does not rely on availability of on-street parking for new developments.</p> <p>For more information about proposed car parking rates for multiple dwellings under More Homes, Sooner – Car parking for multiple dwellings, refer to Council's website. A separate consultation report has been prepared that summarises and responds to submissions for that amendment.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-231, MHS-232, MHS-233, MHS-234, MHS-235, MHS-236, MHS-237, MHS-238, MHS-239, MHS-240, MHS-241, MHS-242, MHS-243, MHS-244, MHS-246, MHS-247, MHS-248, MHS-249, MHS-250, MHS-252, MHS-253, MHS-254, MHS-255, MHS-256, MHS-257, MHS-258, MHS-259, MHS-264, MHS-265, MHS-266, MHS-267, MHS-268, MHS-269, MHS-271, MHS-274, MHS-277, MHS-278, MHS-280, MHS-282, MHS-283, MHS-284, MHS-287, MHS-288, MHS-289, MHS-290, MHS-291, MHS-292, MHS-293, MHS-294, MHS-295, MHS-298, MHS-301, MHS-307, MHS-310, MHS-311, MHS-315, MHS-317, MHS-319, MHS-320, MHS-322, MHS-323, MHS-327, MHS-334, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-341, MHS-342, MHS-345, MHS-347,			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-351, MHS-355, MHS-356, MHS-357, MHS-359, MHS-360, MHS-363, MHS-364, MHS-366, MHS-368, MHS-370, MHS-371, MHS-374, MHS-377, MHS-382, MHS-385, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-390, MHS-391, MHS-394, MHS-397, MHS-399, MHS-401, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-405, MHS-406, MHS-407, MHS-410, MHS-411, MHS-414, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-417, MHS-418, MHS-422, MHS-423, MHS-425, MHS-431, MHS-432, MHS-433, MHS-437, MHS-438, MHS-439, MHS-442, MHS-448, MHS-449, MHS-458, MHS-459, MHS-460, MHS-461, MHS-464, MHS-466, MHS-468, MHS-469, MHS-470, MHS-472, MHS-473, MHS-474, MHS-477, MHS-511, MHS-512, MHS-513, MHS-515, MHS-520, MHS-521, MHS-526, MHS-530, MHS-533, MHS-535			

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-011, MHS-022, MHS-024, MHS-046, MHS-052, MHS-064, MHS-102, MHS-107, MHS-152, MHS-168, MHS-172, MHS-195, MHS-201, MHS-206, MHS-271, MHS-287, MHS-293, MHS-311, MHS-317, MHS-323, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-356, MHS-364, MHS-370, MHS-397, MHS-402, MHS-410, MHS-411, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-423, MHS-425, MHS-444, MHS-461, MHS-466, MHS-468, MHS-470, MHS-472, MHS-512, MHS-513, MHS-520, MHS-521	<p>Submitters oppose the amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increase in families will place unsustainable burden on local schools, leading to overcrowded classrooms, declining educational quality and necessitating unplanned state government expenditure. • A corresponding increase in healthcare access is needed. • Certain areas are not located close to hospitals and do not have the capacity for these services. • Will require an increase in emergency service capacity, including police, fire and ambulance. 	<p>Planning for education, public healthcare services and emergency services is a Queensland Government responsibility and is managed by the relevant department.</p> <p>Requests for changes in these services can be provided to the Queensland Government.</p> <p>As part of the legislated process to propose the amendment, the Queensland Government undertook a state interest review of the proposed amendment. This process involves referral of the proposed amendment to all relevant Queensland Government departments to identify any relevant matters. In March 2026, the Planning Minister confirmed that State interests were appropriately integrated and approved Council to proceed to public consultation.</p>	No change
MHS-004, MHS-011, MHS-014, MHS-017, MHS-024, MHS-078, MHS-109, MHS-147, MHS-148, MHS-170, MHS-172, MHS-188, MHS-189, MHS-205, MHS-216, MHS-290, MHS-312, MHS-344, MHS-382, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-405, MHS-430, MHS-438, MHS-442	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for changes relating to infrastructure networks and investment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each development should undertake an infrastructure and traffic capacity assessment. • Council should conduct infrastructure and transport capacity and impact assessment/modelling before increasing density and release results publicly. • Seeks clarity on whether infrastructure and service capacity are considered and what measures are being taken to address traffic capacity. • A comprehensive traffic management approach is needed, to prevent strains on infrastructure and maintain safety and accessibility. 	<p>Council determines infrastructure requirements through the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). For more information about the LGIP, refer to Council's website. Council undertakes citywide reviews of the LGIP regularly and the infrastructure plan informs the development of the annual budget and future infrastructure programs.</p> <p>The design of car parking areas, roads and cycling infrastructure for new development will continue to be provided in accordance with the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy and the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that upgrades to transport infrastructure, including the road network and pedestrian crossings, are planned and delivered in parallel with the proposed changes. • Basement parking solutions should be prioritised to reduce on-street impacts. • Affected areas need adequate infrastructure, services and facilities to support additional residents before encouraging an increase in population density (including sewage, water supply and waste management). • Council should provide clear and detailed infrastructure plans to support the increased density. • Transparent data on school, drainage and service capacity should be provided. • Appropriate funding needs to be provided to deliver safe footpaths, crossings and bikeways. • Any density increases should be tied to protected deep-planting zones and the creation of new public parklands to mitigate urban heat. • The Norman Park ferry should be re-instated. • A bridge should be built from Bellbowrie to Riverhills to link the freeways. • Roads and bicycle tracks must be widened, and public transport expanded. • Outlines detailed transport infrastructure upgrades that are needed in Bulimba. • Infrastructure charges should be re-invested into the local area of the proposed development. • Require infrastructure charges levied on developments to be reinvested in the same suburb to improve local infrastructure. • Suggests that residential street parking time restrictions need to be introduced and monitored throughout Brisbane. 	<p>For more information about proposed car parking rates for multiple dwellings under More Homes, Sooner – Car parking for multiple dwellings, refer to Council's website. A separate consultation report has been prepared that summarises and responds to submissions for that amendment.</p> <p>Where the required parking spaces cannot be provided at ground, these are typically provided in a basement parking arrangement.</p>	

3.13 General and other comments

