



Consultation report

Mt Gravatt Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan Draft precinct plan – Tailored amendment package

Brisbane City Council

June 2026

This report has been produced by:

Neighbourhood Planning
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

Disclaimer: This document is solely for the purpose of facilitating precinct planning by City Planning and Design, City Planning and Economic Development Services, Brisbane City Council. This document does not represent approved Government policy and is subject to change.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Engagement Activities	5
3	Submissions by topic.....	6
3.1	General.....	6
3.2	Building Heights and Density	9
3.3	Built Form and Urban Design.....	15
3.4	Transport and Parking	27
3.5	Infrastructure and Services	38
3.6	Environment, Open Space and Sustainability	42
3.7	Economic and Small Business.....	49
3.8	Site-specific Zoning, Mapping and Code Provisions	50
3.9	Processes and Other Matters Raised	56
4	Conclusion	61

1 Introduction

Statutory public consultation on the draft Mt Gravatt Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan (draft precinct plan) as an amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) was undertaken from 14 November to 14 December 2025. Council received 109 properly made and 33 not properly made submissions. This document summarises all submissions received about the draft precinct plan. It also outlines how Council has considered these submissions in preparing the final Mt Gravatt Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan (the amendment).

The report is structured as follows:

- Section 1 – Introduction – overview of report;
- Section 2 – Engagement activities – details of the public consultation events and activities;
- Section 3 – Submissions by topic – details the submissions received during the public consultation period and provides a response to the issues; and
- Section 4 – Conclusion.

It is suggested that this report be read in conjunction with the draft precinct plan that was publicly notified. Download the draft precinct plan by visiting www.brisbane.qld.gov.au and searching 'Mt Gravatt Centre Suburban Renewal Precinct.'

Every submitter to the draft precinct plan has been allocated a submitter reference number. Submitters can find out about how Council has responded to their individual submission by searching the submission reference column in the tables in **section 3**.

It is important to note the amendment may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government as part of their consideration regarding adoption.

2 Engagement Activities

Community feedback is essential to shaping amendments to City Plan. Community feedback was collected via various events and activities undertaken by Council, including in person at Talk-to-a-planner sessions and by phone and email.

Specific events and activities supporting the public consultation period in late 2025 are outlined in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 Community engagement events and communication activities.

Method	Information
Newspaper notification	An electronic public notice appeared in <i>The Courier-Mail</i> on 14 November 2025.
Council website	Web pages providing details of the draft precinct plan were published and maintained from 14 November 2025 onwards.
Letters	Letters were sent to all residents, absentee owners and businesses in the precinct plan area.
Signage across the precinct plan area	10 A3 corflutes and 8 tri-fold pole wraps were placed on display across the area during public consultation.
Email updates	An email was sent to City Plan update subscribers on 14 November 2025.
Draft Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan Summary document	A summary document explaining the project, vision and key proposed changes was released online to support public consultation on the draft precinct plan.
Draft Suburban Renewal Precinct Plan Storymap	An online StoryMap showing a summary of the proposed changes, including interactive maps of sub-precincts, zones, building heights and proposed improvements to places was prepared to support public consultation on the draft precinct plan.
Talk-to-a planner sessions	Wednesday 3 December 2025 (2 sessions) – Community Hall at the Mt Gravatt Showgrounds.
	Saturday 6 December 2025 (1 session) – Community Hall at the Mt Gravatt Showgrounds.

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.

3.1 General

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
002, 003, 005, 006, 008, 017, 027, 030, 031, 043, 059, 060, 064, 077, 101, 121, 134, 138, 142	Submitters support key aspects of the plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the uplift and growth provided in the precinct; • the balance of preservation and growth of the plan; • the revitalisation and rejuvenation of underutilised sites and areas of the precinct; and • the provision of greater housing choice and diversity to support people at different life stages. 	Support noted. In response to feedback the amendment proposes changes to building heights and design provisions, as outlined in the sections below. The amendment continues to facilitate renewal outcomes consistent with City Plan, while supporting housing choice, diversity and well-designed development.	No change.
004, 009, 010, 011, 018, 022, 026, 028, 031, 032, 033, 037, 041, 045, 046, 048, 049, 050, 053, 066, 079, 081, 082, 085, 087, 093, 100, 101, 115, 123, 126, 130, 131, 137, 139	Submitters are supportive of the plan, in part, with refinement to elements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduction of proposed heights; • improvements to the built form provisions; • upgrades required to public and active transport; and • upgrades to infrastructure to support the future growth. 	Support noted. The amendment provides for additional housing choice and employment generating activity within a well-serviced centre location with proximity to public transport services along Logan Road. Building heights: The amendment proposes reductions to maximum building heights in key locations, as detailed in the following sections. Built form: The amendment refines built form provisions to achieve high-quality design outcomes, including slender tower forms, subtropical design and active frontage requirements to support high street activity and manage interface outcomes.	Change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>Public and active transport: The amendment supports development in locations with access to public transport and promotes improved walkability/cycling connectivity. Delivery of specific public and active transport upgrades is progressed through relevant transport agencies and Council programs.</p> <p>Infrastructure: Council’s Local government infrastructure plan identifies planned trunk infrastructure to support growth. Any future refinement to trunk infrastructure planning to respond to additional demand will be considered through future LGIP amendments and infrastructure planning processes.</p>	
<p>013, 014, 035, 036, 039, 056, 061, 067, 073, 074, 075, 078, 080, 084, 086, 088, 089, 090, 092, 097, 099, 104, 105, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 117, 118, 119, 122, 125, 128, 129, 132</p>	<p>Submitters do not support the plan with specific concerns relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts upon environmental values of the area; • lack of public and active transport upgrades; and • the lack of infrastructure upgrades. 	<p>Council acknowledges the concerns raised in relation to environmental values, public and active transport, and infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Environmental values: Potential impacts on environmental values are managed through City Plan’s zones and overlays, including the Biodiversity areas overlay and Waterway corridors overlay. The amendment promotes place-based greening, landscaping and subtropical design outcomes.</p> <p>Public and active transport upgrades: The amendment provides a land use and built form framework that supports development in locations with access to existing public transport and promotes improved walkability/cycling connectivity (including through finer grain connections such as arcades/alleys where identified). Delivery of specific transport infrastructure upgrades is progressed through Council and relevant transport agencies’ programs.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>Infrastructure upgrades: Trunk infrastructure planning and delivery is managed through Council's Local government infrastructure plan and other servicing agencies' networks. Any refinement to trunk infrastructure planning to respond to additional demand generated by future development will be considered through future Local government infrastructure plan amendments and infrastructure planning processes.</p>	
035, 039, 063	<p>Submitters question why the suburb has been prioritised over other areas and whether similar changes are proposed for locations such as Carindale, Stones Corner, Woolloongabba, Greenslopes, Buranda or Holland Park.</p>	<p>Mt Gravatt Centre has been prioritised due to its strategic location along the Logan Road corridor, its high level of accessibility, and its significant long-term potential for renewal and redevelopment. Mt Gravatt East and Mt Gravatt Central are also identified as Growth Nodes in City Plan, where more intensive mixed-use development is anticipated to support population growth, housing choice and centre-based activity in a coordinated and sustainable manner.</p> <p>A precinct plan has been completed for Stones Corner, and Council is currently preparing precinct plans for other centres across Brisbane, including Wynnum, Alderley, Sandgate, Chermside and Upper Mt Gravatt.</p>	No change.

