

Consultation report

***Brisbane City Plan 2014***

**Tailored amendment package – Inner-City Affordability Initiative (Car parking)**

Brisbane City Council

February 2025

This report has been produced by:

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

# Contents

i.	Glossary .....	1
1.0	Introduction.....	2
2.0	Engagement activities .....	3
3.0	Submissions .....	4
3.1	Public transport .....	4
3.2	On-street parking and congestion .....	7
3.3	Housing affordability and supply .....	10
3.4	Requests to change City core or City frame boundary areas and/or extend reduced parking rates.....	14
3.5	Suggested changes to policies needed to support the proposed amendment.....	20
3.6	Changes to parking rates .....	24
3.7	Other matters .....	29
4.0	Conclusion.....	32

## i. Glossary

<b>Acronym/Abbreviation/Term</b>	<b>Description</b>
City Plan	<i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i>
Council	Brisbane City Council
The proposed amendment	Tailored amendment package – Inner -City Affordability Initiative (Car parking)

# 1.0 Introduction

Statutory public consultation of the proposed Tailored amendment – Inner-City Affordability (Car parking) (the proposed amendment) to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) was undertaken between 8 October 2024 and 5 November 2024.

Council received a total of 91 submissions, 87 which were properly made. Of the submissions received, there were submissions of support, support in part, of opposition and submissions suggesting changes to the proposed amendment and other parts of City Plan.

An overview of the common matters raised by submitters included:

- Support for, and opposition to, the proposal to expand the City core and City frame boundaries that apply special parking rates.
- Support for Council taking action to address housing supply and affordability.
- Concern that the proposed amendment will not positively affect housing affordability.
- Concern that the proposed amendment will not influence car ownership rates and will increase on-street parking congestion.
- Concern that on-street parking congestion will impact local businesses, and the safety and amenity of neighbourhoods.
- Concern that current public transport networks are not sufficient to support the reduced parking supply, and suggestions that further investment is required in public and active transport, and in the public realm.
- Concern that maximum car parking rates in the expanded City core will impact residential development where a development proposal may seek higher rates.
- Suggestions for further changes (additions and removals) to the City core and City frame boundaries.
- Suggestions for additional and alternative approaches to car parking city-wide, including introducing special rates in walking distance of public transport and centres across the city, and a market-led approach to the provision of parking.

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.

## 2.0 Engagement activities

Council held the following community consultation events during the public notification period:

Talk-to-a-planner session – over phone	15 October 2024
Industry information session – In person (Brisbane CBD)	18 October 2024
Talk-to-a-planner session – In person (Brisbane CBD)	23 October 2024
Talk-to-a-planner session – over phone	29 October 2024

Council notified the proposed amendment in the following manner:

Newspaper notification	A digital public notice appeared in <i>The Courier-Mail</i> on 8 October 2024.
Council website	Web pages providing detail of the proposed amendment were published and maintained from 8 October 2024.
Email	An email was sent to City Plan updates subscribers on 8 October 2024, and on 1 November 2024.
Media release	A media release was distributed on 8 October 2024.

## 3.0 Submissions

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

- Public transport.
- On-street parking and congestion.
- Housing affordability and supply.
- Requests to change the City core and or City frame boundary areas and/or extend reduced parking rates.
- Suggested changes to policies needed to support the proposed amendment.
- Other matters.

### 3.1 Public transport

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-001	The submitter supports the amendment in part, raising concerns that public transport is not yet adequate to support the initiative.	<p>The feedback on the proposed amendment and submissions of support are noted.</p> <p>The inner-city is the major hub for south-east Queensland public transport services, supporting connectivity between rail, bus, and ferry services.</p> <p>Major public transport infrastructure investment is underway, including <a href="#">Brisbane Metro</a> and Cross River Rail, to deliver a faster commute and improved public transport connectivity within and beyond Brisbane.</p> <p>The expanded City core and City frame car parking area boundaries will support key precincts within inner-city transport networks. Council is committed to providing world-class public transport with more buses for the suburbs, expansion of</p>	No change
TACP-002	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment to expand the City core boundary as public transport is not yet adequate to support the initiative so residents will still have cars.		
TACP-006	The submitter supports the proposed amendment. Brisbane has excellent public transport network including train, bus, ferry which is underutilised as it is expensive. The 50-cent fare initiative is brilliant and will go a long way towards increasing community use of these services.		
TACP-008	The submitter supports the proposed amendment for certain developments which have access to high frequency public transport hubs with improvements to the public transport network providing more efficient travel options for inner city inhabitants. The proposed changes remove some barriers which would otherwise prevent the provision of increased density in appropriate areas and offer a wider range of housing choices.		
TACP-019	The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part but does not believe it will be effective without an equivalent focus on active and public transport options. Submitter finds that, as they are currently, Brisbane's transport options are too skewed towards private vehicles and many active transport options are difficult, unpleasant, and unsafe.		
TACP-020	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will increase the pressure on the city's infrastructure, and public transport systems.		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-023	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests further investment in public and active transport. New development in West End and South Brisbane have increased car use and public transport is not meeting resident needs.	<p>the CityCat fleet and subsidised public transport and free services such as CityHopper ferries and city bus loops. The free CityHopper ferries serve eight stops between North Quay and Sydney Street, New Farm. The free City Loop, Spring Hill Loop and South Brisbane Loop bus services also operate in the inner-city to provide easy access to key destinations.</p> <p>The inner-city suburbs included in the proposed amendment benefit from good access to some or all of these public transport services and continued investment will improve the public transport network.</p> <p>Not every resident will need to rely exclusively on public and active transport as parking will still be available on site in new developments in the City core and City frame car parking areas, just at a reduced rate.</p> <p>Further, visitor parking is also still required to be provided on site as part of new development. Where visitors are in the area for less than the applicable regulated parking control time limits (i.e. commonly 2 hours), or outside the regulated parking hours, they will also be able to park on street.</p>	
TACP-028	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and believes that the West End population density is already too high with low parkland to resident ratio, one lane roads, no trains, no trams, or ferry terminal.		
TACP-042	The submitter supports the amendment, particularly for areas with high access to public and active transport, and it will strike a balance between encouraging urban development and ensuring the financial viability of projects.		
TACP-044	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as public transport is insufficient so residents will have to park their cars on the street, which will lead to congestion and prevent visitors from being able to park.		
TACP-046	The submitter supports the proposed amendment as it encourages public transport use and suggests a free inner city bus system be provided.		
TACP-051	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as there is already a huge issue with space from limited parking supply in apartment buildings. The submitter suggests people require one or 2 cars and that public transport is impractical for many trips.		
TACP-061	The submitter supports the proposed amendment as they have found many of the proposed areas to be cheap and convenient to live, work, and socialise in without a car, and with continuing improvements to public and active transport it is becoming easier to live in more areas of Brisbane without owning a car or a second car.		
TACP-062	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and further suggests the proposal needs to be accompanied by both a significant boost in public and active transport and a commensurate draw-down or pricing-in of on-street parking within the City frame.		
TACP-063	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests better, safer, and more comprehensive public transport is required to reduce car dependency.		
TACP-064	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will exacerbate overcrowding and demand on infrastructure and services that are already overstretched in inner city areas, especially on the West End / South Brisbane peninsula.		



Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-070	The submitter comments that transport accessibility is a major issue for the sick, injured, infirm, disabled, elderly, youth, and families.		
TACP-071	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and believes many of the areas being added to the City core are only serviced by a single source of public transport compared to the 2-3 sources of public transport in the existing City core locations. This limits future residents of these areas to a single mode of transport, and the proposed areas are impacted by topography.		
TACP-074	The submitter supports the intent of the proposed amendment and suggests a detailed review of the City frame boundary, including consideration of expanded public, active and e-mobility transport solutions (such as Brisbane Metro, Cross River Rail, green bridges) into additional suburbs.		
TACP-076	<p>The submitter raises concerns with the proposed amendment, in particular the broader consequences that the policy change may have upon the transport network and access to New Farm and Teneriffe peninsula. The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City core expansion should be focused on immediate proximity to public transport.</li> <li>• Council should demonstrate how the broader transport network capacity will be maintained in the context of the proposed changes.</li> </ul>		

## 3.2 On-street parking and congestion

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-001	The submitter supports the amendment in part, however, has concerns that it will result in more congestion and on-street parking.	The feedback on the proposed amendment and submissions of support are noted.	No change
TACP-003	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will negatively impact local businesses as there is no available on-street parking for customers. If the proposal proceeds, it must be stipulated that tenants of new builds can't have a vehicle.	The majority of the proposed City core and City frame parking areas are located within Council's regulated parking permit scheme areas.	
TACP-005	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will not reduce car ownership and will push residents to park on-street, based on experience from Sydney. Access to local greenspace, supermarkets and public transport is insufficient to accommodate the intended increase in density and would require personal vehicle usage to counteract, particularly in the Newstead/Teneriffe area.	This means on-street parking limits are in place to stop all day parking and make space available for short stay parking, including customer parking for local businesses.	
TACP-010	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment without any proposed parking solutions within the boundary, due to increasing congestion of on-street parking and placing children at risk when playing around neighbourhood streets.	Resident parking permits are available for eligible residents who live in a regulated parking permit scheme area. However, residents who live in a multiple dwelling (e.g. apartment) or student accommodation, approved as a result of a development application lodged after 31 March 2015, are ineligible for a resident parking permit, with some exceptions.	
TACP-011	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will not reduce car ownership and it will increase street parking both within and outside the City frame. The submitter suggests removing or reducing on-street parking and converting street parking to active transport lanes and wider footpaths, increase off street parking for delivery and other short-term users, and retain existing parking requirements but introduce by-laws to encourage use of parking spaces as storage rooms when not used for parking.	More information about resident parking permits is available on <a href="#">Council's website</a> .	
TACP-020	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will increase the pressure on the city's infrastructure, on-street parking and result in more clogged streets that will create issues for emergency services.	Declining car ownership rates and the availability of active transport and high-frequency public transport networks in these locations are expected to reduce the need for future residents to own a vehicle.	
TACP-021	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as parking provided for inner city apartments is already woefully inadequate and further reducing them would exacerbate pre-existing street parking issues for inner city areas. This includes Toowong, where existing exemptions for student accommodation has meant there is no available parking for visitors.		
TACP-022	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as there is already an issue with street parking in Annerley, many people own multiple cars and reducing parking minimums will only further clog up the road. Many streets are too narrow for two cars to pass, and further on-street parking resulting from this proposal will amplify that issue.		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-023	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and believes the proposal will reduce amenity for residents, businesses, public transport users and further clog the streets with parked cars.		
TACP-028	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it is negatively impacting business viability in West End due to the lack of availability of on- street parking.		
TACP-035	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests the proposed amendment will impact neighbourhood amenity, safety and liveability. Residents will have to pay to park elsewhere, there is rarely street parking available (including in Kangaroo Point), and it will increase congestion. Most people own at least one vehicle in Brisbane and public transport is terrible. This will only benefit developers.		
TACP-038	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many inner-city residents own more than one car and also use street parking for caravans, trailers and boats.</li> <li>• People from outside the inner city drive into the area and park to catch the convenient public transport the rest of the way.</li> <li>• Resident use of on-street parking is impacting availability for visitors, customers to local businesses, and attractiveness of using active transport.</li> </ul>		
TACP-040	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking in the City core is already a major issue for businesses and residents and this will continue.</li> <li>• Residents overwhelmingly drive cars.</li> <li>• BCC Residential Parking Permits will still be allocated per newly built unit with no parking spaces available, creating avoidable tension between neighbours, residents and local businesses.</li> </ul>		
TACP-043	The submitter raises concerns regarding current congestion from street parking in Teneriffe and that further reducing car parking in high density buildings will worsen this and make the area less congenial to those who are already there.		
TACP-044	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as public transport is insufficient so residents will have to park their cars on the street, which will lead to congestion and prevent visitors from being able to park.		
TACP-045	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will worsen the existing difficulty of finding on-street parking in residential areas, including West End, as people will continue to rely on a car.		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-052	The submitter suggests that parking is a real issue in the inner city, and that capacity has been reached, especially in the last 5 to 10 years.		
TACP-054	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will result in an even worse parking nightmare and average residents will suffer. Submitter says that having lived near train stations; they have still required 2 cars.		
TACP-060	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as Australians have cars, sometimes multiple, and that is not going to change. High density development is occurring throughout the city to increase the supply of affordable housing, but this product is not what a large proportion of young families want, and car parking provided in these developments are too small which results in more on-street parking. The submitter refers to Moorooka as an example of how ineffective reducing carparking will be, as the transit hub is used by many local residents that travel there via car. Submitter suggests that parking requirements are increased to a realistic minimum rate for all residential, commercial and industrial development.		
TACP-063	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People will park on the street, creating safety and congestion issues or will have to give up their car which would negatively impact local businesses and tourism.</li> <li>• It is not practical to have no car at all in the region, and not affordable to ride-share or use taxi services to get somewhere quickly.</li> </ul>		
TACP-064	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and believes that residents and visitors will still drive cars, which will place more demand on already limited parking and street congestion and references Montague Road, as an example of this.		
TACP-065	The submitter suggests that reduced parking ratios without a corresponding infrastructure improvement plan risks further congestion in these already crowded areas, and that many residents still depend on cars for commuting and daily activities.		
TACP-067	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ownership of specific apartments without a parking space is offered to those without cars, otherwise there is a safety and congestion issue from street parking.</li> <li>• The safety and logistical issue of those required to walk a great distance from their car to their home is addressed in the plan.</li> <li>• Congestion from excessive street parking is addressed.</li> </ul>		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-070	The submitter comments that the proposed amendment will put additional pressure on on-street parking. The submitter comments that Brisbane is not a city like New York, Tokyo, or Amsterdam and requires cars due to the city's temperatures, weather, and sprawl.		
TACP-077	The submitter supports in part the proposed expansion of the City frame but suggests that imposing on-street parking restriction for residents or metering parking in high demand areas will discourage residents using this parking for longer periods of time.		
TACP-024 TACP-088	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and believes it will impact existing residents as additional resident parking permits would be issued in affected areas.		