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-006, MHS-008, MHS-009, MHS-010, MHS-012, MHS-021, MHS-025, MHS-028, MHS-059, MHS-063, MHS-065, MHS-072, MHS-082, MHS-083, MHS-085, MHS-088, MHS-092, MHS-098, MHS-113, MHS-119, MHS-124, MHS-127, MHS-128, MHS-130, MHS-131, MHS-136, MHS-141, MHS-144, MHS-164, MHS-165, MHS-190, MHS-194, MHS-202, MHS-207, MHS-210, MHS-212, MHS-211, MHS-215, MHS-221, MHS-225, MHS-245, MHS-260, MHS-262, MHS-281, MHS-296, MHS-302, MHS-318, MHS-324, MHS-325, MHS-326, MHS-367, MHS-373, MHS-396, MHS-427, MHS-434, MHS-443, MHS-445, MHS-454, MHS-455, MHS-457, MHS-467, MHS-471, MHS-475, MHS-476, MHS-478, MHS-510,	Submitters support the proposed amendment for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates the delivery of more houses that are well-designed and more affordable, through reducing lot sizes and car parking requirements. • Facilitating density near high-frequency public transport and centres supports more sustainable outcomes, such as increased walkability. • Increases housing supply within our urban footprint, helping to protect our remaining natural environmental areas (reducing urban sprawl). • Responds to high population growth and increased housing demand through facilitating more homes within well-located areas that are near public transport, centres and within established infrastructure networks. • Supports increased housing supply in established areas, allowing for efficient use of existing infrastructure. • Supports increased feasibility for low-medium density housing (also referred to as the 'missing middle'), including small infill development. • Focuses growth close to centres and high-frequency public transport. • Aligns with Council's strategic planning frameworks and goals to encourage growth in certain, well-located areas. • A 'stepping stone' to increase housing supply. • Supports small, suburban businesses, fostering more place-based identity and more life in suburbs. Creates a livelier, thriving city that is not so CBD-centric. • Supports housing options for ageing in place. • Supportive of mixed density housing, allowing for new, energy efficient, flood-mitigated development. • Provides clear and flexible planning requirements. 	Support noted.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-514, MHS-522, MHS-529, MHS-538			
MHS-017, MHS-018, MHS-040, MHS-047, MHS-050, MHS-069, MHS-096, MHS-099, MHS-105, MHS-156, MHS-309, MHS-319, MHS-395, MHS-396, MHS-419, MHS-426, MHS-428, MHS-441	<p>Submitters support in part the proposed amendment and provide the following comments and suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be expanded to more areas and LMR zoned land could be expanded across the city. • There are a limited number of blocks that could be redeveloped under the policy. • Housing mix needs to be broadened, including student and community housing, townhouses, duplexes and low-rise apartments. • Should include provisions for affordable housing, such as for essential service workers and the inclusion of affordable, 3-4 bedroom homes for families. • Greater diversity and affordability could be achieved through recognising and supporting co-housing types (including community-led housing) within the LMR zone and the LDR zone. Detailed suggestions on implementation and potential amendments to support this are provided. • Higher density zoning should be applied around major public transport stations. • Empower existing landowners, not just developers, through making small-scale infill development easier • Current affordable housing (older units) should not be lost to redevelopment under this policy. • LMR zoned land is constrained by existing character protections, environmental and natural hazard restrictions and precinct/neighbourhood plan requirements. • Should require 20% deep planting within the LMR zone to ensure no loss of green space and tree canopy. • Create larger, more 'meaningful' centre zoned areas outside of the CBD. • Allow the following citywide: 2-3 storey dual occupancies, 2-3 storey small lot houses and 3 storey multiple dwellings in suitable locations (such as near public 	<p>The support and comments are noted.</p> <p>The changes included in the proposed amendment relate primarily to the LMR zone. Further expansion of the LMR zone, up-zoning land or provision for additional density in other zones is out of scope of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>The proposed amendment seeks to support additional housing supply and diversity that meets the needs of current and future residents, including families and providing for ageing in place.</p> <p>Building regulations such as National Construction Code apply to the design and construction of dwellings. The Livable Housing Design Guidelines are also available to support the uptake of accessible design elements.</p> <p>Council will continue to support community housing providers through the <i>Brisbane Housing Supply Incentive Policy</i>, which reduces infrastructure charges applicable to social and affordable housing developments where managed by a registered community housing provider.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes design requirements for new development to ensure the protection of existing street trees or planting of new street trees. Other design requirements are included to provide adequate space for landscaping and open space for smaller homes, and existing deep planting requirements will continue to apply for multiple dwelling developments.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>transport, centres and main roads) on lots greater than 800m².</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider the longevity of developments and design, including to support ageing in place. • It will support increased investment and revitalisation in some areas and centres. 	<p><i>Brisbane's Clean, Green, Sustainable 2017-2031</i> details Council's approach to sustainable city development and environmental management. It includes Council's key sustainability achievements and future targets and commitments to support council's objectives for a cleaner, greener and more sustainable city.</p> <p>. The establishment of 40% natural habitat cover on mainland Brisbane by 2031 is one of Council's key targets for protecting the biodiversity and natural values of Brisbane.</p> <p>Where neighbourhood plans or overlays apply to a site, the requirements of the applicable codes will continue to apply. Overlay codes require that relevant hazards and features, such as environmental constraints and traditional character, are considered and assessed as part of any development proposal.</p>	