3.2 Building Heights and Density

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
001, 004, 007, 010, 011, 013, 014, 020, 035, 036, 037, 039, 040, 041, 044, 045, 047, 054, 057, 058, 061, 062, 067, 071, 073, 074, 075, 076, 078, 080, 083, 084, 086, 088, 089, 090, 091, 092, 093, 094, 095, 096, 097, 099, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 125, 126, 128, 129, 132, 135, 136	Submitters oppose the proposed building heights and/or increased densities for the precinct due to concerns regarding one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current zoning allows for sufficient uplift and housing; • the changes are unsympathetic to the local identity and character; • loss of views and sight lines to Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve; • excessive building bulk and scale; • loss of subtropical character; • increase of traffic congestion and car parking overflow; • safety and visibility risks, including an increase of crime; • overshadowing of existing homes and loss of natural light, breezes and privacy; • loss of existing detached dwellings, decrease property values, and creation of adverse impacts on existing housing; • will provide inappropriate housing typologies for the local market/demographics; • new taller buildings will impact on wind flow and create wind tunnels; • the changes facilitate spot zoning of sites; 	The proposed building heights and densities in the draft precinct plan were informed by City Plan’s Strategic framework and by the ShapingSEQ 2023 Regional Plan. These planning frameworks support higher-density, mixed-use development within well-serviced centres and corridors to accommodate population growth, housing choice and employment opportunities. <p>In response to community feedback, changes are proposed to advertised building heights in key locations, as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mt Gravatt East core sub-precinct (NPP-005a): maximum proposed building heights have been reduced from 12 storeys to 10 storeys through changes to the proposed building height table; • Mt Gravatt central residential sub-precinct (NPP-002c) – Lauder Street, Selborne Street, Raffles Street (southern side) and Creek Road: maximum proposed building heights have been reduced from 8 storeys to 5 storeys for identified properties through a zone change. Land in this location is proposed to be retained in the Medium density residential zone (current City Plan zone) rather than the advertised High density residential zone. As a result of this zone change, proposed sub-precinct NPP-002c has been removed in this location; • Mt Gravatt central residential sub-precinct (NPP-002c) – Springwood Street, Lauder Street and Selborne Street: maximum proposed building heights 	Change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on environmentally sensitive areas; • displaces people in affordable housing and lower income groups; and • relationship with the proposed City Plan amendments for More Homes Sooner and impact on new areas proposed to be changed to the Low-medium density residential zone. 	<p>have been reduced from 8 storeys to 5 storeys through a zone change for identified properties. The zone for properties in this part of the sub-precinct has been changed from High density residential (as advertised) to Medium density residential (currently City Plan zone is Low-medium density residential (2 or 3 storeys zone mix)). As a result of the zone change, sub-precinct (NPP-002c) has been removed in this location; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mt Gravatt central mixed-use frame sub-precinct (NPP-002b) – Tenby Street: maximum proposed building heights have been reduced from 10 storeys to 8 storeys for those parcels fronting Tenby Street through amendments to the building height table. <p>City Plan includes assessment provisions that also manage building bulk, scale, setbacks and interface outcomes. In addition, the amendment includes refined built form controls to promote slender tower forms (i.e. through maximum tower site cover, width and separation distances) and enhanced subtropical design outcomes through a green plot ratio. Landmark sites and publicly accessible plazas are also required to incorporate deep planting to improve amenity and microclimate outcomes.</p> <p>Traffic, transport, safety and infrastructure impacts associated with development are assessed and managed through City Plan’s development assessment framework, infrastructure planning mechanisms and the programs of Council and relevant State agencies.</p> <p>The More Homes, Sooner amendment package proposes changes to the Low-medium density residential</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>zone provisions in City Plan to support additional homes in suitable locations. The proposed changes relating to building heights, lot sizes and other built form and design requirements for residential development in the More Homes, Sooner amendment package also propose to expand the areas in which smaller lots can be created in the Low density residential zone. Consultation on this amendment closed on 20 March 2026. It is scheduled to be adopted and effective in City Plan in mid-late 2026.</p>	
<p>004, 014, 037, 040, 041, 057, 059, 060, 061, 062, 064, 067, 069, 086, 095, 098, 099, 100, 107, 116, 121, 123, 141</p>	<p>Submitters suggest a range of alternative building heights including potential increases, reductions or maintenance of current heights, including:</p> <p>Proposed increases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase heights from 3 to 5 storeys for properties between Raffles Street and Grenfell Street, and in the area bordered by Creek Road, Dykes Street and Broadwater Road; • increase the height for sites located within the Mt Gravatt central core sub-precinct (NPP-002a) to 20 storeys; • increase the height of all Low-medium density residential zoned land where adjoining open space and community facilities to 5 storeys; • increase the heights of all Low-medium density residential and Medium density residential zoned land; <p>Proposed reductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce maximum height to 8 or 10 storeys for the sites at the corner of 	<p>Submitters have suggested a range of alternative building heights across the precinct, including proposed increases, reductions and retention of existing height limits. In response to submissions, no increases to maximum building heights above those advertised in the draft precinct plan are proposed. Changes post consultation propose targeted reductions to maximum advertised building heights in key locations, as detailed earlier in this section.</p> <p>The amendment continues to support growth and renewal within the centre in a manner consistent with City Plan’s Strategic framework.</p>	<p>Change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>Logan Road and Creek Road rather than 16 storeys, given the surrounding topography and nearby suburban streets;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limit the maximum building height along Logan Road in front of Berge Street to 6 storeys; • reduce heights along Logan Road and Creek Road to a maximum of 8 storeys; • reduce proposed 8 storey areas to 6 storeys; • reduce the height for the street block around the former Scurrs building to 3 storeys; • reduce the heights across the precinct to a mixture of 3, 5, 8 or 10 storeys at different locations; and • only allow intensification to occur in the core or along Logan Road. <p>Retain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retain all current height limits; • retain the current heights at 2 storeys for the area between Mountain Street and High Street adjoining the Mt Gravatt Reserve; • retain current heights of 5 storeys in the Mt Gravatt central precinct (NPP-002). 		
<p>030, 036, 061, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 086, 089, 090, 097, 099, 121</p>	<p>Submitters raise concerns about specific proposed building height transitions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid abrupt height differences between High density residential zone 	<p>Council has reviewed submissions and in response, proposes targeted reductions to building heights to provide a more graduated interface with surrounding low-rise areas, as detailed earlier in this section.</p>	<p>Change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>land and properties in the Low-medium density residential zone when redevelopment may not occur for a long period of time e.g. 8 to 16 storey towers located adjacent to low-rise housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid 8 storey buildings next to 2 and 3 storeys (which does not provide for a gradual transition) such as in Lauder Street, Bothwell Street, Wardle Street and surrounding low-rise areas; • provide stronger built form controls to ensure development is context sensitive, e.g. a 2-3 storey limit within 10m of the Low density residential zone; • reconsider the maximum building heights for a landmark site when it adjoins a High density residential zoned site; • enforce transitional heights where neighbouring low-rise buildings are unlikely to develop within 20 years; and • remove excessive height allowances from transition sensitive and steeply sloping sites. 	<p>City Plan also manages building height transitions between centres either sharing a common boundary or fronting a minor road that is opposite premises in the Low–medium density residential zone, Low density residential zone or Character residential zone, but not the Medium density residential zone.</p> <p>These provisions require buildings to be setback at appropriate building heights from existing suburban development by ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building height within 10m of the common boundary or fronting the minor road is no more than 1 storey of the residential development; and • building height within 20m of the common boundary or fronting the minor road is no more than 2 storeys of the residential development. <p>City Plan also manages building height transitions through the Multiple dwelling code, Retirement and residential care facility code, Special purpose code and Specialised centre code.</p>	
036, 061, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097, 118, 119	Submitters request to have the heights of buildings stated in metres rather than storeys.	City Plan expresses maximum building heights using both storeys and/or metres above ground level. The amendment uses storeys to describe building heights to clearly communicate intended built form outcomes at a precinct scale, while allowing flexibility in detailed building design.	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
064, 082, 100, 121	<p>Submitters support the landmark sites to provide additional development potential.</p> <p>A submitter supports the designation of 48 Creek Road as a landmark site and seeks the inclusion of the properties at 1478, 1480, 1484, 1484A, 1484B, 1484C and 1486 Logan Road as part of the landmark designation.</p> <p>Incentives should also be included in the plan to encourage the amalgamation of the smaller adjacent sites fronting Creek Road into a larger landholding with the landmark site with an amendment to note that the same maximum building height of the landmark site should apply to the whole of the amalgamated site.</p>	<p>Support noted. The amendment identifies 48 Creek Road as a landmark site within the Mt Gravatt central core sub-precinct (NPP-002a), with a maximum building height of 16 storeys. This designation reflects the site's ability to accommodate buildings or development that can attain citywide prominence through a combination of notable architectural excellence, siting and location.</p> <p>Land outside the mapped landmark site, including properties fronting Logan Road in NPP-002a, is proposed to retain a lower maximum building height of 12 storeys. This approach supports an appropriate transition in building height and scale across the precinct and responds to surrounding context and interface considerations.</p>	No change.
036	<p>Submitter recommends additional measurable criteria that require demonstration of commensurate public benefit for height bonuses on landmark sites.</p>	<p>Provisions included in the amendment require development on landmark sites to provide high quality subtropical design elements, public artwork, creative lighting and publicly accessible open space, with some of the landmark sites also having requirements for plazas.</p>	No change.