### 3.3 Housing affordability and supply

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-001	The submitter supports the amendment in part, however questions whether the outcome will be increased housing affordability when developers and landlords charge based on supply and demand.	The feedback on the proposed amendment and submissions of support are noted.	No change
TACP-002	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as placing upper limits on parking will not create affordable housing. Also allowing development of apartments with lower parking rates will not create affordable housing and will only create higher profits for developers.	Through <a href="#">Brisbane's Sustainable Growth Strategy</a> and supporting <a href="#">Housing Supply Action Plan</a> , Council aims to increase jobs, housing supply and diversity, and to get more homes built sooner. Facilitating improved diversity of housing will be crucial to meet the needs of our changing population.	
TACP-012	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will worsen housing affordability, housing standards and quality of life by abetting further population growth. The proposal will shift pressure for car parking onto the streets and support a high-rise development outcome which is not a solution to housing affordability. The submitter suggests that only by ending population growth can housing affordability begin to improve.		
TACP-013	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment. The submitter supports efforts to increase affordable housing in Brisbane but believes the proposed amendment is unrealistic, underestimates the importance of vehicle ownership and will not diminish the need for parking. On-street parking exacerbates traffic flow and local street congestion. Submitter questions whether development savings will be passed on to residents.	While the number of 1-2 person households in Brisbane is only set to grow, a range of housing types and sizes is required to ensure all residents have the option to live in a home and	

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required	
TACP-019	The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part but questions whether there is evidence that supports the idea that reducing car parking for new dwellings will improve affordability of those dwellings.	location that is well suited to them, throughout all phases of life including providing for ageing in neighbourhood.		
TACP-020	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests that the proposal will not improve affordability, which is related to demand, not cost to build.	The proposed amendment, which is an action identified in the <a href="#">Housing Supply Action Plan</a> , is one step Council is taking to support the supply and diversity of housing in Brisbane. By removing a barrier to construction of new apartments, the proposed amendment will assist with broader supply issues which are contributing to housing prices.		
TACP-021	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it would have minimal effect on homelessness, which could be more affectively addressed using other solutions.			
TACP-023	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as while it will result in reduced construction costs (and increase developer profits) it won't reduce housing prices, which is determined by the market, not construction costs.			
TACP-024 TACP-088	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it lacks a strong connection with the Housing Supply Action Plan.			
TACP-026	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it does not guarantee affordable housing, with no accountability for developers to deliver affordable housing, and it doesn't fit with the Housing Supply Action Plan solutions.		Ongoing precinct planning in key locations is a further important step Council is taking to respond to housing challenges. <a href="#">Stones Corner</a> is the first precinct to progress under the <a href="#">Suburban Renewal Precinct Program</a> .	
TACP-027 TACP-080 TACP-083	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will not improve housing affordability.</li> <li>• It only provides construction cost reductions without a mechanism for accountability to the city, unit owner and Brisbane's citizens.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a percentage of units (1, 2 and 3 bedroom) that must meet the affordability definition.</li> <li>• Implement a framework to evaluate the value of this change in achieving affordable housing stock.</li> <li>• Condition development approvals to provide evidence of the reduction of the selling value of units that meets the affordability definition, to be maintained in perpetuity.</li> </ul>			
TACP-038	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does not demonstrate sufficient cost saving or materially reduce the cost of housing.</li> <li>• Typical development within the City frame is for high-end, one unit per floor apartments, so it will not reduce the market price.</li> </ul>			

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will only benefit developers, not the community.</li> <li>It will shift the cost and burden of providing car parking from the developer to Council.</li> </ul>		
TACP-040	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will only benefit the profit margin for developers and it is very unlikely any savings would be passed on to a prospective purchaser.</li> <li>It is incredibly manipulative to pass this through under the guise that it will 'make housing more affordable'.</li> <li>It is very unlikely any savings created from not having to outlay additional funding for the provision of adequate parking solutions would ever be passed on to the prospective purchaser.</li> <li>While this new plan will allow for more units to be created per new build and provide additional/ongoing council rates to be paid per unit, this is not a sensible nor practical long-term proposal.</li> </ul>		
TACP-045	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will have no effect on housing affordability, which is set by supply and demand.</p>		
TACP-055	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment as it will reduce the cost of construction and make housing more affordable. Submitter notes public and active transport has improved over the years.</p>		
TACP-056	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment as it will reduce the provision of car parking spaces and enable new developments to reduce costs associated with the construction of housing.</p>		
TACP-057	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it lacks targets and accountability for affordability. Additionally, there is a lack of transparency for how the boundaries were determined and non-existent planning for community infrastructure.</p>		
TACP-058	<p>The submitter suggests there is insufficient documentation to substantiate the claim that the proposed amendment will reduce the cost of new housing and make it more generally available. Submitter suggests the inner city is, and has always been, expensive and does not cater to first home buyers or social housing needs. Submitter refers to the old DPI site in Yeerongpilly as a past example of a failure to provide housing. Council should provide supporting information for the proposed amendment from disparate sources, such as what the savings will be, the target market and whether it will serve the existing market demand.</p>		
TACP-059	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it represents another concession to developers at the expense of the community, will have a</p>		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	negative impact on traffic flow, character, and liveability of the city, and will not increase housing affordability. A similar policy was removed in 2011-2012 as it caused major problems.		
TACP-063	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will not reduce housing costs, will just end up as extra margin for developers and homebuyers will pay more for less. Submitter suggests taking a multi-faceted approach to address supply and demand to improve housing affordability.		
TACP-064	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as the proposed changes to parking will not make housing more affordable for those who are at risk of homelessness.		
TACP-070	The submitter comments that the proposed amendment's impact on housing affordability is reactionary and short term and will create even greater problems for the future. Submitter also recommends Council seek alternative, real, long- term solutions to housing affordability that are a more carefully researched and inclusive of the population's needs.		
TACP-071	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it has the potential to increase the cost of providing housing while also negatively impacting the future owners and residents. The amendment will mean that additional parking cannot be provided and sold to purchasers that require additional parking, which offsets the cost of construction.		
TACP-072	The submitter supports Council's broader objectives for the proposed amendment but suggests that while it may reduce construction costs it may not result in bringing on much-needed housing supply.		
TACP-079	The submitter supports the proposed amendment as it will reduce construction costs and times, improve housing diversity and affordability, encourage alternate transport methods and assist in achieving reduced emissions targets.		
TACP-082	The submitter supports the proposed amendment as it will reduce apartment construction costs while increasing site yield and housing diversity, and potentially reducing reliance on private car usage.		
TACP-085	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it will not deliver affordable housing. There are no mechanisms to ensure reduced construction costs will be directly transferred to apartment selling prices and no affordable unit targets associated with the proposed change.		
TACP-087	The submitter suggests initiatives to improve housing affordability are welcome, including a cap on development car parking with improvements in public and active transport as well as ride share and e-mobility. However, the submitter suggests a map is not required to apply special parking rates and a		



Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	general provision across the whole of Brisbane would be appropriate. The submitter further notes that no specific, quantifiable affordability objective is identified, and no clear and transparent accountability measures for developers means there is no ability to deliver on the claim of housing affordability.		