<p>MHS-038, MHS-019, MHS-058, MHS-073, MHS-077, MHS-111, MHS-173, MHS-174, MHS-175, MHS-176, MHS-193, MHS-266, MHS-283, MHS-284, MHS-287, MHS-290, MHS-306, MHS-307, MHS-310, MHS-336, MHS-343, MHS-359, MHS-360, MHS-361, MHS-364, MHS-366, MHS-371, MHS-372, MHS-399, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-410, MHS-414, MHS-422,</p>	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The private sector will continue to deliver the majority of homes, therefore profit will remain the main driver. • Reduces the amenity of Brisbane's liveable streets and high quality urban design outcomes. • Reduces the quality of life and sense of community (in particular locations). • Reducing lots sizes and fast-tracking approvals encourages low-quality, poorly constructed buildings. • It will result in overdevelopment. • It will increase demand for the limited, local employment options. • The amendment will accelerate the loss of detached housing stock, reducing housing choice for families and push them out of established neighbourhoods, and people do not wish to live in units. 	<p>The proposed amendment is considered t provide an opportunity for incremental increases in density in the LMR zone that does not result in higher density typologies (such as medium density).</p> <p>Detailed design requirements are proposed for residential development in the zone (including apartments, dual occupancy and small lot houses) to regulate the bulk and scale of future development through requirements for building heights, setbacks, site cover, private open space, and impervious area.</p> <p>These requirements work collectively to ensure that infill development provides a suitable level of amenity for existing and future residents, including access to light and breezes, privacy between dwellings, and access to private outdoor space.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-433, MHS-464, MHS-466, MHS-477, MHS-525, MHS-527, MHS-530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will result in increased rates and local costs to support the increased density. • Increased development of small lots and multiple dwellings may reduce liveability and community cohesion, potentially creating 'slum-like conditions'. • Impacts on mental health/community wellbeing due to decreased community cohesion, erosion of neighbourhood identity, increased noise, loss of sunlight and green space and overcrowding. • Does not believe that increased density will stimulate business growth. • Small suburbs such as Sandgate will not be able to cope with an influx of new residents. • A one-size-fits-all (citywide) amendment is not good for the future of Brisbane. • Residents choose to live/purchase in specific areas as they are predominantly low-rise, and this amendment breaches the community's trust, including trust in the planning process. • Will cause more shortages in grocery supply. • Will intensify overcrowding of public spaces. • It will lead to increased safety and security issues on streets due to additional traffic. 	<p>The majority of Brisbane's suburbs are located within the LDR zone, which will continue to provide for primarily 1-2 storey detached dwelling houses.</p> <p>Increased housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone is intended to improve affordability, social inclusion and healthier, more connected neighbourhoods, while delivering long-term economic and environmental benefits for the city as a whole.</p>	
MHS-182, MHS-201, MHS-283, MHS-303, MHS-307, MHS-310, MHS-327, MHS-328, MHS-345, MHS-370, MHS-379, MHS-397, MHS-399, MHS-410, MHS-415, MHS-416, MHS-423, MHS-425, MHS-433, MHS-444, MHS-447, MHS-461, MHS-465, MHS-468,	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment as it is inconsistent with other Council and State planning policies and principles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicts with Brisbane's Sustainable Growth Strategy, which proposes density to be targeted to inner-city, well-connected areas, not outer suburbs like Manly. • Increased housing supply should start in the city centre. • Inconsistent with the State Planning Policy and <i>ShapingSEQ 2031</i>, which requires housing to be targeted to areas located near centres, jobs, public services, infrastructure and reliable transport, and respect local character. 	<p>The proposed amendment supports Council's broader strategy for housing supply, including Brisbane's Sustainable Growth Strategy and the Housing Supply Action Plan. It supports the plan to grow up, not out by support infill development in well-located LMR zoned land and providing for increased diversity of housing types. For more information on Council's approach for housing supply, visit Council's website.</p> <p>The proposed amendment has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i>. The relevant outcomes sought by the State Planning Policy and</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-470, MHS-512, MHS-520, MHS-526	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased density should be focussed in the inner city, near existing and planned infrastructure such as the green bridges, Brisbane metro and other busways. Outer suburbs, such as Carindale, should not be the target of increased density and mixed housing choices. It is inconsistent with Brisbane City Council planning policies and Queensland Government planning principles in relation to protecting neighbourhood character, managing amenity impacts, and ensuring infrastructure keeps pace with growth. 	<p><i>ShapingSEQ 2031</i> (including higher densities near transport nodes or High amenity areas) have been responded to in the proposed amendment.</p> <p>As part of the legislated process to propose the amendment, the Queensland Government undertook a state interest review of the proposal. This process involves referral of the proposed amendment to all relevant Queensland Government departments to identify any relevant matters, and review against the State Planning Policy and <i>ShapingSEQ 2031</i>. In March 2026, the Planning Minister confirmed that State interests were appropriately integrated and approved Council to proceed to public consultation.</p>	
MHS-018, MHS-019, MHS-026, MHS-058, MHS-071, MHS-074, MHS-076, MHS-079, MHS-097, MHS-110, MHS-111, MHS-152, MHS-171, MHS-172, MHS-179, MHS-182, MHS-187, MHS-193, MHS-197, MHS-213, MHS-219, MHS-226, MHS-227, MHS-229, MHS-230, MHS-231, MHS-232, MHS-233, MHS-234, MHS-236, MHS-237, MHS-238, MHS-239, MHS-240, MHS-241, MHS-242, MHS-244, MHS-246, MHS-247, MHS-248, MHS-249, MHS-250, MHS-252, MHS-253,	<p>Submitters provided the following comments and suggestions for change relating to housing affordability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed amendments won't improve housing affordability or solve the housing crisis. It will unfairly benefit developers. It will cause the demolition of existing lower-cost houses that are the most affordable. There are no proposed inclusionary zoning requirements, quotas for affordable housing, incentives or other mechanisms to ensure provision of affordable housing. Mechanisms should be introduced to ensure it does result in affordable housing, including suggestions for: 10% or 25% affordable housing quota, mandated provisions for essential service worker housing and 3-4 bedroom units for families. The upcoming Olympics will increase build costs and slow the delivery of homes, making improvements in affordability unlikely. Smaller lots will not create true density. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>With demand for housing exceeding supply, the cost of owning and renting a home continues to increase. We need a strong and continuous pipeline of homes being built, or the cost of housing will continue to increase as demand exceeds supply.