3.3 Built Form and Urban Design

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
037, 123	Submitters express support for proposed setbacks as well as design controls (i.e. podium and tower design).	Support noted.	No change.
011, 036, 041, 067, 069, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097, 108, 115	<p>Submitters raise concerns about proposed setback provisions and suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased setbacks in higher density areas and along Logan Road; • maintaining a minimum separation distance of 20m along Logan Road where buildings reach or exceed 5 storeys; • increased setbacks to allow for additional landscaping and subtropical planting; or • increased setbacks where neighbouring sites are unlikely to develop within the next 20 years. 	<p>The amendment includes built form provisions that promote slender building outcomes through tower site cover, tower width, minimum separation distances and setback provisions. Building height transitions are also provided for through the Centre or mixed use code, Multiple dwelling code, Retirement and residential care facility code, Special purpose code and Specialised centre code.</p> <p>Setback provisions in the amendment have been changed to align with the Centre or mixed use code or the Multiple dwelling code.</p>	Change.
121	<p>Submitter raises concerns about the relevance of building height transition provisions for development sharing a side and rear boundary with residential land with increased maximum building heights within the residential sub-precinct. The submitter recommends changes to the building height transitions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • require a minimum 4m side boundary setback where properties adjoin the Low-medium density residential zone; • require a minimum 10m rear boundary setback where properties adjoin the Low-medium density residential zone; and 	<p>City Plan manages building height transitions at interfaces between centres and residential areas through a range of assessment provisions, including the Centre or mixed use code, Multiple dwelling code, Retirement and residential care facility code, Special purpose code and Specialised centre code.</p> <p>The Centre or mixed use code provisions require buildings to be setback at appropriate building heights from existing development adjoining or opposite a minor road in the Low-medium density residential zone, Low density residential zone or Character residential zone by ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building height within 10m of the common boundary or fronting the minor road is no more than 1 storey of the residential development; and 	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> establishing a maximum total straight wall length of 25m where adjoining the Low-medium density residential zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> building height within 20m of the common boundary or fronting the minor road is no more than 2 storeys of the residential development. <p>The amendment does not propose additional side or rear setback distances beyond those already established by City Plan.</p>	
<p>073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 088, 089, 090, 095, 097, 103, 137</p>	<p>Submitters provide feedback relating to design provisions relating to tower and podium including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> podium heights of a maximum of 2 storeys where adjacent to residential zones; podium including publicly accessible open space with deep planting, canopy trees, shading and seating; towers less than 75% of the site width and greater separation next to low-rise dwellings coupled with landscaping protect privacy, sunlight and overall amenity; increased separation distances between podiums and towers along the western side of Logan Road, between Virgil Street and Shire Road to preserve views to the Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve; slender towers can cause adverse wind-tunnelling impacts. <p>A submitter also raised concern about the overreliance of podium and tower typology as a design control rather than manage the cumulative impacts of building heights</p>	<p>The amendment includes built form provisions that promote podium and tower outcomes in higher intensity sub-precincts. These provisions are intended to manage building bulk and scale and improve streetscape amenity.</p> <p>To achieve slender tower outcomes, the amendment includes acceptable outcomes that limit tower width to no more than 75% of site width or a maximum of 30m in any direction, caps tower site cover to 50%, and specifies minimum tower separation distances of 10m. These measures seek to manage cumulative impacts and support access to daylight and breezes, and assist in managing overlooking and bulk.</p> <p>The Subtropical building design planning scheme policy also provides further information for the design of podiums, subtropical planting and landscaping.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	resulting in visual dominance, loss of outlook and broader impacts for residents.		
036	Submitter recommends plot ratio and site cover are enforced as per the provisions in the draft precinct plan.	Plot ratio controls were deleted from the draft precinct plan advertised for community consultation. Building height limits, site cover, setbacks, tower separation and other built form provisions are used collectively to manage development bulk and scale.	No change.
121	Submitter supports the removal of plot ratio and land mix controls within the plan.	Support noted.	No change.
064	Submitter recommends removing the restrictive site cover and setback requirements to allow for additional building floor area and increased dwelling yield including allowing for a maximum tower site cover above 50%.	The draft precinct plan includes site cover and setback provisions to achieve slender building forms and manage the intensity, bulk and scale of development within higher-density areas. A maximum tower site cover of 50% is intended to support access to daylight, natural ventilation and breezes, reduce building bulk, and improve amenity outcomes for streets, public spaces and adjoining development.	No change.
005, 008, 027, 032, 036	Submitters express support for emphasising the local character and a vibrant village feel through active uses, including cafes, restaurants, and dining.	Support noted.	No change.
060, 095	Submitters support the provision of high street and subtropical boulevard outcomes along Logan Road to create more pedestrian focused design and requests clarification regarding the delivery of design elements associated with improvements (e.g. changes must be associated with a reduction in speed limits and removal of on-street parking). Landmark sites should also be required to satisfy all elements of the Subtropical building design planning scheme policy.	<p>The amendment identifies most of Logan Road as a Subtropical boulevard within the Streetscape hierarchy overlay. Design guidance for streetscape outcomes is provided through the overlay code and Council's Infrastructure design planning scheme policy. The delivery and staging of specific streetscape improvements is progressed through Council's infrastructure planning and is not directly managed through the amendment.</p> <p>The amendment also identifies primary and secondary active frontages which operate alongside the Centre or mixed use code. Together, these provisions support a</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>more pedestrian-focused high-street environment through building orientation, ground-level activation and improved interface with the public realm.</p> <p>Development on landmark sites is subject to additional design requirements through the amendment and City Plan provisions. Landmark site developments are required to demonstrate a high standard of design quality and public realm contribution, including the provision of high quality subtropical design elements, shading, deep planting and layered landscaping.</p>	
052, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097, 092, 105, 137	<p>Submitters raise concerns and provide comments about the requirement of 10% for publicly accessible open space on landmark sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proportion is insufficient for the role and function within a centre; • connected and visible to Logan Road or Creek Road, offer clear, unrestricted public access at all times; • providing requirements clarifying delivery of either amalgamated or fragmented space on development sites; and • providing access and safety (i.e. control of CCTV) for publicly accessible open space on private land. 	<p>The requirement for a minimum of 10% publicly accessible open space on landmark sites in the amendment is to ensure development on these sites makes a contribution to the centre’s public realm, pedestrian network and open space. The amendment requires that these areas are sited at key intersections or site entrances along either Logan Road or Creek Road.</p>	No change.
064, 121	<p>Submitters request amendments to the requirement of 10% for publicly accessible open space on landmark sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recommending removal of this requirement for publicly accessible open space on landmark sites; and 	<p>Landmark sites are identified due to their strategic role as prominent locations within the centre. Council has considered submissions requesting the removal or modification of the requirement for landmark sites to provide a minimum of 10% of the site as publicly accessible open space. This requirement has been retained, as it is intended to ensure landmark</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> amend requirement for a maximum of 1,250m² as the proportion of open space on large sites is disproportionate to the role and function of the centre and undermine development feasibility. 	<p>developments make a meaningful contribution to the centre’s public realm, pedestrian network and open space.</p>	
121	<p>Submitter requests changes to Figure b in the proposed amendment to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all properties at the northern side of the Logan Road/Creek Road intersection to be identified as a Potential development site and Landmark site with increased building heights; the location of privately owned, publicly accessible open space as well as through-road and pedestrian connections; pedestrian connectivity is indicatively nominated; and the location of primary and secondary active frontages. 	<p>The amendment identifies 48 Creek Road on the northern side of Creek Road as a landmark site within the Mt Gravatt central core sub-precinct (NPP-002a), with a maximum building height of 16 storeys. This designation reflects the site’s ability to accommodate buildings or development that can attain citywide prominence through a combination of notable architectural excellence, siting and location.</p> <p>Land outside the mapped landmark site, including properties fronting Logan Road in NPP-002a, is proposed to retain a lower maximum building height of 12 storeys. This approach supports an appropriate transition in building height and scale across the precinct and responds to surrounding context and interface considerations. The locations of plazas, local road connections and arcades shown in Figure b are indicative only, with detailed outcomes to be determined through a future structure plan in accordance with the Structure planning planning scheme policy. Secondary active frontages at this site along Creek Road have been retained to support street-level activation.</p> <p>For consistency within City Plan, “potential development site” will be renamed “key development site”.</p>	Change.
036, 092	<p>Submitters support the inclusion of shaded plazas on key development sites within the draft precinct plan but raised concerns, including:</p>	<p>Support noted. The draft precinct plan identifies that high-quality, privately provided plazas be integrated into key development sites identified in Figure b and Figure e, which will be publicly accessible and incorporate</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not supporting developers delivering plazas and requests Council acquiring the land as public open space; and identifying them on development sites with maximum building heights of 12 and 16-storey, contradicting intended function for publicly accessible plazas. 	subtropical, shaded open spaces available for use 24 hours a day, seven days a week.	
005, 008, 011, 036, 041, 050, 073, 074, 075, 080, 082, 084, 089, 090, 097, 098, 100, 104, 138	Submitters support integration of green spaces, deep planting, green plot ratio, subtropical landscaping, green infrastructure, improved shading and sustainable design.	Support noted.	No change.
036, 056, 061, 064, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097, 131	<p>Submitters raise concerns about the draft precinct plan’s deep planting provisions and identify several measures to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increasing to a minimum requirement of 20% deep planting; mandating minimum soil volumes and depths for large canopy trees; requiring a proportion of large mature tree species for developments of five storeys or more; enforcing long-term maintenance, irrigation and replacement planting; prohibiting substitution of deep planting with vertical greenery unless equivalent outcomes are independently verified; publishing compliance reports on green plot ratio and deep-planting delivery; preserving and protecting mature trees on development sites; 	<p>The Centre or mixed use code and Multiple dwelling code include minimum deep planting requirements of 10% of the site area on specified development sites. These requirements support the retention and protection of existing significant vegetation and enable the establishment of large subtropical shade trees that contribute to urban cooling and amenity outcomes.</p> <p>The draft precinct plan builds on these outcomes by introducing a green plot ratio of 25%, which recognises deep planting areas while also allowing a range of complementary green infrastructure elements, including green walls, green facades, rooftop gardens and podium-level planting. This approach provides flexibility in how greening outcomes are achieved, while retaining deep planting as a key contributor to achieving effective landscape and microclimate benefits.</p> <p>Further guidance is provided through the Subtropical building design planning scheme policy, which encourages development to respond to Brisbane’s subtropical climate. This includes measures to reduce</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing for alternative greening mechanisms; and addressing the urban heat island effect sufficiently. 	urban heat, enhance shade, improve microclimate conditions and minimise reliance on artificial heating and cooling through integrated landscape design, building orientation and built form responses.	