### 3.4 Requests to change City core or City frame boundary areas and/or extend reduced parking rates

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-004	The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part and suggests further expanding the City frame to include inner city suburbs serviced by ferries such as New Farm.	The feedback on the proposed amendment and submissions of support are noted.	Change required
TACP-008	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests further expanding to other suburbs, such as Holland Park, Buranda, Mount Gravatt, with direct access to high frequency public transport (e.g. Southeast busway) that also may not require the same level of parking due to the owners' reliance on public transport would also benefit from the opportunity to be assessed for reduced parking requirements.	The proposed amendment is focused on the inner city, and locations outside of the inner city are better considered as part of a broader car parking review or any future localised planning exercise.	
TACP-009	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests further expanding the City frame to include Herston.		
TACP-014	The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part, specifically supporting the maximum and minimum parking rates that apply in the City core and City frame, but not supporting the extent of the City core and City frame areas. Submitter believes the scope of the City core and City frame area is too narrow and should be applied more broadly to the city to have a bigger impact on housing affordability. The submitter suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding the City core to cover an area roughly connecting Toowong, St Lucia, Fairfield, Annerley, Coorparoo, Kedron Brook and Stafford.</li> <li>Expanding the City frame to cover the remainder of Brisbane.</li> </ul>	In identifying the proposed City core and City frame car parking area boundaries, consideration was given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proximity to the high-frequency public transport network</li> <li>proximity to the active transport network</li> <li>current and future land uses and zoning</li> <li>the location of precinct plans currently being prepared by Council</li> <li>Council's regulated parking permit scheme areas.</li> </ul>	
TACP-017	The submitter supports the proposed amendment to the City core boundary and suggests the City frame boundary is redundant and should be expanded, particularly near major public transport corridors.		
TACP-018	The submitter supports the proposed amendment but does not believe the amendment goes far enough to address the affordability issues associated with car parking. The submitter provides the following suggestions:		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The initiative is applied and expanded throughout the city to incentivise development in the suburbs and delivery of gentle density.</li> <li>The special parking rates in the City core and City frame both be applied as maximum parking rates, or at a minimum, are further reduced for multiple dwellings in the City frame.</li> <li>Extend the minimum car parking rates of the City frame to areas within 400m walking distance of key public transport nodes outside of the city centre (e.g. Albion, Carindale, Carseldine, Coorparoo, Gaythorne, Morningside, Nundah, Taringa and Wynnum, amongst others). The Victorian Planning Scheme is cited as an example of this policy approach.</li> </ul>	<p>Suggested changes to the City core and City frame car parking area boundaries have been considered in light of these factors. The proposed amendment is focused on the inner city, and locations outside of the inner city are beyond the scope of this amendment.</p>	
TACP-025	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part and suggests the West End estate precinct of the West End-Woolloongabba district neighbourhood plan be excluded from the City core boundary as it could be the first step in watering down of character protections for the area. Further, block size, street frontage and narrow streets already actively limit car parking within the precinct.</p>	<p><u>New Farm</u> The request to expand the City frame to cover the whole of New Farm has been considered and no change is proposed to be made. The whole area is not considered to benefit from the same level of public transport access and is not subject to regulated parking.</p>	
TACP-027 TACP-080 TACP-083	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no need for the change if there is no ulterior motive to override the neighbourhood plans within the inner city with new planning/zoning regulations.</li> <li>The City core boundaries through West End and New Farm are deliberate lines and do not align to the Brisbane Central Traffic Area, and it is not clear how these boundaries were determined.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Holland Park and Mt Gravatt</u> The request to include Holland Park and Mt Gravatt in the City frame has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.</p>	
TACP-029	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part and states that the initiative does not go far enough. The submitter suggests the following changes to the boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend the City frame boundary southward to Aston Street and Glenny Street, Toowong, to encompass the High density residential zoned land that has excellent access to public and active transport.</li> <li>The Buranda transit oriented development (TOD) site falls outside the proposed city frame boundary, despite being served by rail, busway and the V1 veloway.</li> <li>Extend the City frame boundary southwest to Cornwall Street and eastward to Montague Street/Logan Road, Buranda.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Buranda</u> The request to include Buranda in the City frame has been considered and a change is proposed to include the area bounded by Ipswich Road, Cornwall Street and Regent Street in the City frame car parking area.</p>	

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-030	The submitter supports the proposal to expand the city core boundary, however, opposes the proposed boundary, as it doesn't align with the rationale outlined by Council. The submitter suggests the proposed City core boundary be aligned to the TLPI No. 2 of 2023 Kurilpa Sustainable Growth Precinct boundary as it is more reflective of current transport options. The submitter recommends the City frame remain as is until transport infrastructure is completed, although would also be comfortable with the proposed boundaries.	<p><u>Herston</u> The request to include the whole of Herston in the City frame has been considered and a change is proposed to expand the City frame car parking boundary to include some additional properties north of Butterfield Street located in the Mixed use zone and Low impact industry zone.</p> <p><u>West End and Highgate Hill</u> The feedback on the City core and City frame boundary in West End and Highgate Hill has been considered and changes are proposed to adjust the boundary line to relocate land primarily zoned as Character residential or Low-medium density residential to the City frame car parking area rather than the City core.</p> <p>The boundary was previously based on the Brisbane Central Traffic Area boundary, and it is considered appropriate to match the proposed extended boundary with land use zoning to better align with development expectations for the area.</p> <p><u>Toowong</u> The request to extend the City frame boundary in Toowong has been considered and a change is proposed to expand the City frame car parking boundary further west and south to include additional properties located in</p>	
TACP-034	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and would like to see further expansion of the boundaries to cover areas within easy reach of quality public and active transport options.		
TACP-036	The submitter suggests the proposed amendment is a great idea to increase public and active transport use and suggests further expanding the proposal to include other areas within a few hundred metres of transit hubs/train stations.		
TACP-037	The submitter supports the proposed amendment in principle and suggests further expanding the proposal to include Albion Village, which is well connected and highly accessible. It would incentivise development to proceed that has been planned but not commenced and would contribute to improved activation, amenity, and active transport connections within the village.		
TACP-041	The submitter suggests further expanding the City frame to include Stones Corner, particularly around the Cleveland Street area, which is undergoing rejuvenation, is well connected to public transport and has an influx of student accommodation, a demographic that doesn't necessarily rely on cars.		
TACP-047	The submitter suggests the City core and City frame be further extended to accommodate for the growth of Albion, including the precinct surrounding Albion Station, which is subject to a Station Upgrade Project and will form the northern end of the ongoing Cross River Rail project, as well as being set for significant urban renewal and new residential development.		
TACP-049	<p>The submitter broadly supports the intent of the proposed amendment and raises concerns about the proposed extent of the City core and City frame boundaries. Submitter suggests that the Albion Park Raceway be included within the City frame as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surplus land is available to accommodate residential development.</li> <li>• It could form a future destination precinct within the inner city.</li> <li>• It is located within proximity to public and active transport networks.</li> </ul>		
TACP-056	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests the City frame boundary be extended in East Brisbane to capture an area of Mixed use and Low-medium density residential zoned land between Wellington Road and		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	Manilla Street which also benefits from access to high frequency public transport and local services, and is in the Gabba Traffic Area.	the High density residential zone and in proximity to Toowong Train Station.	
TACP-061	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City frame be extended to all suburbs up to 10km out and on high-frequency public transport routes.</li> <li>• Increase bicycle parking requirements to one per bedroom.</li> <li>• Increase the required electricity outlets for both electric cars and bikes.</li> <li>• Reduce parking requirements of non-residential uses within the City core and City frame.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Kurilpa</u> The request to reduce the City core boundary to match the Kurilpa TLPI boundary has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.</p>	
TACP-062	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and further suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the City frame to include high-frequency public transport corridors within 5km of Brisbane City Hall.</li> <li>• Expand the City core to include the area covered by the City West neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>• Tie the Brisbane Central Traffic Area to the City frame boundary.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Albion</u> The request to include Albion in the City frame and/or City core car parking areas has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.</p>	
TACP-068	The submitter supports the proposed amendment as the inner city is well serviced by public and active transport options, but recommends it be extended across all of New Farm. Further development of sites for affordable accommodation purposes is currently restricted by parking requirements.		
TACP-069	The submitter suggests the inclusion of select locations along Given Terrace be included in the City frame extent due to its easy active transport access, access to high-frequency public transport, proximity to services, location within the Lang Park Traffic Area and the City Plan's strategic intent for it to be a retail and entertainment high street dominated by pedestrians rather than cars.		
TACP-075	The submitter suggests the City frame be extended to include Buranda Village, down to Cornwall Street, which benefits from access high frequency public transport and supports the Princess Alexandra Hospital Precinct. The site represents an opportunity to deliver substantial public benefits, including housing, employment and activated public realm, and already has an approved master plan with reduced parking rates.	<p><u>Stones Corner</u> Stones Corner is currently part of Council's precinct planning program, and the <a href="#">draft Stones Corner Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan</a>, which includes supporting updates to the Eastern corridor neighbourhood plan, was recently on public consultation. The draft precinct plan seeks to apply the City frame car parking rates to multiple dwelling development within the precinct plan area. It is therefore not proposed to include Stones Corner in the City frame area as part of this proposed amendment.</p>	
TACP-077	<p>The submitter supports in part the proposed expansion of the City frame, but questions the boundaries chosen for the expansion and also the potential unintended consequences of expanding the City core. Submitter suggests changes to the City frame as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundary in Buranda be shifted south of the PA Hospital busway station and Buranda Train Station.</li> <li>• Inclusion of the full New Farm peninsula in the City frame.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Langlands Park Busway Station</u> The request to include Langlands Park busway station in the City frame has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.</p>	