</p> <p>By allowing smaller lot sizes to accommodate smaller homes, and up to 4 storey multiple dwellings in the LMR zone, the goal is to provide a diverse range of housing options at a range of price points.</p> <p>Council will continue to support community housing providers through the <i>Brisbane Housing Supply Incentive Policy</i>, which reduces infrastructure charges applicable to social and affordable housing developments where managed by a registered community housing provider.</p> <p>For more information on Council's approach for housing supply, visit Council's website.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-254, MHS-255, MHS-256, MHS-257, MHS-258, MHS-259, MHS-264, MHS-265, MHS-266, MHS-267, MHS-268, MHS-269, MHS-271, MHS-274, MHS-277, MHS-278, MHS-280, MHS-282, MHS-287, MHS-289, MHS-298, MHS-299, MHS-301, MHS-310, MHS-312, MHS-315, MHS-319, MHS-320, MHS-322, MHS-334, MHS-359, MHS-360, MHS-366, MHS-368, MHS-387, MHS-388, MHS-390, MHS-394, MHS-396, MHS-401, MHS-407, MHS-422, MHS-432, MHS-438, MHS-442, MHS-445, MHS-447, MHS-458, MHS-460, MHS-469, MHS-471, MHS-473, MHS-474, MHS-521, MHS-535	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing zoning capacity does not automatically translate into increased housing supply – concerned that the amendment will impact residents and not deliver targets. The LMR zoned areas located inner suburbs will not be affordable. Reforms must unlock very large amounts of zoned capacity to deliver any meaningful improvements in housing affordability. Further strategic enhancements are required to ensure these changes translate into rapid housing delivery and genuine affordability. Provide incentives for delivery of social and affordable housing, including through the involvement of Community Housing Providers. 		
MHS-172, MHS-453	Submitters oppose the proposed amendment and make the following comments about Brisbane’s growth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic uplift from the Olympics is likely to be less than anticipated, so Brisbane should not reshape its suburbs based on outdated assumptions about Olympic-driven growth. Does not believe there is a housing shortage as Brisbane’s population continues to grow, therefore there must be 	Brisbane is growing rapidly, and by 2046, we will need around 210,800 new homes to support a larger and more diverse population. This growth is driven by people moving here from interstate and overseas, as well as natural population increases. The proposed amendment is about supporting this population growth.	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	sufficient supply and the citywide amendment to increase housing supply is inappropriate (and should be undertaken through a precinct-based approach).	The proposed amendment is only one way in which Council is working to address housing supply. Council is also undertaking precinct planning in suburban and urban renewal locations to create opportunities for new homes and jobs, working closely with the community to create precinct plans that respond to the local circumstances and opportunities. For more information about this program, visit Council's website .	
MHS-392, MHS-532	Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns regarding safety and security impacts from increased density, including relating to crime.	Increasing density near public transport and centres helps to deliver increased visual engagement with the street and supports increased walkability, resulting in improved social inclusion and healthier, more connected neighbourhoods, while delivering long-term economic and environmental benefits for the city as a whole.	No change
MHS-095, MHS-100, MHS-151, MHS-168, MHS-173, MHS-174, MHS-209, MHS-222, MHS-223, MHS-228, MHS-284, MHS-291, MHS-311, MHS-323, MHS-328, MHS-334, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-356, MHS-364, MHS-375, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-411, MHS-425, MHS-464, MHS-466, MHS-472, MHS-477, MHS-513, MHS-525	Submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to concerns it will negatively impact property values and questioned whether compensation would be available where property values decrease.	Property valuations and marketability are influenced by many considerations, including (but not limited to) economic factors, trends in the housing market, planning requirements (including zoning and overlays), surrounding amenity and services, and the quality and condition of the individual property.	No change
MHS-162, MHS-261, MHS-279, MHS-319, MHS-396, MHS-442, MHS-523	Submitter made comments and suggestions regarding external factors that can influence housing supply and affordability and should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller developments do not lead to faster housing supply. 	The comments are noted. The proposed amendment relates only to changes to City Plan, which cannot regulate many of the matters raised. Council will continue to work with other levels of	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites with development potential can remain undeveloped for extended periods due to strategic landowner behaviour, market risk, financial constraints, high construction costs, and limited industry capacity. • Increasing medium-density housing supply will require complementary measures that address financial, institutional, and market constraints. • Additional workshops and explanatory materials are needed to support timely uptake of the proposed changes and more efficient development processes. • The assessment process needs to be simplified by eliminating or reducing the emphasis on process issues. • The combination of Federal, State and local planning policies is excessive and difficult to understand, especially for residents looking to undertake small-scale development on a suburban lot. To support increased housing supply, there should be processes to assist these types of small-scale development to progress. • Shorten the time developers have to build, to stop them from land banking and seeking approvals they don't act on. • Suggests strengthening delivery and affordability outcomes in the LMR zone by enforcing time-limited development approvals, capturing uplift value for local infrastructure, accelerating construction through modern methods and standardised designs, streamlining approvals for compliant infill development, and requiring mandatory inclusionary zoning to deliver affordable housing in larger developments. • Fragmented ownership and limits on commercial feasibility, such as construction costs, financing restrictions, land costs, market demand and so forth will constrain development. • Alternative economic measures, such as a vacancy tax, limits on investment properties, and restrictions on land banking. 	<p>government and advocate for change where necessary to ensure additional affordable housing supply can be delivered in Brisbane using all available mechanisms.</p> <p>For more information on Council's approach for housing supply, visit Council's website.</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a community education strategy to engage and build community capacity to understand housing needs and solutions. 		