121	Submitter requests the draft precinct plan clarify that any deep planting delivered within the plaza is included within the standard 10% deep planting site requirement.	The draft precinct plan has been amended to include a new note clarifying that deep planting provided within plazas (identified in Figure b or Figure e), contributes toward meeting the 10% deep planting requirement under the Centre or mixed use code.	Change.
064	Submitter recommends that the minimum green plot ratio percentage of 25% should be reduced.	<p>The 25% green plot ratio has been included to ensure development contributes to a strong subtropical landscape setting that softens the bulk, scale and form of built elements and enhances streetscape and pedestrian amenity within the centre.</p> <p>Retaining this minimum green plot ratio is intended to support urban cooling, improve microclimate outcomes and reinforce the centre’s subtropical character, particularly in higher-intensity areas. Areas of a site used for deep planting, typically comprising 10% of the site area, contribute toward achieving the required green plot ratio.</p>	No change.
006, 008, 030, 037, 048, 060, 082, 114, 138	Submitters support the arcades, alleys, plaza, the high street and/or local streets to improve connectivity and activation.	Support noted.	No change.
036, 048, 058, 071, 092, 100	<p>Submitters raise concerns with the operation and design of the arcades and alleys and propose the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve lighting that avoids spill onto residential dwellings; provide 24/7 public access; include active frontages and mandatory safety and security 	Arcades and alleys play an important role in enhancing the permeability, connectivity and vitality of the centre by providing convenient pedestrian links between streets, destinations and public spaces. These connections are delivered primarily through redevelopment of sites over time and may result in changes to site layouts, including the location of driveways and car parking.	Change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>measures to address existing crime issues and deter antisocial behaviour;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include appropriate building separation; • include pedestrian and pet-friendly amenities such as drinking water facilities and dog-waste provisions; • ensure they are well-ventilated and cool; and • ensure they provide for active transport mobility devices within the centre. 	<p>The draft precinct plan strengthens arcades and alleys by identifying new locations and introducing specific design requirements to improve safety, amenity and useability.</p> <p>In response to submissions, the arcade provisions in the amendment have been further refined to ensure they exclude bin storage areas, service driveways and parking areas within, or directly adjoining, arcades, reducing conflicts and improving pedestrian priority.</p> <p>City Plan’s Crime prevention through environmental design planning scheme policy also seeks to enhance visibility, promote passive surveillance and reduce opportunities for antisocial behaviour.</p>	
064	<p>Submitter recommends the reduction in the number of proposed local road connections, arcades, plazas and alleys to enhance the viability of new projects.</p>	<p>The amendment identifies indicative local road connections, arcades, plazas and alleys to improve amenity and connectivity. The location of these items has been informed through background research and urban design analysis. The indicative local road connection between Bothwell Street and Creek Road will assist in improving the local road network capacity.</p>	No change.
114	<p>Submitter requests the inclusion of additional arcades along Logan Road connecting it to Tenby Street and Bothwell Street.</p>	<p>The amendment identifies arcade connections between Logan Road and both Tenby Street and Bothwell Street, as shown in Figure b. These arcades are intended to improve pedestrian permeability and connectivity within the centre.</p>	No change.
098	<p>Submitter notes the plan discusses pedestrian arcades and alleys but does not address cycling infrastructure. Clarification is sought on whether bikes would be able to use these connections.</p>	<p>Arcades and alleys identified in the amendment are privately owned, publicly accessible pedestrian connections designed to prioritise pedestrian safety, comfort and amenity. Cycling infrastructure is guided by City Plan’s Bicycle network overlay, which identifies a Primary cycle route along Logan Road and additional Secondary and Local routes within the precinct.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
064	Submitter recommends the reduction of active frontages along Logan Road, Creek Road, Selborne Street and in the arcade between Logan Road and Bothwell Street.	<p>The draft precinct plan proposes active frontage designations along Logan Road, Selborne Street, and within the arcade connecting Logan Road and Bothwell Street. These designations support the precinct plan’s objectives to create a mixed-use village centre with a strong high-street experience, characterised by streets and arcades activated by a mix of ground-floor uses that enhance pedestrian amenity and centre vitality.</p> <p>Refinements are proposed in the amendment to reduce active frontage requirements in specific locations. The Active frontage – secondary designation shown in Figure b is to be removed from properties at 52, 56, 58, 60 and 62 Creek Road, which are now proposed to be zoned Medium density residential. The active frontage designation is also proposed to be partially removed along the indicative local road connection between Vulcan Street/Marlene Street and Creek Road, with the eastern side removed where it interfaces with the High density residential zone, while the western side connection where it interfaces with the District centre zone is retained.</p>	Change.
004, 060, 085	Submitters propose the extension of active frontages, especially along Logan Road between Nursery Road and Creek Road at least on one side of the road, to better define key streets and plazas as vibrant, lively and safe.	Active frontage locations have been established to reinforce key streets and plaza locations, support ground-level activation and passive surveillance, and promote a lively and safe centre environment. No further extension of active frontage requirements is proposed.	No change.
076, 112	Submitters are concerned the draft precinct plan lacks enough family-sized three-bedroom apartments. The focus on smaller studio and 1 bedroom units will not meet local needs and may discourage young families. Clarification is sought on	The amendment does not prescribe or regulate detailed dwelling mix outcomes, enabling the specific composition of dwelling types (including the number of bedrooms) to be determined at the development application stage. Car parking is also assessed at the development application	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	the intended mix of dwelling types, sizes and car parking provisions.	stage in accordance with City Plan’s parking requirements.	
014	Submitter opposes any heritage listing of properties that impose unreasonable constraints on property owners without delivering a clear community benefit.	The precinct plan area has one existing Local heritage place at 1381 Logan Road. No additional Local heritage places are proposed as part of the draft precinct plan.	No change.
092	Submitter expresses concern that the absence of traditional building character protections in Mt Gravatt East and Mt Gravatt Central leaves all buildings vulnerable to demolition, diminishing the local identity.	The Traditional building character overlay applies to protecting residential buildings constructed in 1946 or earlier that individually or collectively contribute to the traditional building character of the locality. The draft precinct plan, as advertised, proposed to remove 3 properties located at 6 and 8 Miriam Street and 16 Pickthorne Street from the overlay as they are not considered to form part of an intact streetscape.	No change.
005, 014, 030, 036, 067, 092, 100, 132	<p>Submitters raise concerns about the impact on local character, amenity and culture with submitters requesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protection of Mt Gravatt’s community assets, including the Mt Gravatt Showgrounds and Outlook Reserve; • protection of view corridors; • safeguarding vulnerable community members; • inclusion of measures to mitigate noise for residents and customers in the business areas; • preserving and expanding heritage, traditional building character and character protections to historic sites in the precinct, including Mt Gravatt Fire Station and inter and post-war shopfronts; • clearer evidence about how building form and articulation will protect 	<p>The amendment has had regard to local character, amenity and cultural values, while implementing the strategic intent for growth within a well-serviced centre.</p> <p>Community assets: The Mt Gravatt Showgrounds and Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve are located outside the draft precinct plan area. No changes to the planning provisions affecting these important community assets are proposed.</p> <p>Views: Key views towards local landmarks, including Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve, are experienced primarily along the Logan Road corridor and at key intersections. The amendment and City Plan include built form controls that manage building height, scale and siting. Slender tower forms, setbacks and separation distances are intended to reduce visual bulk and allow views between developments.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>vegetation, maintain views to Mt Gravatt, and ensure adequate solar access; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • details of how development will respond to topography. 	<p>Built form, vegetation and topography: Built form provisions within City Plan and the amendment require development to achieve an appropriate scale and form within the suburban context, with particular emphasis on slender buildings, articulation and setbacks. Landscaping requirements, including deep planting and layered subtropical landscaping, contribute to protecting and reinforcing green character, shade and microclimate outcomes. Development is also required to respond to solar access and topography, with site-specific design solutions assessed through the development application process.</p> <p>Amenity, noise and vulnerable communities: Amenity impacts, including noise, are managed through City Plan’s assessment framework. The Centre or mixed use code includes controls relating to hours of operation and noise emissions to protect the amenity of adjoining residents, while the Multiple dwelling code includes design and construction measures to minimise noise impacts on future occupants. These provisions apply to all development, regardless of tenure or occupant group, and are intended to safeguard residential amenity.</p> <p>Heritage: Within the precinct plan area, one Local heritage place at 1381 Logan Road is identified under City Plan’s Heritage overlay. No additional heritage places are proposed as part of the amendment.</p> <p>Character: The Traditional building character overlay applies to residential buildings constructed in 1946 or earlier that individually or collectively form an intact character streetscape. Most dwellings within the precinct plan area were constructed after 1946 and do not meet</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>these criteria. The overlay has been removed from 6 and 8 Miriam Street and 16 Pickthorne Street, as these buildings were assessed as not collectively contributing to an intact traditional character streetscape. No further inclusions or removals to the Traditional building character overlay are proposed.</p>	
036	<p>Submitter recommends the addition of accessibility standards within the public realm and private development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unobstructed footpaths; • disability parking; • seating and resting points; and • tactile and audible cues. 	<p>Accessibility and inclusive design within the precinct are addressed through a combination of Council policy, City Plan provisions and the development assessment framework. Council’s <i>A City for Everyone: Inclusive Brisbane Plan</i> provides a strategic framework to guide planning and design outcomes that support accessibility and inclusion across the city, including consideration of unobstructed pedestrian movement, seating and resting opportunities, and inclusive public spaces. City Plan also includes requirements to support accessibility within both the public realm and private development. These include provisions relating to footpath design, access, parking supply (including disability parking), and pedestrian amenity through the relevant assessment codes and infrastructure standards.</p> <p>In addition, the National Construction Code establishes minimum accessibility requirements for buildings, including standards informed by the Livable Housing Design Guidelines (Silver level).</p> <p>Detailed design matters such as tactile and audible cues, seating provision, path widths and gradients are addressed at the development application stage through compliance with these standards and policies, enabling site-specific consideration of inclusive and accessible design outcomes appropriate to each development.</p>	No change.