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The boundary in Windsor be revised to capture land north of the proposed expansion near Lutwyche Road, closer to the Windsor Train Station.</li> <li>Expansion to the west and south in Toowong.</li> </ul>	<u>East Brisbane</u> The request to expand the City frame car parking boundary in East Brisbane has been considered and a change is proposed to expand the City frame car parking boundary further east to include properties along Manilla Street located in the Mixed use zone.	
TACP-079	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests the boundary be extended to cover additional areas, including for example New Farm and East Brisbane.		
TACP-084	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand the City core to include Woolloongabba Cross River Rail station and north to Kangaroo Point at the new bridge, Woolloongabba South and PA Hospital, and the Kelvin Grove Urban Village.</li> <li>Expand the City frame to include the catchments of Stones Corner and Langlands Park busway stations, Dutton Park Station, Toowong Station and Albion Station.</li> </ul>	<u>City west neighbourhood plan area</u> The request to expand the City core car parking boundary to cover the City west neighbourhood plan area has been considered and a change is proposed to include the Normanby renewal precinct in the City frame. No further changes are proposed to be made.	
TACP-085	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests there is no need to change the City core and City frame boundary area unless there is a proposed zoning change for these areas, and as part of the affected area is low density and character areas. It is not clear how the boundary through West End and New Farm was established.		
TACP-086	The submitter suggests the boundaries of the Dutton Park Traffic Area, Gabba Traffic Area and Lang Park Traffic Area would form a logical boundary for the City frame boundary.	<u>Dutton Park</u> The request to include Dutton Park in the City core has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.	
TACP-089	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests addition of the following areas to the City frame: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A block in Woolloongabba bounded by Vulture Street, Wellington Road, Cairns Street and Kennedy Terrace.</li> <li>Stones Corner and surrounds.</li> <li>Toowong and surrounds.</li> </ul>	<u>Kelvin Grove Urban Village</u> The request to include the Kelvin Grove Urban Village in the City core has been requested and no change is proposed to be made.	
TACP-090	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests further changes to the boundary, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include the whole of the Tenerife/New Farm peninsula.</li> <li>Through East Brisbane the 'City Core' should extend east to the 'City Frame' boundary with the 'City Frame' boundary shifting east to Bulimba Creek.</li> <li>The southern alignment of the 'City Core' should extend south to the 'City Frame' boundary with the 'City Frame' boundary shifting south to Cornwall Street.</li> <li>From Dutton Park to Toowong the Brisbane River should be the extent of both the 'City Core' and the 'City Frame'.</li> </ul>	<u>Woolloongabba</u> The request to include Woolloongabba in the City core has been considered and changes are proposed to extend the City core to include land located in the Woolloongabba Priority Development Area, and expand the City frame to include some additional land to the east of the Priority	

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The western extension of the 'City Core' should follow the rail line.</li> <li>Inclusion of Latrobe and Given Terraces in the City frame, and clarification of the City frame along Moggill Road west of Toowong.</li> </ul>	<p>Development Area to Fisher Street and Rosslyn Street.</p> <p><u>Windsor</u> The request to expand the City frame boundary further north in Windsor has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.</p> <p><u>Outer suburbs</u> The request to include the broader Brisbane area, including suburbs outside of the inner city and in proximity to high-frequency public transport has been considered and no change is proposed to be made.</p> <p>Other suggestions are better considered as part of a broader car parking review or any future localised planning exercise and would consider sustainable car parking opportunities for residential development.</p> <p><u>Non-residential and Commercial parking rates in City core and City frame car parking areas</u> Where located in the City core and City frame car parking areas, reduced car parking rates for uses other than multiple dwellings, including commercial uses, apply as per <a href="#">Table 13 – Car parking standards in specific cases in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy</a>. These parking rates are not being changed as part of this amendment package.</p>	

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-091	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using the City frame as the City core extent instead.</li> <li>A review of the proposed boundaries identifies some inconsistencies, including the boundary through West End and Highgate Hill, boundary in Teneriffe, and an area of industrial investigation in Bowen Hills.</li> <li>Extending the City frame to within 800m walking distance of every train and busway station within 10km of the CBD, including future Cross River Rail and Brisbane Metro stations.</li> <li>Extending the City core to Albion Train Station and within 800m walking distance of the station.</li> </ul>		