MHS-080	<p>Submitter suggests restricting the proposed rezoning from LMR to MDR, to only areas within 500m from shopping centres and public transport hubs</p>	<p>The proposed amendment does include changing the zone of land from the LMR zone to the MDR zone. Rather, the proposed amendment seeks to support additional housing supply and diversity within existing LMR zoned land through changes to planning controls.</p>	No change
MHS-047, MHS-130, MHS-154, MHS-172	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure increases in density should be matched with strong design standards to deliver high-quality, durable housing. • Housing design should be considered including flexible internal arrangement, as well as construction materials to encourage people to live in one house throughout their lifetime. • Ensure the current level of green coverage, street trees and public spaces/parks is maintained into the future. • Where sites have scaled setback requirements due to adjoining lower densities or character residential, relax the opposite side and rear setback requirements. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes design requirements for new development to ensure the protection of existing street trees or planting of new street trees. Other design requirements are included to provide adequate space for landscaping and open space for smaller homes, and existing deep planting requirements will continue to apply for multiple dwelling developments.</p> <p><i>Design-led City – A design strategy for Brisbane</i> sets the framework for a citywide approach for design that reflects Brisbane’s character, identify and climate, identifying a set of design values that can apply to all elements of the built environment. For more information on this Strategy see Council's website.</p> <p>In addition, the Subtropical building design planning scheme policy within City Plan supports and provides clear guidance for achieving the subtropical building design vision and design elements in the <i>New World City Design Guide – Buildings that Breathe</i>.</p> <p><i>Brisbane’s Clean, Green, Sustainable 2017-2031</i> details Council’s approach to sustainable city development and environmental management. It includes Council’s key sustainability achievements and</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		<p>future targets and commitments to support council's objectives for a cleaner, greener and more sustainable city. The establishment of 40% natural habitat cover on mainland Brisbane by 2031 is one of Council's key targets for protecting the biodiversity and natural values of Brisbane.</p> <p>Building regulations such as National Construction Code apply to the design and construction of dwellings. The Livable Housing Design Guidelines are also available to support the uptake of accessible design elements.</p>	
MHS-522	<p>Submitter made detailed suggestions for the Subdivision code, including cut and fill requirements and provision for shared crossovers.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the Subdivision code in relation to the cut and fill requirements, to include additional considerations for lots under 180m².</p> <p>The proposed amendment makes provision for shared crossovers for lots under 180m² as part of a subdivision application.</p> <p>In response to other submissions other changes have also been made to the Subdivision code.</p>	Change to Subdivision code
MHS-166	<p>Submitter suggests a review of refuse requirements to better support alternative waste servicing, particularly for small and rear lots, such as shared bin collection points and smaller bins.</p>	<p>A broader review of refuse storage and collection requirements is out of scope of the proposed amendment and no changes have been made.</p>	No change
MHS-432	<p>Submitter suggests the proposal is inconsistent with the LDR zone code and will introduce more low-medium density properties into this area (particularly in Norman Park). Increased density should be directed towards locations appropriate for growth, such as transport corridors and centres, as identified in City Plan.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment is not considered to conflict with the intent of the LDR zone to maintain its low density, detached housing suburban identity.</p> <p>The proposed change to the LDR zone to increase opportunities for smaller lots down to 300m² in 300m walking distance of centres is considered to provide an opportunity for incremental infill development in well-located areas of the LDR zone.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
		The majority of changes included in the proposed amendment are intended to support additional housing supply and diversity in the LMR zone, not the LDR zone.	
MHS-191, MHS-344	<p>Submitters request that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release the assumptions and analysis used to assess future dwelling needs, before and after the proposed changes to enable testing of the assumptions. • Publish analysis on how many sites are captured by the combined subdivision thresholds and outline a monitoring process for uptake, assessment pathways used and net dwelling outcomes in key locations, to inform any necessary future refinements. 	<p>Brisbane is growing rapidly, and by 2046, we will need around 210,800 new homes to support a larger and more diverse population. This growth is driven by people moving here from interstate and overseas, as well as natural population increases. The proposed amendment is about supporting this population growth and to respond to changing household composition.</p> <p>The proposed amendment supports Council's broader strategy for housing supply, including Brisbane's Sustainable Growth Strategy and the Housing Supply Actions Plan. It supports the plan to grow up, not out by support infill development in well-located LMR zoned land and providing for increased diversity of housing types. For more information on Council's approach for housing supply, visit Council's website.</p>	No change.