3.4 Transport and Parking

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
004, 011, 028, 035, 036, 037, 046, 050, 053, 054, 055, 058, 060, 063, 071, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 077, 080, 082, 083, 084, 085, 087, 089, 090, 092, 097, 098, 100, 101, 103, 104, 109, 110, 114, 115, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 133, 135, 136, 137, 142	<p>Submitters express concern about the lack of investment in public transport with requests for improvements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bus stops and interchange facilities; • line capacity and frequency of services; • east-west connections; • night bus services; • connections to hospitals, the busway and train stations; • road widening or dedicated bus priority lanes; • expanded park and ride facilities; • express buses to Westfield Mt Gravatt shopping centre and the city centre; • walking distances between bus stops; • connections to larger parks and green space; and • bus routes that operate the full length of Broadwater Road. 	<p>Public transport infrastructure and services within the precinct are delivered through a combination of Council-managed assets and Queensland Government responsibilities. Council manages existing bus stop assets. Upgrades to stops occur based on stop utilisation, available funding and against citywide priorities.</p> <p>The TransLink division of Department of Transport and Main Roads is responsible for funding and managing the bus network and the existing Holland Park - park and ride. Council recognises a need for improved bus services and will continue to work with the Queensland Government to advocate for service improvements.</p>	No change.
011, 019, 036, 046, 048, 051, 052, 054, 058, 060, 061, 062, 068, 073, 074, 075, 079, 080, 084, 089, 090, 092, 095, 097, 098, 100, 101, 105, 108, 109, 111, 115, 124, 126, 127, 131, 138, 140	<p>Submitters express concern about the lack of investment in active transport with requests for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completion of the footpath network including improved accessibility, wider footpaths and levelled footpaths; • additional street and raised crossings, refuges, and shorter signal crossing wait times; • provision of bike lanes on Logan Road, Creek Road, Bothwell Street and Broadwater Road; 	<p>Council is committed to encouraging public and active transport. Future planned road upgrades include provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle infrastructure to support these outcomes.</p> <p>Suggested footpath and street infrastructure improvements are noted. They are considered as part of Council’s ongoing infrastructure upgrade investigations that are reviewed and proposed on an annual basis through Council’s budget.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved connections between residential, retail, commercial businesses, schools, the city centre, Westfield Mt Gravatt shopping centre, the Veloway, Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve, Showgrounds and Geoff Toakley Park; • provision of pedestrian overpasses; • more end of trip facilities and bike parking; • separated and protected bike lanes; • provision of traffic calming, reduced parking and improved streetscape design to support alfresco dining; • pedestrian protection measures and slower traffic speeds near Logan Road and Creek Road; • using vacant lots as new active transport connections; and • improved walkability to green space. 	<p>Council will investigate the request for additional pedestrian crossings in Mt Gravatt. Requests for any repairs required to specific infrastructure, including footpaths, should be directed to Council’s Contact Centre on 3403 8888, or online at https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/about-council/contact-council;</p> <p>Bikeways are shown in the Bicycle network overlay in City Plan and implementation is considered as part of Council’s ongoing bikeway infrastructure investigations.</p> <p>End of trip facilities and bike parking rates are set in City Plan.</p> <p>Roadway design takes into consideration all forms and modes of transport to meet the future needs of the community. This addresses allocations, facilities, treatments and control measures in accordance with current road planning and design guidelines.</p> <p>New pedestrian links can be provided through redevelopment for lots that are currently developed or vacant.</p>	
005, 006, 036, 064, 068, 127, 137, 138	Submitters support the improvements to and integration of active and public transport.	Support noted.	No change.
006, 011, 016, 061, 095, 098, 101	<p>Submitters identified specific active travel improvements within the draft precinct plan area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedestrian links between the precinct and Mt Gravatt Showgrounds; • multi-modal (i.e. pedestrian, cycling and e-mobility) green spine through Mt 	<p>Council recognises the range of active travel improvements identified by submitters and supports enhanced walking, cycling and inclusive access outcomes within and around the precinct over time.</p> <p>Mt Gravatt Showgrounds is located outside the precinct plan area and is subject to separate planning and</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>Gravatt East precinct with the possibility of extending this route east of Glindemann Park to Marshall Road;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedestrian zone along part of the plan area and redirecting vehicles to rear streets; • signalised pedestrian crossing on Logan Road between Invermore Street and Selborne Street; • pedestrian-friendly neighbourhood streets with shading, traffic calming to help reducing rat-running and support children’s activity and community use; • incorporating safe drop off areas in the road corridors to accommodate older generations accessing services and amenities in the centre; and • cycle-friendly streets as alternative routes to Logan Road providing safe and efficient cycling access with potential routes including Rise Street, Gordon Parade, Invermore Street, Howsan Street, Springwood Street, Selborne Street and Bothwell Street. 	<p>development arrangements. Opportunities to improve pedestrian and cycling connections between the precinct and surrounding destinations, including major parks and community facilities, are considered through Council’s broader active transport and infrastructure planning programs.</p> <p>Logan Road upgrades for walkability will be delivered as part of any future Council corridor upgrades and private developments to meet streetscape hierarchy requirements.</p> <p>Footpath and street infrastructure improvements are considered as part of Council’s ongoing infrastructure upgrade investigations that are reviewed and proposed on an annual basis through Council’s budget. Council will investigate the request for additional pedestrian crossings in Mt Gravatt. Requests for any repairs required to specific infrastructure, including footpaths, should be directed to Council’s Contact Centre on 3403 8888.</p> <p>Roadway designing takes into consideration all forms and modes of transport to meet the needs of the environment and community going forward. This addresses allocations, facilities, treatments and control measures in accordance with current road planning and design guidelines. Traffic flows and speeds would be addressed during planning phases, and treatments designed to address these types of concerns are included to ensure suitability.</p> <p>Developing cycle-friendly streets is a consideration in the planning for the local street network. The needs of all</p>	