### 3.5 Suggested changes to policies needed to support the proposed amendment

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
TACP-007	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part. Agreeing that Brisbane needs to move away from our car centric design and get more people onto active and public transport. However, the submitter suggests this change must be accompanied by policies to support better active and public transport. These changes should include slower streets (30km/h), road diets to calm traffic, wombat crossings, a significant increase in dedicated bike lanes, and the conversion of traffic lanes to bus lanes. It is not simply enough to reduce parking minimums without also encouraging active and public transport.</p>	<p>The submitter suggestions of changes to other parts of City Plan and other Council policies are noted.</p> <p>The amendment package is proposing changes only to Figure a of the Transport, access, parking and servicing code.</p>	No change
TACP-015	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment to expand the City core boundary and suggests many inner-city residents, including themselves, do not own a car and have access to public transport and various car hire options for holidays which is cheaper than the cost of owning a car year-round (including registration, maintenance and fuel costs). Submitter suggests this proposal also needs continued investment in public and active transport, accessibility infrastructure, shading trees and narrowing roads to limit car speeds.</p>	<p>The amendment package is not proposing any changes to the car parking rates that are located in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy.</p> <p>The amendment package is not proposing changes to any other part of City Plan.</p>	
TACP-026	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed change and suggests mandating EV charging stations and e-bike, scooter and bicycle hubs within proposed new developments, as well as improvements to the public realm, including:</p>	<p>Consideration of dedicated bike lanes, bus lanes, expanding car share, end of</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efficient, fast, regular public transport throughout the city.</li> <li>Widen and smooth footpaths for the movement of people on foot.</li> <li>Plant more tree coverage urgently for our warming climate.</li> <li>E-devices moved to the roadways.</li> <li>E-device hire collection points set out, rather than the present dangerous policy of individually scattered all over footpaths.</li> </ul>	<p>trip facilities, building height and other suggestions are outside the scope of the proposed amendment. Any consideration of changes to building heights is best addressed through a localised planning exercise that can balance housing and development needs with local character and amenity.</p> <p>Other suggestions are better considered as part of a broader car parking review or any future localised planning exercise and would consider sustainable car parking opportunities for residential development.</p> <p>Council is committed to a number of long-term plans and strategies that are in place to address planning for the future. You can view details on <a href="#">Council's Vision and Strategy webpage</a>. One strategy is <a href="#">Brisbane's Inner City Strategy</a> (released in 2022). This strategy sets the planning direction that will shape the future of Brisbane's inner city and guide Council's program of inner-city precinct planning and infrastructure delivery. It includes a network of iconic boulevards to improve amenity, walkability and active transport links in the inner city.</p> <p>The Streetscape hierarchy overlay in City Plan also identifies streetscape outcomes sought as part of new</p>	
TACP-027 TACP-080	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests that each new multiple dwelling development should include a transport and mobility strategy to offset the reduction in carparking spaces and promote active and public transport. Such strategies should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated carsharing carpark stalls – as well as dedicated visitor parking.</li> <li>Secure bicycle and scooter storage, including charging stations for e-transport.</li> <li>Dedicated onsite ride sharing drop-off zones.</li> </ul>		
TACP-031	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment in part and suggests in order to reduce not only the supply but the demand for parking spaces in the inner city, this amendment package goes hand-in-hand with car sharing schemes that are more visible on-street throughout the inner city.</p>		
TACP-034	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment as it will reduce the costs of building as well as the need for infrastructure to support cars. Submitter supports greater provision of public and active transport.</p>		
TACP-038	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as, in isolation, it will not reduce reliance on private transport. Submitter suggests progressing the proposed amendment only if it is part of a suite of changes, such as metered parking, increased active transport infrastructure, and increased end-of-trip facilities.</p>		
TACP-039	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment for the inner-city area but suggests outer areas need further consideration to allow extra building height to accommodate the additional car parking required. Currently, the parking rates required outside the inner city have made smaller builds more challenging to deliver without an extra building level to offset the cost of car parking, greenery, bin storage and bike racks, and basement parking is too expensive.</p>		
TACP-044	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests the implementation of mandatory car share arrangements for unit complexes, with dedicated car share parking spaces, and Body Corporate to decide on the car share supplier.</p>		



Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
TACP-050	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests that additional bus services, shared footpaths and bike lanes could be provided, and that similar measures could be introduced around high frequency train and bus stations.	development, including sufficient pedestrian path widths and treatments, street tree plantings and subtropical outcomes suitable to the location and pedestrian demand.  Council levies infrastructure charges as part of the development assessment process and in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . Charges apply when a subdivision (reconfiguring a lot), material change of use or carrying out of building work occurs, generating extra demand on trunk infrastructure networks. Charges levied by Council must be used to contribute to the provision of essential trunk infrastructure that services our growing city. The three trunk infrastructure networks managed by Council are, transport, parks and land for community facilities, and stormwater. Read more about infrastructure charges on <a href="#">Council's website</a> .  An initiative under <i>Brisbane's Housing Supply Action Plan</i> , Council is reducing the cost of building our city's most needed housing developments. <i>Brisbane's Housing Supply Incentive Policy</i> offers reduced infrastructure charges for eligible developments.  It is a matter for the developer to determine what type of facilities are	
TACP-061	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and supports efforts to increase supply of car share spaces in multiple dwelling developments and on surrounding streets.		
TACP-065	Submitter suggests developer contributions to public infrastructure would support a more sustainable, connected cityscape and infrastructure that keeps pace with rapid growth and identifies Dubai as an example where development undergoes a traffic impact assessment and funds necessary upgrades to the surrounding network. The submitter suggests a cost-sharing approach (via developer contributions to public infrastructure) will ensure development of affordable housing options and long-term urban resilience, and that profit margins for high-density towers are robust enough to accommodate responsible infrastructure contributions. The submitter also suggests multi-level podium parking should be used in place of basement parking as a feasible solution to meet parking requirements.		
TACP-067	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose built apartments with limits on car parking and ownership.</li> <li>• Removal of luxuries in apartments to reduce costs instead, such as pools, multiple bathrooms, and private laundries.</li> <li>• Incentivise businesses to encourage use of public transport.</li> <li>• Developers build a general car park within proximity to homes instead.</li> <li>• Confirm whether there will be any demand for apartments with no parking.</li> </ul>		
TACP-078	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and recommends supporting changes to the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy to enable further car sharing that would facilitate the proposed change. The suggested changes are intended to better address the needs and requirements of ride shares, such as including specific parking rates for carshare spaces and allowing public access to carshare spaces that are well-lit and accessible 24/7. The submitter suggests that the current City Plan requirement for carsharing to be for the exclusive use of residents is limiting the benefit and viability of the schemes. Further, conditioning of development approvals with respect to carshare arrangements is inconsistent and changes are recommended to development approval condition wording.		
TACP-079	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests:		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting high-quality podium parking outcomes by allowing additional building height to compensate for podium parking levels.</li> <li>Provide additional concessions for car share and micro-mobility shared parking facilities.</li> </ul>	suitable for their proposed development. Aspects such as bathrooms and laundries are matters considered under building legislation.	
TACP-083	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repeated failure of similar amendments to deliver tangible benefits to residents (and have instead benefited private developers).</li> <li>It will not improve housing affordability.</li> <li>It does not include a broader methodology to reduce car dependency and increase access to active and public transport.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter supports higher density residential development that is thoughtfully designed, outside flood zones, meets affordability standards and supported by well-planned community infrastructure. These principles are not achieved by the South Brisbane and riverside neighbourhood plan, the Kurilpa TLPI, and now the proposed amendment.</p>		
TACP-084	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests undertaking a parking review to inform subsequent amendments to the TAPS code and policy (including Figure a, centres and corridors, parking rates, car share and a mobility-led housing response), supported by a thorough review of regulated parking areas and associated provisions.		
TACP-085	The submitter supports maximum parking rates for multiple dwellings in transit-oriented locations, but suggests the proposal is a missed opportunity to include active transport requirements and public realm upgrades as part of new development.		