MHS-171, MHS-193	Submitters suggest the proposed amendment is inconsistent with the Chermside Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan. The precinct plan identifies the core intensification area as being around Gympie Road, the Westfield interchange and major transport nodes, however much of the proposed amendment falls outside these targeted uplift zones.	Some land within the Chermside precinct plan boundary is included within the LDR and LMR zone and development of the precinct plan will have regard to the proposed changes to these zones as part of this amendment. More information about the proposed Chermside Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct is available on Council's website .	No change
MHS-050, MHS-065, MHS-072, MHS-074, MHS-105, MHS-114, MHS-118, MHS-122, MHS-123, MHS-126, MHS-134, MHS-142, MHS-165, MHS-191, MHS-270, MHS-272, MHS-273, MHS-302,	<p>Submitters suggest that land be rezoned and additional density allowed outside of the LMR zone to provide additional housing supply, particularly well-located land in proximity to public transport, shopping centres, and major employment areas. These suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change some LDR zoned land to LMR zone. • Allow increased density in the LDR zone, including townhouses and apartments. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Changes to the allocation of residential zones across the city are not in scope of the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment includes changes to development requirements that apply to existing LMR zoned land to support additional housing supply and diversity.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-367, MHS-383, MHS-398, MHS-457, MHS-463, MHS-467, MHS-478, MHS-529, MHS-536	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow additional density in CR zone, including townhouses and apartments. Provide additional MDR zone land. Upzone all sites that are greater than 1,000m². Change zoning in particular nominated local areas. 	<p>Future amendments may be considered to take further action to support targeted density in appropriate locations, such as through precinct planning.</p>	
MHS-018, MHS-093, MHS-105, MHS-114, MHS-117, MHS-134, MHS-199, MHS-205, MHS-276, MHS-285, MHS-395, MHS-396, MHS-457, MHS-463, MHS-467, MHS-536	<p>Submitters suggest that the proposed amendment should be expanded to support additional density and housing supply in the city, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher density outcomes should be supported around train stations within 8km of the CBD. Support increased density in areas that meet key location definition but are not zoned LMR, such as through re-zoning or applying similar provisions. Change zoning of areas within 400m to high-frequency public transport, centres and other significant uses to mixed use, medium density or high density zoning, with a maximum height of at least 5 storeys. Increase heights for large and wide sites that are in well-located areas. Increase heights to a minimum of five storeys in proximity to every train and bus station. Increase heights to 4-8 storeys where within 800m of high-capacity transit stations. Expand to more suburbs to cater for growth. Allow 5-6 storeys where land shares a boundary with commercial zoning Enable 3 storey height in the LDR zone also. 	<p>Changes to the allocation of residential zones across the city, or to increase heights or density in other residential zones are not in scope of the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment includes changes to development requirements that apply to existing LMR zoned land to support additional housing supply and diversity.</p>	
MHS-028, MHS-069, MHS-070, MHS-083, MHS-085, MHS-092, MHS-128, MHS-145, MHS-154, MHS-202, MHS-207, MHS-273, MHS-300, MHS-314, MHS-412, MHS-445, MHS-476	<p>Submitters made suggestions for specific zoning changes or development outcomes in particular local areas or sites, including: Sandgate, Chermside, Wynnum, Nundah, Balmoral, Aspley, Red Hill, Morningside, Clayfield and Albion.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Changes to the zoning or development outcomes for particular sites and areas are out of scope of the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment includes changes to development requirements that apply citywide to existing LMR zoned land to support additional housing supply and diversity.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-018, MHS-042, MHS-093, MHS-118, MHS-272, MHS-276, MHS-318, MHS-344, MHS-349, MHS-350, MHS-383, MHS-396, MHS-430, MHS-463, MHS-529, MHS-536	<p>Submitters suggest that the Traditional building character (TBC) overlay (or Heritage overlay) are a significant constraint for new development in the LMR zone and make the following suggestions for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the TBC overlay to prioritise zoning intent, particularly for LMR zoned land, including where there is limited housing of TBC value, within 8km of the city centre and within 800m of all railway and bus stations. • Additional works should be allowed as accepted development within the TBC overlay. • Make allowance for relocation of and greater demolition extent for character houses. • Suggests changes to the heritage overlays particularly within the inner 5km ring. • Update the TBC (design) overlay code (whilst overlay is being reviewed), to place greater emphasis on outcome-based design responses and provide greater built form guidance (e.g. updated figures) to illustrate appropriate height transitions to achieve both character retention and increased density outcomes. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Changes to the TBC overlay or Heritage overlay are out of scope of the proposed amendment.</p>	No change
MHS-102, MHS-147, MHS-148, MHS-179, MHS-183, MHS-184, MHS-195, MHS-197, MHS-271, MHS-304, MHS-319, MHS-366	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change as alternative approaches to provide additional housing supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build somewhere new instead of infill. • Invest in well-planned satellite cities to distribute growth while preserving established suburbs. • Regulate AirBnB and short-term accommodation. • Impose higher rates or a levy on unoccupied or rental premises. • Facilitate high-density uplift in underutilised industrial areas instead of established residential areas. • Density should be focused in inner-city, commercial or high-density precincts that already have strong infrastructure. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes changes to development requirements that apply to existing LMR zoned land to support additional housing supply and diversity. Changes to other planning controls are out of scope of the proposed amendment.</p> <p>Future amendments – such as uplift of underutilised industrial land - may be considered through more targeted approaches, such as precinct planning.</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on high-rise, mixed-use development near, adjacent to and above major transport hubs rather than established residential areas. • Build high rises on main roads to create a buffer zone with the suburbs. • Encourage higher occupancy of existing dwellings through multi-generational housing and dual-living configurations. • Appropriately located commercial land should be rezoned for residential use. 		