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		community members are included within existing road planning and design guidelines and current road laws. Access to parking and loading zone resources would be included in both private and public redevelopment projects	
014	Submitter opposes inclusion of bike lanes along arterial roads due to increased congestion concerns.	Bikeways are shown in the Bicycle network overlay in City Plan and implementation is considered as part of Council's ongoing bikeway infrastructure investigations.	No change.
098	Submitter raised concerns for requiring developers responsible for cycling infrastructure shifting responsibility from Council, creating inconsistent delivery at different times not supporting formation of a connected cycling network.	Delivery of the bikeway network is primarily the responsibility of Council and is not expected to occur as part of private development within the draft precinct plan area.	No change.
072, 127	Submitters support the indicative local road connections on key development sites, particularly between Bothwell Street and Marlene Street to Creek Road.	Support noted.	No change.
030, 044, 058, 065, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097	<p>Submitters oppose the indicative local road connections with concerns they will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • congestion along neighbourhood street intersections; • reduced developable land; • limited pedestrian benefit; • the demolition of existing retail uses; • linking small residential streets to major roads, increasing congestion near Creek Road, Nursery Road and Logan Road which are already affected by school traffic. <p>Submitters also identified concerns about proposed indicative local road connections</p>	Indicative local network connections have been identified in the draft precinct plan to improve local access. The figures in the draft precinct plan identifying these connections form part of the Neighbourhood plan code. Non-local traffic would be managed by way of local area traffic management planning and which could include speed restrictions to disincentivise and mitigate rat running.	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	cannot be mandated on the key development sites as they are not required in the neighbourhood plan code.		
019	Submitter supports an upgrade at the Logan Road and Nursery Road intersection.	Support noted.	No change.
006	Submitter supports the gateway investigation areas for the intersections between Logan Road, Selborne Street, and Shire Road/Mt Gravatt Outlook Drive to alleviate safety hazards and congestion.	Support noted.	No change.
010, 011, 013, 014, 018, 022, 030, 034, 035, 036, 039, 040, 044, 048, 050, 051, 053, 054, 055, 058, 062, 071, 073, 074, 075, 076, 078, 080, 082, 083, 084, 086, 087, 088, 089, 090, 094, 096, 097, 098, 099, 100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 123, 125, 128, 130, 132, 135, 136, 139	<p>Submitters raise concern about the increase in congestion and traffic flow due to higher densities and an increase in population. Submitters also raise concerns that the proposed height increases do not consider the needs of and impacts upon the local schools and nearby residents, in particular ease of access, infrastructure needs, congestion, safety and emergency access and evacuation routes.</p> <p>New development may fragment residential areas and lead to increased traffic and on-street parking.</p> <p>Neighbourhood streets and culs-de-sac should not be upzoned without traffic management solutions.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised about rat running in local streets, traffic congestion around turning lanes onto Logan Road, pedestrian safety, and the narrowness of existing</p>	In response to future growth, the need for a local area traffic management project will be investigated for Mt Gravatt, with a view to improving the operation, safety and amenity of the precinct. This could include improvements such as intersection upgrades, pedestrian crossings, kerb build outs and speed reductions.	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>residential streets and their inability to accommodate increased density. Submitters request a yellow line on the hotel side of Creighton Street to improve two-way flow.</p>		
<p>009, 018, 030, 036, 060, 065, 079, 098, 124, 131</p>	<p>Submitters recommend upgrades to the local road network, including pedestrian crossings, narrowing widths and reduced speeds, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic calming, fewer car lanes, more street trees and reducing the speed limit of 50 km/h on Logan Road to create a more welcoming environment for pedestrians and local shoppers; • speed limit of 40 km/h along Logan Road from Nursery Road to Broadwater Road coupled with chicanes and lane narrowing and large canopy trees; • removal of on-street parking along Logan Road between Virgil Street and Shire Road and between Shire Road and Tudor Street for the inbound lane only to improve pedestrian visibility; • closure of Shire Road or Selborne Street from Logan Road to improve safety, congestion and traffic flow; • narrow walkways along neighbourhood streets to allow for street widening for ease of vehicle movement (including emergency services); and • road closures (with vehicle access for residential dwellings only) to deliver additional green open space within the 	<p>In response to future growth, the need for a local area traffic management project will be investigated for Mt Gravatt, with a view to improving the operation, safety and amenity of the precinct. This could include improvements such as intersection upgrades, pedestrian crossings, kerb build outs and speed reductions.</p> <p>Council plans to keep the four-lane configuration along Logan Road. Potential improvements include cycle tracks, verge widening, and vegetation planting.</p> <p>Improved outdoor dining can be achieved along Logan Road through development setbacks.</p> <p>Existing speed limits are not being changed as a part of this draft precinct plan. Residents may submit requests to Council on 3403 8888, or online at https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/about-council/contact#mail for the reduction of speed limits on local roads. Council will consider such requests with reference to the Department of Transport and Main Roads' Queensland Road Safety Technical User Volumes: Guide to Speed Management.</p> <p>The request regarding the removal of on-street parking along Logan Road has been noted. Footpath and street infrastructure improvements are considered as part of Council's ongoing infrastructure upgrade investigations</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>precinct, including Creighton Street (between Logan Road and Berge Street), Gowrie Street (between Logan Road and Tenby Street), and Bothwell Street.</p>	<p>that are reviewed and proposed on an annual basis through Council’s budget.</p> <p>Council will investigate the request for additional pedestrian crossings in Mt Gravatt. Requests for any repairs required to specific infrastructure, including footpaths, should be directed to Council’s Contact Centre on 3403 8888.</p> <p>For narrow walkways, the reduction of verge widths for vehicle pavement expansions is generally not supported. Parking restrictions and enforcement are typically utilised for narrow roadways. Any changes to the road network are always required to meet the current road planning and design guidelines. In conjunction with Queensland road rules, current and new road networks will always provide adequate emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Regarding road closures, local network connections are required to improve local access for all modes of travel. It is not considered best practice to close connections entirely; however, the design and use of access to side streets would be considered in accordance with road planning and design guidelines, within the planning and designs for the whole corridor.</p>	
<p>036, 048, 055, 058, 061, 063, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 080, 083, 084, 089, 090, 097, 105, 107, 109, 114, 115, 123, 125, 130, 133, 137, 139</p>	<p>Submitters raised concerns about the capacity of the existing road network and corridors to accommodate additional demand from vehicles associated with population growth from development considering existing congestion and difficult access including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M3 northbound and towards Moorooka; 	<p>Intersection and road connection concerns raised for the draft precinct plan are noted and are planned to be improved through gradual corridor improvements and major infrastructure projects over time. Planning and design of the whole corridor in line with road planning and design guidelines ensures turning facilities are adequate and function to meet demand requirements. The design and use of access to side streets would be</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marshall Road–Bapaume Road intersection; and • Marshall/Holland Road–Logan Road intersection. <p>Submitters also raised concerns about the capacity to accommodate additional vehicular access in specific locations within the draft precinct plan area where congestion already exists, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logan Road corridor without corresponding upgrades considering current levels of congestion; • turning lanes and access points off and on Logan Road subsequently increase the number of vehicles queuing to access side streets; • Lawn Street and Nursery Road will accommodate increased traffic, especially increased traffic caused by the nearby landmark site; • right turn opening on Logan Road into Gowrie Street; • entrance from Creek Road to the Mt Gravatt library with a narrow access coupled with closeness to left turn from Logan Road; and • right hand lane of Logan Road southbound queuing to turn into High Street because of recent development of food and drink outlet and service station uses. 	<p>considered within the planning and designs for the whole corridor.</p> <p>Access to the Council Library facility would be considered within the redevelopment of the Logan/Creek Roads intersection upgrade when planning and design commences in the future.</p> <p>Council is aware of the complexities associated with the other intersections identified by submitters. The design and use of access to these intersections would be considered within the planning and designs for the whole corridor. Current Queensland road rules are still applicable. Traffic control measures and parking restrictions can be reviewed and possibly revised on a case-by-case basis if required.</p>	
060	Submitter recommends a review of the Infrastructure design planning scheme	The recommendation of a review of the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy (IDPSP), to address the	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	policy to improve traffic calming, traffic diversion and pedestrian priority within the draft precinct plan area.	<p>matters raised in the submission, is noted. However, the IDPSP must be aligned with Austroad guidelines and Council standards and best practices. Any roadway changes as part of this draft precinct plan would consider traffic management and control measures to ensure the road network is designed to function safely and provide acceptable facilities to meet the community needs.</p> <p>Existing speed limits are not changed as a part of this draft precinct plan. Residents may submit requests to Council on 3403 8888, or online at https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/about-council/contact#mail for the reduction of speed limits on local roads. Council will consider such requests with reference to the Department of Transport and Main Roads' <i>Queensland Road Safety Technical User Volumes: Guide to Speed Management</i>.</p>	
036	Submitter requests construction management plans be mandated for major developments that detail traffic and parking issues during construction.	Construction management plans are incorporated into development application approvals and are not part of the amendment.	No change.
009, 011, 014, 015, 016, 020, 022, 030, 034, 036, 037, 039, 040, 042, 044, 045, 046, 048, 050, 051, 052, 054, 055, 058, 071, 072, 073, 074, 075, 080, 082, 084, 086, 088, 089, 090, 094, 096, 097, 098, 099, 100, 101, 103, 107, 111, 112, 113,	<p>Submitters raise concerns about a lack of car parking and with an increase of residential densities and commercial/retail activities there will be a resulting congestion on neighbourhood streets.</p> <p>Submitters raise the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the lack of on-street parking, central parking, street visibility issues, off-street undercover parking, and short term parking for businesses; 	<p>Council acknowledges submissions raising concerns about car parking availability and the potential for increased congestion on local streets as densities and activity increase within the centre.</p> <p>On-street parking is managed on a case-by-case basis. It is not possible for Council to guarantee allocation for residential private parking; therefore, residential vehicle storage is to be managed by the owner. <i>Transport Operations (Road Use Management – Road Rules) Regulations 2009</i>, the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Queensland road rules and local parking laws</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
<p>115, 117, 123, 125, 127, 129, 130</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need for increased minimum on-site parking rates such as at least two car parks per unit; • the lack of any public car parking strategy including for the park and ride facilities; • that car parking should be located at the rear of retail and commercial buildings; and • the need for a parking demand management strategy. <p>Suggestion from a submitter for the implementation of residential car parking permits in neighbouring residential streets and timed parking in commercial areas</p>	<p>address street visibility issues and assess conditions on a locational needs basis.</p> <p>Off-street parking and short-term parking is part of the design requirements for each development and assessed at the development application assessment stage. Minimum parking rates are specified in City Plan and reviewed separately at different points in time to ensure the operational design needs of development in the city are met.</p> <p>On-street parking is a finite resource which is balanced between the competing user groups as best as practicable. As density increases in all cities, private vehicle ownership must be balanced with the limitations of the available resources. High density areas require modal shift to function and to reduce congestion in most instances which is why such infrastructure is both desired and warranted.</p> <p>Current Council residential parking policies and localised parking regulations address the issue of car parking permits on a case-by-case basis.</p>	
<p>060, 064, 065, 121</p>	<p>Submitters provided feedback on proposed car parking rates and design provisions for development for multiple dwellings within the draft precinct plan area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rates and design provisions require basement car parking that impact upon development viability, and podium level car parking to be allowed as a viable design solution; 	<p>Off-street parking and short-term parking is part of the design requirements for each development and assessed at the development application assessment stage. Minimum parking rates are specified in City Plan and reviewed separately at different points in time to ensure the operational design needs of development in the city are met.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recommends relaxations to car parking rates for development on 55 Creek Road; • recommends updates to car parking rates to reflect contemporary planning practice for multiple dwellings close to public transport proposing a rate of 2 bedroom dwelling be adjusted from 2 spaces to 1 space per dwelling; and • recommends City frame car parking rates as specified in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy. 		
083	<p>Submitter is concerned that assumptions about reduced car parking use overlook matters such as steep terrain, climate and ageing residents, which limit active transport options and mean ongoing reliance on private vehicles and street parking.</p>	<p>Council recognises concerns that factors such as steep topography, subtropical climate and an ageing population can influence travel behaviour and may limit the ability of some people to rely solely on walking, cycling or public transport. These considerations are taken into account through City Plan’s parking standards, access requirements and the design of the road network to support a range of transport needs.</p> <p>At the same time, as centres accommodate higher residential densities and employment growth, transport planning seeks to balance private vehicle use with the finite capacity of the street and parking network, while improving access to alternative transport options where feasible. In well-serviced centres, this includes supporting a gradual shift toward a broader mix of travel modes to manage congestion and maximise the efficient use of available infrastructure.</p> <p>Parking provision, street design and traffic management are assessed at the development application stage and</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		through Council’s transport planning processes to ensure outcomes are responsive to local conditions, community needs and accessibility considerations.	