### 3.6 Changes to parking rates

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
TACP-003	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests an increase to car parking rates as the proposed reduction will worsen the pre-existing car parking issues in Woolloongabba where residents struggle to secure a parking space.	Feedback on the parking rates for the proposed amendment and submitter support for the amendment is noted.	No change
TACP-005	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests that dedicated loading docks or sufficient loading areas should be compulsory for all future apartment builds.	The existing parking rates for City core and City frame parking areas are not changing as part of this amendment.	
TACP-006	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests commercial development also have reduced car parking rates for City core and City frame areas.	This amendment is proposing only to change the boundaries of the City core and City frame car parking areas.	
TACP-016	The submitter supports the proposed amendment as the current parking rates are overly restrictive and do not allow for logical development to be feasible across the city. Submitter suggests dropping car parking rates across the city or applying the reduced parking rates to all areas near high frequency public transport and/or growth nodes as development outside of the City core and City frame remains unfeasible.	The City core and City frame car parking boundaries have not been reviewed since <i>Brisbane City Plan 2000</i> . The timely review coincided with Council investigating ways to help support the delivery of additional housing supply.	
TACP-017	The submitter suggests the car parking rates for the City core and City frame areas should be further reduced to meaningfully address affordability and make a shift to public transport use, as developers will provide parking at the maximum rate possible.	In identifying the proposed City core and City frame car parking area boundaries, consideration was given to:	
TACP-022	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests increasing the parking rates required for each development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>existing and planned public and active transport infrastructure,</li> <li>current and future land uses and zoning</li> <li>location of current and future precincts</li> <li>Regulated parking permit scheme areas.</li> </ul>	
TACP-027 TACP-080 TACP-083	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests instead implementing maximum parking rates in areas within 400m walking distance of a dedicated public pedestrian access point of a major public transport interchange.		
TACP-033	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as increased density and people will require increased parking requirements, more than is currently being provided.		
TACP-048	The submitter supports the general intent of the proposed amendment, however has concerns and suggests further flexibility is required in the parking rates to ensure development can respond to market and commercial drivers. The submitter is concerned the current proposal favours the construction of build-to-rent or smaller investor units, will discourage the	Other suggestions are better considered as part of a broader car	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<p>delivery of high-density housing for owner-occupiers (particularly larger homes), and that the proposed City core area has varying levels of accessibility. The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City core rates be applied as a minimum rather than a maximum.</li> <li>• A maximum parking rate could continue to apply to the City Centre neighbourhood plan area, distinct from the balance of the City core.</li> <li>• Alternatively, the City core could have both maximum and minimum rates, depending on proximity to public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>parking review or any future localised planning exercise and would consider sustainable car parking opportunities for residential development.</p>	
TACP-050	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment as car parking requirements increases the cost of development and indirectly encourages people to own and use cars. The submitter supports maximum rather than minimum parking rates.</p>	<p>Car parking as a category of assessment trigger to impact assessment is only applicable to development in the Principal centre zone in the City Centre neighbourhood plan.</p>	
TACP-062	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and further suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove on-street parking for non-commercial vehicles within the City core, along key active transport corridors and around Games precincts by 2032.</li> <li>• Remove parking minimums within 800 metres of a train or Busway station or a major bus interchange and 400 metres of BUZ and CityGlider stops.</li> <li>• Amend car parking rates for City core, City frame and within 400m of a major public transport interchange to specific alternative rates.</li> <li>• Change parking limits within the Brisbane Central Traffic Area to increase the cost of resident permits, cap the number of resident permits per household, and remove the time restriction on the signed two-hour limit.</li> <li>• Begin a draw-down of 2,000 parking spaces per year within the City frame.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed changes to the extent of the City core car parking boundaries have no bearing on the applicable category of assessment for development.</p> <p>The proposed changes are also not intended to discourage any particular form of residential development.</p> <p>In accordance with the performance based planning scheme drafting and development assessment rules under the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>, developments may seek to supply parking at an alternative rate than identified by City Plan, both within the City core and City frame, and outside of it. Council officers have a statutory obligation to assess an application on its merits, while balancing the intended built form,</p>	
TACP-067	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests a review of parking requirements for commercial buildings.</p>		
TACP-071	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing a minimum one parking space per apartment, including for one-bedroom apartments.</li> <li>• Reduce the City core extent and decrease the minimum rate for the City Frame.</li> <li>• Introduce rates for the City core where access to high frequency public transport exceeds acceptable walking distance.</li> </ul>		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
TACP-072	<p>The submitter supports Council's broader objectives for the proposed amendment, but suggests either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain the existing mapping and lower the City frame minimum rate to the City core rate; or</li> <li>• adopt the proposed mapping but use a minimum rate for the City Core instead of a maximum.</li> <li>• Diverse housing market requires flexibility in development options, including variations in parking provisions.</li> <li>• The free market is best positioned to determine the most efficient product for each location.</li> </ul>	<p>amenity and living environments as envisioned by City Plan.</p> <p>Where located in the City core and City frame car parking areas, reduced car parking rates for uses other than multiple dwellings, including commercial uses, apply as per <a href="#">Table 13 – Car parking standards in specific cases in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy</a>. These parking rates are not being changed as part of this amendment package.</p> <p>Council continues to monitor City Plan policy in response to feedback and changing circumstances. Where necessary, amendments are proposed and made to City Plan.</p>	
TACP-073	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment but suggests future amendments consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing maximum parking rates so that the market demand can determine the appropriate maximum.</li> <li>• Where minimums are required, car or bike share arrangements or similar alternatives to car and bike ownership should be considered.</li> <li>• Resident bike parking requirements should include any storage provided in apartments, not just communal areas.</li> <li>• Exclusive building bike share programs should decrease the number of resident bike parks required.</li> </ul>		
TACP-074	<p>The submitter supports the intent of the proposed amendment and suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of a flexible approach within the City core to allow development with additional parking requirements above the maximum rates to not trigger impact assessment.</li> <li>• Consideration for a new zone or zones where neither minimum or maximum parking rates apply to allow a dynamic response that transitions between inner-city and suburban needs and responds to ongoing market challenges driving the current housing crisis.</li> </ul>		
TACP-076	<p>The submitter raises concerns with the proposed amendment, in particular the broader consequences the policy change may have upon the transport network and access to New Farm and Teneriffe peninsula. The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking rates should not be subject to a blanket approach.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to a market led approach and how this works in the context of the broader transport network.</li> <li>• A distinction needs to be made between residential and non-residential car parking rates. Car parking rate changes should be limited to residential uses, with existing rates maintained for non-residential uses.</li> </ul>		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes to car parking rates must not be made in isolation and should be provided in conjunction with improvements to the road and public transport network, removal of on-street parking areas along Brunswick Street, James Street and Macquarie Street, and relocation of loading bays and drop-off zones to side streets.</li> <li>Remove the artificial maximum for residential car parking rates, whilst retaining and reassessing minimum rates.</li> </ul>		
TACP-077	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking rates be revisited across the city as a whole, particularly where near high frequency public transport and/or centre zones.</li> <li>The maximum City core parking rates are too low to sustain market driven residential unit outcomes, particularly in South Brisbane, Woolloongabba, Fortitude Valley and Newstead. A market led approach is a better option within the City core area.</li> <li>The 'one size fits all' model of providing parking rates for a multiple dwelling use is considered to no longer be fit for purpose.</li> <li>Suggests baseline parking rates should be tailored to individual housing typologies and a greater ability should be placed on development driven outcomes demonstrated at the time of a development application.</li> </ul>		
TACP-079	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow parking maximums to be exceeded in the City core, particularly to allow for premium residential apartments where less than one space per unit may not fulfil the need.</li> <li>Apply reduced parking rates for key growth areas outside the City frame, including future Olympic and Paralympic infrastructure, within 400m walking distance of public transport stops/stations and centres (reflective of City core rates), major educational and research facilities and universities.</li> </ul>		
TACP-081	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing City core area maintains its current maximum on site car parking requirement.</li> <li>The proposed City frame retain its minimum on site car parking requirement.</li> <li>The area between the existing Core and proposed Frame allows zero on site car parking requirements or a number of car parking spaces it may require. This area could be referred to as "City Fringe".</li> </ul>		

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are proponent-driven exceptions to on-site carparking in areas of City Fringe and Frame beyond the current Core area which do not trigger impact assessment and allow for performance solutions for car parking.</li> <li>• Apply City frame parking rates to all areas beyond the City frame.</li> <li>• Provide additional concessions for car share and micro-mobility shared parking facilities in place of on-site parking provision.</li> <li>• Apply reduced parking rates for key growth areas outside the City frame, including future Olympic and Paralympic infrastructure, within 400m walking distance of public transport stops/stations and centres (reflective of City core rates), major educational and research facilities and universities.</li> </ul>		
TACP-082	The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests further consideration to reduce parking minimums in the future.		
TACP-090	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests further complementary changes, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply maximum parking rates within 500m walking distance of mass rapid transit stations, as well as BUZ and City Glider routes.</li> <li>• Advance a car share policy to support maximum parking rates relative to the scale of the development.</li> <li>• Allowance for car share spaces to be included up to 25% of parking supply for short-term accommodation.</li> </ul>		
TACP-091	The submitter suggests including multiple dwelling parking rates in Table 13 of the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy where within 500m walking distance of a dedicated public pedestrian access point of a major public transport interchange.		