MHS-042, MHS-044, MHS-072, MHS-093, MHS-134, MHS-187, MHS-199, MHS-224, MHS-270, MHS-366, MHS-396, MHS-430, MHS-454, MHS-457, MHS-463, MHS-467, MHS-522, MHS-529, MHS-536	Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to other planning controls in City Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower levels of assessment for standard forms of infill development in all residential zones. • Suggests that smaller lot sizes be supported in the Low-density residential zone and Character zone to encourage more single level homes, to better allow for ageing in place. • Secondary dwellings should be more readily supported in all zones, including the LMR zone, or allowing more than one or larger secondary dwellings. • Provide for more mixed-use type development near or above train stations. • Increase housing opportunities in the Community facilities zone. • Allow townhouses and apartments in the LDR zone, particularly where it is well-located. • Mandates should be put in place for native green trees to line streets, efforts for bee/pollinator promoting gardens on Council land and bans to poisoning. • Requests a reduction in bicycle parking and green space requirements, or a more performance-based way to assess these aspects. • Suggests that a targeted review of LMR settings, proportional height concessions, infrastructure compliance pathways and policy transition frameworks are needed to 		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>improve feasibility for small-scale apartment and townhouse projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing setbacks and building footprints are already minimal and should not be reduced further, particularly on lots less than 800m². Increase the code assessable threshold from 1,000m² to 3,000m² for subdivision of land for multiple dwellings. 		
<p>MHS-096, MHS-099, MHS-156, MHS-228, MHS-392, MHS-396, MHS-471</p>	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions about social and community housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is already enough social housing and does not want the proposed density to include more of this. Concerns relating to quality of life, safety and security due to social housing. Proposed increased density should be coupled with appropriate support services. Concern is raised that some sites identified for increased building heights currently contain social or affordable housing and will be impacted under the proposed changes. Perceived increase in crime. Allow a greater range of housing typologies to better support contemporary living arrangements and community needs. Enable streamlined pathways, in partnership with state government, to support the delivery of social and affordable housing. Such as lower levels of assessment or removing submitter-appeal rights, as consistent with the Ministerial Infrastructure Designation (MID) process to provide greater certainty, reduce timeframes and enable community housing providers to respond to urgent housing needs. Provide incentives for delivery of social and affordable housing, including through the involvement of Community Housing Providers. Introduce specific community housing provisions, such as a clear affordable housing framework with support for affordable housing uses throughout the planning scheme 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Social and community housing and support services are out of scope of the proposed amendment. The delivery and management of social and community housing is the responsibility of the Queensland Government in conjunction with community housing providers.</p> <p>Council will continue to support community housing providers through the <i>Brisbane Housing Supply Incentive Policy</i>, which reduces infrastructure charges applicable to social and affordable housing developments where managed by a registered community housing provider.</p> <p>Council will continue to work with other levels of government and advocate for change where necessary to ensure additional social and community housing supply can be delivered in Brisbane using all available mechanisms.</p> <p>For more information on Council's approach for housing supply, visit Council's website.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	to establish clear delivery pathways and reinforce Council's objectives.		
MHS-306, MHS-366, MHS-536	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions for change relating to the development assessment process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide transparency on development approvals that exceed the maximum heights in the planning scheme. • Review 'Risk Smart' approval pathways as it is no longer viable for many projects. • Development applications must not be assessed in isolation and cumulative impacts must be considered. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Development assessment processes are out of scope of the proposed amendment. Council undertakes development assessment in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	No change
MHS-297	<p>Submitter advocates for inclusion of policy on tiny homes, noting current challenges for tiny homeowners in Queensland and the benefits of this type of housing.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment includes changes to development requirements that apply to existing LMR zoned land to support additional housing supply and diversity. Changes to other planning controls are out of scope of the proposed amendment.</p>	No change
MHS-037	<p>Submitter opposes the proposed amendment and suggests levels of assessment applicable to rooming accommodation should be code or impact assessable, to apply more scrutiny and allow for public notification for new developments. Submitter is concerned an increase of rooming accommodation outcomes will result in less parking, reduced tree canopy, increased heat island effect and reduced neighbourhood character.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment does not include changes to the existing levels of assessment for rooming accommodation uses. It also does not address the design of rooming accommodation uses more broadly. As rooming accommodation is out of scope of the proposed amendment, no changes will be made.</p> <p>You may be interested to read more about another amendment Council has prepared – Major amendment package L – which does include changes relating to rooming accommodation. You can refer to the project webpage for more information.</p>	No change
MHS-201, MHS-203, MHS-393	<p>Submitters made the following comments and suggestions relating to the management of population growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulate international student numbers and encourage development to convert empty office buildings into affordable housing. • Decentralization and less immigration would be a better response to high population growth. 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Immigration policy is set by the Australian Government.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing apartments leads to increased and unnecessary immigration and discourages population growth due to limited space. 		
MHS-094	Submitter supports granny flats generally but suggests heights should be restricted and adequate parking should be provided on site.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment does not make any changes to granny flat (secondary dwelling) requirements.</p>	No change.
MHS-344, MHS-443	Submitters suggest changes should be made to increase the support for short-term accommodation in the LMR zone to increase housing supply.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment does not make any changes to short-term accommodation.</p>	No change
MHS-349, MHS-350	Submitters suggest Council should continue their ongoing investment of capital improvements in Brisbane's suburbs.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Council is investigating opportunities for renewal in suburban areas, by working closely with the community to deliver new infrastructure, planning and development in suburban areas. For more information about Council's Suburban Renewal s program, visit Council's website.</p>	No change.