3.5 Infrastructure and Services

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
004, 010, 011, 014, 034, 036, 037, 047, 061, 086, 088, 089, 091, 092, 094, 096, 098, 099, 103, 104, 110, 116, 121, 125, 135, 138	Submitters express the need for infrastructure improvements to support and facilitate development, including the networks for electricity, water, sewerage, stormwater, gas and roads. Details about what is being provided, location and timeframes should be included in the plan to demonstrate how new infrastructure will support the growth.	<p>Council acknowledges submissions raising the need for timely and coordinated infrastructure to support growth within the precinct, including electricity, water, sewerage, stormwater, gas and road networks.</p> <p>Infrastructure planning and delivery are managed through a combination of Council and servicing authorities’ frameworks. Council’s Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) identifies the trunk infrastructure required to support forecast growth across Brisbane, including in centres such as Mt Gravatt. The LGIP outlines the type, servicing catchments and timing assumptions for trunk infrastructure, and is reviewed and updated regularly to respond to changes in growth demand.</p> <p>Other networks such as electricity, gas, telecommunications and parts of the road network are planned and delivered by the relevant servicing providers, including the Queensland Government, through separate statutory and business planning processes. The location, design and timing of infrastructure upgrades are informed by development demand, network capacity, funding availability and prioritisation across the city.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>The amendment does not deliver infrastructure directly or specify detailed timing for individual infrastructure upgrades. Instead, it establishes a land use and built form framework that informs future infrastructure planning by identifying where growth is expected and enabling Council and service providers to plan for coordinated investment over time. Detailed infrastructure provision and any required upgrades are assessed at the development application stage, including any conditions or contributions necessary to support additional demand.</p>	
036	<p>Submitter expresses need to coordinate growth with infrastructure delivery via an infrastructure staging plan to mandate infrastructure upgrades with associated development construction.</p>	<p>Development applications are assessed in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>, including relevant infrastructure servicing and infrastructure charging requirements. Infrastructure planning, sequencing and delivery are coordinated through Council’s Local government infrastructure plan and associated infrastructure planning and charging frameworks, which identify trunk infrastructure required to support anticipated growth across the city.</p>	No change.
100	<p>Submitter raises the need for improved access to local resource recovery and waste management facilities, including potential drop-off points for recyclables, containers and hard-to-recycle items.</p>	<p>Waste collection, recycling services and resource recovery facilities are planned and delivered through Council’s citywide waste management strategies and operational programs. The amendment does not identify or deliver specific waste or recycling facilities.</p>	No change.
036	<p>Submitter raises concerns about the lack of energy efficient and climate mitigation provisions/ strategic intent and recommends the following outcomes be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new development to address energy efficiency through solar panels, battery storage, and high performance glazing; and 	<p>Energy efficiency standards, solar installation and electric vehicle charging requirements are regulated through the National Construction Code and Queensland building legislation. City Plan supports climate responsive design through the Subtropical building design planning scheme policy. The draft precinct plan does not introduce additional building performance standards beyond these frameworks.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> facilities for electric vehicle charging. 		
004, 133	Submitters raise concerns about the lack of public realm upgrades, and wider, more generous streetscapes. These should be initiated and led by Council.	Council acknowledges the submitters' concerns about public realm upgrades and improved streetscape design. Public realm and streetscape upgrades on public land are planned and delivered through Council's citywide capital works, streetscape and maintenance programs, which prioritise works across the city based on need, funding availability and strategic outcomes. The draft precinct plan does not allocate funding or establish new upgrade programs, as these matters are considered through Council's budget and capital works processes.	No change.
011, 036, 056, 077, 082	Submitters express the need for additional community facilities, including schools, within the precinct area.	<p>Council acknowledges the submitters' comments regarding the need for additional community facilities, including schools, to support a growing population. Once the plan is finalised, Council will refer dwelling density projections associated with the draft precinct plan to relevant State agencies for consideration as part of their future service and infrastructure planning.</p> <p>Council-owned community facilities are planned and delivered through separate strategies and capital works programs and are not provided through precinct planning provisions.</p>	No change.
092	Submitter notes that several proposed community space locations appear to be on privately owned land.	The Community facilities zone includes activities, whether publicly or privately owned, such as schools, hospitals, sites for transport and telecommunication networks, utility installations, and residential uses either as an affordable housing component or associated with a community care centre, place of worship or residential care facility. The zone for these properties in the draft precinct plan area will remain unchanged.	No change.
036, 122	Submitters raise concerns the draft precinct plan does not account for the historical watercourse running through the	Flooding and stormwater management are addressed through City Plan's current provisions, including the Flood overlay code and Stormwater code, which require	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>precinct, which is considered to increase the flood risk for the area. There is also concern that insufficient stormwater infrastructure may contribute to worsening overland flow.</p>	<p>development to manage runoff appropriately, discharge to a lawful point, and ensure there is no worsening of flood risk or overland flow impacts on surrounding properties. These matters are assessed at the development application stage, having regard to site-specific conditions and appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>Planning for future trunk stormwater infrastructure is undertaken through Council’s Local government infrastructure plan, which identifies infrastructure required to support projected growth and is updated over time. Investigation of historical watercourses and potential infrastructure upgrades occurs through Local government infrastructure plan updates and detailed infrastructure planning, rather than through precinct plan mapping.</p>	
<p>008, 036, 060, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097</p>	<p>Submitters express the need for community infrastructure projects within the plan to support a growing population, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expansion to the community centre; • expansion or upgrades to the library; • upgrade showground as a multi-use venue; and • provision of sport and recreation facilities. 	<p>Council-owned community facilities, such as community centres, libraries, recreation facilities and upgrades to existing venues, are planned and delivered through separate strategic planning, service planning and capital works programs, rather than through precinct planning.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>036</p>	<p>Submitter raises concerns that development approvals will be approved and built before infrastructure improvements are undertaken which does not achieve the requirements under the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the concern regarding the timing of infrastructure delivery in relation to development. The planning, sequencing and delivery of trunk infrastructure are coordinated through Council’s Local government infrastructure plan, which identifies infrastructure needs to support anticipated growth and is reviewed and updated over time.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