### 3.7 Other matters

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-024 TACP-088	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City core and City frame areas have been subject to higher rating value than other suburbs.</li> <li>• The proposal does not align with the reason presented for making the changes.</li> <li>• The proposal is devoid of any identifiable outcomes related to the reason for making the changes.</li> <li>• The proposal is incomplete in dealing with the regulated parking area of the inner city.</li> <li>• The proposal lacks a public realm guideline for dealing with the impacts of actions arising from the change.</li> <li>• The proposal lacks clarity, definition and certainty.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of the reference to 'affordability' as it is not a measurable or achievable action under the control of BCC.</li> <li>• An expanded enunciation of the impact of this proposal on each suburb, taking into account the existing planning provisions.</li> <li>• An explanation of the logic and rationale that sees some regulated parking areas included and some others excluded.</li> <li>• An explanation of the full implications of the new parking arrangements for the proposed new core and frame within the context of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</li> <li>• Removal of 'city wide' from the proposal and an explanation of the relevance of only targeting the 'inner city'.</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback has been noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment, which is an action identified in the <a href="#">Housing Supply Action Plan</a>, is one step Council is taking to support the supply and diversity of housing in Brisbane. By removing a barrier to construction of new apartments, the proposed amendment will assist with broader supply issues which are contributing to housing prices.</p> <p>Council is committed to a number of long-term plans and strategies that are in place to address planning for the future. You can view details on <a href="#">Council's Vision and Strategy webpage</a>. One strategy is <a href="#">Brisbane's Inner City Strategy</a> (released in 2022). This strategy sets the planning direction that will shape the future of Brisbane's inner city and guide Council's program of inner-city precinct planning and infrastructure delivery. It includes a network of iconic boulevards to improve amenity, walkability and active transport links in the inner city.</p> <p>In identifying the proposed City core and City frame car parking area boundaries, consideration was given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proximity to the high-frequency public transport network.</li> <li>• proximity to the active transport network.</li> <li>• current and future land uses and zoning.</li> <li>• the location of precinct plans currently being prepared by Council.</li> <li>• Council's regulated parking permit scheme areas.</li> </ul>	No change



Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-026	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spring Hill has its own neighbourhood plan that should be respected.</li> <li>• It does not set out how the streets of the inner core will not become gridlocked and there is no supporting report from transport planners.</li> <li>• It does not fit with the Race for Gold Plan and current Transport Plan for Inner City areas.</li> <li>• It will result in Council having to supply parking, which would be at the expense of parkland, worsening the heat island effect.</li> </ul>	<p>The feedback has been noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment does not change the effect or intended planning outcomes of existing neighbourhood plans in City Plan. The proposed amendment is intended to facilitate development, which is still expected to achieve the outcomes set out in the various neighbourhood plans covering the proposed City core and City frame car parking areas.</p> <p><a href="#">The race to gold Brisbane's Games Transport Legacy</a> delivers Council's long-term transport vision for Brisbane by encouraging the uptake of more sustainable transport choices. By expanding high-frequency transport options, shading pedestrian bridges and expanding active transport infrastructure it is believed that this will support the strategy and reduce reliance on personal car usage.</p>	No change
TACP-028	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed amendment as it expands the City core further into the Brisbane river flood zone, making development in the flood plain more attractive. Any further development in flood plains should be discouraged.</p>	<p>The feedback on the proposed amendment and submissions of support are noted.</p>	No change
TACP-032	<p>The submitter suggests Council conducts a detailed survey of all residential blocks in the city to determine level of usage of car parking, and progressing the proposed amendment without this is irresponsible. Residents without a car may choose to lease their parking space out to others, and others with multiple cars are parking on-street.</p>	<p>Consideration of surveys, size of units and apartments, size of vehicles, loading and unloading, subdivision, setbacks, traffic lanes and regulated parking are outside the scope of the proposed amendment and in some cases outside the scope of City Plan.</p>	
TACP-046	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendment and suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density residential development should be an adequate size to cater for families.</li> <li>• There should be apartment hubs to cater for families, with daycare centres, green spaces, shopping, restaurants etc. within the hub. Dutton Park would be ideal for this.</li> </ul>	<p>Other suggestions are better considered as part of a broader car parking review or any future localised planning exercise and would consider sustainable car parking opportunities for residential development.</p>	

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-053	The submitter suggests cars are getting larger and taking up more space, and that a tax should be charged for cars based on size and weight. Smaller cars, active transport and (E-) bikes should be encouraged.	Brisbane sits on a floodplain, which means flooding is possible. Council works to manage and reduce the risks of flooding to ensure our city remains safe and liveable. City Plan identifies flood risk from the Brisbane River, creeks/waterways and overland flow on the Flood overlay. The Flood overlay code seeks to ensure development minimises exposure of people and property to unacceptable risk from flood hazard in all flood events (based on land use compatibility with a flood risk) and mitigates the flood risk through its location, siting, design, construction and operation whilst maintaining amenity.	
TACP-066	The submitter recommends council require all high-rise sites have set-down and pick-up parking for at least six vehicles at one time as without them there are far too many cars double parking in traffic lanes.		
TACP-070	The submitter comments that building higher density housing, with zero lot boundaries, subdividing lots, cutting car parking spaces will make the city unlivable and unlikeable.		
TACP-076	The submitter raises concerns with the proposed amendment, in particular, the broader consequences the policy change may have upon the transport network and access to New Farm and Teneriffe peninsula. The submitter suggests Brunswick Street needs to be two lanes of flowing traffic in each direction to maintain capacity to the peninsula.		
TACP-086	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanding the regulated parking in inner city areas that are zoned for Low-medium density housing and are within close proximity to regular public transport or active transport corridors.</li> <li>• In regulated inner city parking areas, detached houses should only be allowed one on-street resident parking space to provide more equity between houses and units and recognise limited availability in the inner city.</li> <li>• Further community education is needed about the operation of regulated parking areas.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also notes changes in residential development trends and car ownership in Annerley in recent years, as well as increased public and active transport options as evidence of changing needs.</p>		
TACP-024 TACP-088	The submitter challenges the completeness and accuracy of materials provided, and that it does not meet the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> or Council's Community Engagement Policy.	Public consultation on the proposed amendment was undertaken for a 20-day period in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> .	No change
TACP-026	The submitter suggests not enough information has been provided to communities affected by the proposed change.		

Submission Reference	Submission Summary	Response	Change required
TACP-060	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and the public consultation period of 5 days is insufficient.	During this period, Council conducted multiple in-person and online events to enable the community to speak to Council about the proposed amendment.  Information on the proposed amendment was made available on Council's website, including interactive mapping, to assist the community to understand the purpose and effect of the proposed amendment, in line with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> .	
TACP-063	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and recommends conducting a longer public consultation with a proper analysis of costs and benefits instead of continuing with the proposed amendment.		
TACP-083	The submitter does not support the proposed amendment and believes there was a lack of meaningful community engagement.		

## 4.0 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.