MHS-178	Submitter supports the amendment but is concerned about retaining established trees and suggests redirecting money from seedling giveaways to reducing rates for residents that retain established trees.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Council's budget and decisions relating to budget allocation are not aspects regulated by City Plan.</p>	No change.

3.14 Consultation and process for amendments

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
MHS-004, MHS-024, MHS-035, MHS-077, MHS-087, MHS-147, MHS-148, MHS-168, MHS-171, MHS-172, MHS-186, MHS-193, MHS-283, MHS-310, MHS-311, MHS-323, MHS-334, MHS-336, MHS-337, MHS-338, MHS-343, MHS-345, MHS-356, MHS-362, MHS-363, MHS-364, MHS-370, MHS-371, MHS-379, MHS-380, MHS-382, MHS-399, MHS-402, MHS-404, MHS-406, MHS-411, MHS-413, MHS-425, MHS-433, MHS-438, MHS-447, MHS-459, MHS-461, MHS-466, MHS-472, MHS-513, MHS-515	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed amendment and provide the following comments about the consultation and submission process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suburb-level guidance should be provided on the proposed changes before adoption. • Clear, measurable outcomes from public consultation should be reported. • The submission portal does not work on mobile devices. • It is difficult to navigate multiple websites for information. • Consultation was rushed and not open for long enough. • Genuine community engagement was not undertaken. • Public consultation was misleading, as cross-sections were not to scale and it did not state existing height limits. • Council did not write directly to all affected property owners. • Previously, proper consultation was undertaken, including letters to landowners, even for minor amendments. • Consultation was not widely communicated/advertised or transparent, with many residents unaware of the proposed changes. • Council communication was insufficient, raising concerns about the amendment being developer-driven. • Concerned the amendment may be fast-tracked by the State Government before the consultation period closes. • Detailed, colour-coded zoning maps with street names and key locations were not available. • The Nathan, Salisbury, Moorooka Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2025 following rigorous community consultation, including on height limits. Overriding these limits in less than a year undermines public trust in the planning process. • As the Chermside precinct plan is still undergoing initial consultation, the proposed amendment will bypass this process and diminish the value of community participation. 	<p>The proposed amendment was advertised in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> (the Guideline) for a period of 20 business days. In addition, the amendments were notified in <i>Living in Brisbane</i> which is delivered to all households in the city, and the amendment was reported in other media channels.</p> <p>The consultation process allowed residents an opportunity to have their say on the proposed changes that may affect their property or neighbourhood. The public notification period was an opportunity for communities, residents and local groups to provide feedback on the proposed amendment based on their own local knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Council is required, in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i>, to consider all properly made submissions on a proposed amendment to City Plan. In reviewing submissions, Council must consider all information provided and seeks to balance social, environmental and economic considerations in making decisions.</p> <p>Changes are regularly made to proposed amendments to City Plan following public consultation. Council is making changes to this proposed amendment in response to submissions where appropriate and those changes are identified in this Consultation Report.</p> <p>Feedback on the online survey submission process is noted. Council will consider this feedback for potential future system updates. Council encourages</p>	No change

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feels a lack of influence over the amendment and outcomes. Any increased density must be matched with genuine community consultation rather than broad-brushed rezoning. 	<p>submissions from the community on all proposed amendments to the City Plan.</p> <p>Other options were also available for the community to make a submission, including emailing the project team and writing to Council.</p>	
MHS-325, MHS-373	<p>Submitters made the following comments about the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation process may be impacted by particular perspectives/community groups having disproportionate influence and spreading misinformation (particularly on social media). Council should provide clear, factual information and evaluate the substance of particular arguments. Particular perspectives in the community may not be heard and more opportunities for quieter voices to be heard should be held (such as in-person sessions and surveys), in addition to opportunities for more nuanced discussions. 	<p>The proposed amendment applies citywide to land in the LDR and LMR zone and, where a neighbourhood or precinct plan overrides citywide development requirements, these variations will continue to apply. Some land within the Chermside precinct plan boundary is included within the LDR and LMR zone and development of the precinct plan will have regard to the proposed changes to these zones as part of this amendment. More information about the proposed Chermside Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct is available on Council's website.</p>	
MHS-197, MHS-319, MHS-452	<p>Submitters made the following suggestions regarding forward progression of the proposed amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should monitor the implementation of amendments and ensure they allow for feasible, deliverable development outcomes. Including a review of the cumulative impact of key planning controls including parking requirements, lot size provisions, infrastructure contributions and neighbourhood planning provisions and consider targeted refinements to ensure they are supporting increased housing supply, quickly. Council must modify the amendment and fund essential infrastructure based on the submissions made by residents during this process. 	<p>The proposed amendment supports Council's broader strategy for housing supply, including Brisbane's Sustainable Growth Strategy and the Housing Supply Action Plan. It supports the plan to grow up, not out by support infill development in well-located LMR zoned land and providing for increased diversity of housing types. For more information on Council's approach for housing supply, visit Council's website.</p> <p>Council determines infrastructure requirements through the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). For more information about the LGIP, refer to Council's website. Council undertakes citywide reviews of the LGIP regularly and the infrastructure plan informs the development of the annual budget and future infrastructure programs.</p>	No change

4 Conclusion

The submissions received have been considered in the development of the final package of amendments.

It is important to note that the proposed amendment may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government during the Minister's consideration period.