3.6 Environment, Open Space and Sustainability

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
<p>010, 011, 021, 024, 025, 026, 031, 033, 036, 037, 041, 049, 060, 061, 062, 070, 073, 074, 075, 080, 082, 084, 089, 090, 091, 094, 096, 097, 100, 107, 120, 122, 124, 126</p>	<p>Submitters raise concerns about the local koala population and the impact this plan will have on numbers and habitat, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased traffic, human and domestic pet interactions; • heightened noise and light; • loss of habitat and food sources; • impact upon koala movement by increased planting or by physical barriers such as retaining walls, fences, altered site levels; • increased stormwater pollution entering the creek; and • entrapment points such as car parks, pools, fenced areas and service lanes. <p>Submitters suggest the koala population could be protected by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving the quality of movement corridors/crossings; • undertaking a movement analysis study; • preventing entrapment through barrier designs; • reducing speed limits; • providing wildlife signage and detection cameras; • preservation of habitat and food sources; 	<p>Council acknowledges the importance of protecting koalas and urban biodiversity, and the role of Mt Gravatt Reserve and surrounding greenspaces as important fauna habitat. The development of the draft precinct plan has considered these aspects. Environmental values, including koala habitat and movement, are managed through City Plan including the Environmental management zone, Biodiversity areas overlay, Waterway corridors overlay. Together with the Natural Assets Local Law, they collectively seek to protect habitat, movement corridors and ecological values.</p> <p>Detailed matters such as fauna movement analysis, entrapment prevention, speed management, signage and detection technologies are appropriately considered at the development application stage, where site-specific conditions and impacts can be assessed.</p> <p>The draft precinct plan does not remove existing biodiversity protections and does not allow development within Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve or Toohey Forest Park.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adoption of Koala Sensitive Design Guidelines; • provision of overpasses/underpasses; • provision of nature corridors and habitat canopy protection; • incorporating koala friendly vegetation and green corridors within new development. 		
<p>006, 011, 012, 014, 036, 051, 052, 054, 056, 058, 060, 061, 062, 067, 069, 071, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 080, 081, 082, 084, 086, 089, 090, 091, 092, 095, 097, 099, 104, 105, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 122, 125, 136, 137, 138</p>	<p>Submitters raise concerns there are no additional Council owned green space, pocket parks, sport and recreation facilities, playgrounds, and/or related embellishments in the area and wish to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council land acquisition for a pocket park in the main centre zone; • minimum canopy, shade and area benchmarks in the precinct; • conversion of the unused car park at Mt Gravatt Plaza into a local park; • use of the proposed road from Creek Road to Marlene Street as a local park; • provision of a water park in Glindemann Park; and • park dedications be provided from the largest sites in the precinct. 	<p>Council acknowledges submissions seeking additional public green space, parks and recreation facilities within the precinct.</p> <p>The provision of public open space across Brisbane is planned and prioritised through Council’s Local government infrastructure plan and capital works planning processes, which consider network coverage, population growth, accessibility, funding and city-wide priorities.</p> <p>Requests for additional public open space, including pocket parks, upgrades to existing parks, playgrounds or sporting facilities, are considered through future Local government infrastructure plan amendments and Council’s capital works programs as growth occurs and demand changes over time.</p> <p>The proposal to convert the Mt Gravatt Plaza car park to public open space is noted. This site is located on private land, and any redevelopment or land use change would be at the discretion of the landowner, subject to City Plan requirements.</p> <p>Green space, shade and amenity outcomes within the centre will also be delivered through private</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>development, including landscaped plazas, deep planting and greening requirements. These spaces complement, rather than replace, Council-owned parks and contribute to a more walkable, shaded and liveable centre environment.</p> <p>Proposals relating to specific park embellishments, such as water play facilities or expanded recreation uses within existing parks (including Glindemann Park), are considered through separate park planning, renewal and funding processes, and are not determined through the precinct plan.</p>	
054	<p>Submitter suggests creating a new park beside the Nursery Road Special School, noting the site is underused and would benefit the community. If not pursued, it is requested that significant green space in new developments and more street trees be provided to improve shade and amenity.</p>	<p>New parks and land acquisition are considered through the Local government infrastructure plan and capital works planning. Streetscape outcomes are assessed at development application stage or delivered through separate Council programs. The proposed precinct plan does require additional green plot ratio outcomes and links to provisions in the City Plan regarding onsite landscaping and deep tree planting.</p>	No change.
032, 051, 052, 054, 061, 062, 067, 073, 074, 075, 080, 082, 084, 089, 090, 091, 094, 096, 097, 100, 101, 104, 107, 109, 118, 119	<p>Submitters are concerned about the draft precinct plan impacting the broader green and ecological networks of the area including protection of mature trees, waterway health, and fauna habitats.</p>	<p>Council recognises the role of existing green infrastructure, waterways and mature vegetation in supporting ecological health and local amenity. Protection of these elements is managed through City Plan overlays and codes, including vegetation protection, stormwater quality controls and water sensitive urban design requirements.</p> <p>The amendment strengthens these outcomes by supporting subtropical landscaping, green plot ratio provisions and improved public realm planting. Restoration or daylighting of creek corridors and detailed waterway treatments are matters to be investigated through future capital works programs and Local</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		government infrastructure plan updates, rather than through precinct planning provisions.	
061, 122	Submitters request to have Geoff Toakley Park identified as a local biodiversity sensitivity zone in order to protect its environmental values.	Public parks and reserves are currently protected for conservation and recreation purposes through City Plan zones and overlays. Additional biodiversity designations are not proposed as part of the amendment. Management of public parkland occurs through Council’s park planning, maintenance and environmental management programs.	No change.
061, 073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097	Submitters request that all development include habitat supportive landscaping and considers that screening, deep planting or other landscaping should provide visual separation from existing low-rise dwellings.	The amendment includes requirements for subtropical landscaping, deep planting and green plot ratio outcomes to improve environmental performance and visual amenity. These provisions work alongside existing City Plan requirements that address building setbacks, transitions and residential interface treatments. Detailed landscaping design, including screening and species selection, will be assessed at the development application stage to ensure compatibility with adjoining low-rise residential areas.	No change.
036, 091	Submitters are concerned the draft precinct plan does not address how increased development may impact Mt Gravatt Reserve and opposes any encroachment into Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve or Toohey Forest Park.	<p>Council acknowledges the importance of protecting bushland reserves, such as Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve and Toohey Forest Park. City Plan includes a suite of biodiversity and vegetation protections through the Environmental management zone, Biodiversity areas overlay, Waterway corridors overlay and the Natural Assets Local Law, which collectively seek to protect habitat, movement corridors and ecological values.</p> <p>Development where mapped under the above zones or overlays, will continue to be assessed against relevant provisions, including requirements for habitat retention, mitigation of vehicle and lighting impacts, fauna sensitive fencing, landscaping and stormwater management. Detailed matters such as fauna movement analysis,</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>entrapment prevention, speed management, signage and detection technologies are appropriately considered at the development application stage, where site-specific conditions and impacts can be assessed.</p> <p>The amendment does not remove existing biodiversity protections and does not support encroachment of development within Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve or Toohey Forest Park.</p>	
<p>011, 034, 036, 042, 051, 052, 058, 061, 067, 071, 073, 074, 075, 076, 080, 084, 085, 089, 090, 094, 096, 097, 111, 120, 126</p>	<p>Submitters are concerned about vegetation loss and seek stronger protection of existing green infrastructure along with clear, enforceable planting requirements. There is a lack of firm subtropical and environmental targets, including shade along Logan Road, and the proposed provisions are inadequate.</p> <p>Submitters also seek mandatory standards for subtropical design covering urban heat, tree canopy, selection of native plants, minimum tree sizes, green roofs, solar panels and cooling materials, as well as stronger water sensitive urban design measures.</p>	<p>The amendment supports the evolution of Logan Road as a greener, more pedestrian friendly high street through subtropical landscaping, active frontages and improved public realm outcomes. Detailed design, species selection, infrastructure coordination and visibility considerations will be resolved through public realm projects and development applications.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>036, 056, 067</p>	<p>Submitters are concerned the plan does not identify creek lines for restoration or daylighting. They note that increased hard surfaces from higher density development could further impact these waterways.</p> <p>A submitter also requests strengthening the Norman Creek/Glindemann Creek corridor by daylighting additional sections</p>	<p>While the benefits of creek restoration are acknowledged, daylighting and large-scale waterway works require detailed engineering, land acquisition and funding considerations. These matters may be investigated through future infrastructure and environmental programs. Planning for future trunk stormwater infrastructure forms part of Council's Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP). Investigation of historical watercourses, restoration opportunities and</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>along Logan Road. A continuous creek line park should form part of the major development area and be included in the plan.</p>	<p>capacity upgrades occurs through LGIP updates and detailed infrastructure planning rather than precinct plan mapping.</p> <p>Flooding, overland flow and stormwater quality are managed through City Plan’s Flood overlay code and Stormwater code. These provisions require development to ensure no worsening of flood risk, lawful discharge and appropriate water quality treatment.</p>	
<p>011, 041, 051, 073, 074, 075, 076, 080, 084, 085, 089, 090, 095, 097, 111</p>	<p>Submitters consider that Logan Road could operate as a vibrant, pedestrian friendly high street if development delivers substantial tree canopy and ground level planting. The subtropical boulevard concept is supported but vegetation should not obstruct visibility or interfere with surrounding infrastructure. It is also suggested the spine should include shade trees linking greenspaces between Creek Road, Marlene Street and Springwood Street.</p>	<p>Street tree planting and public land landscaping programs are delivered through Council’s capital works and maintenance programs. Funding and prioritisation of such programs are not part of the draft precinct plan process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>036, 051, 052</p>	<p>Submitters raise concerns the draft precinct plan promotes deep planting and subtropical landscaping without measurable requirements. Specific targets should be included such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% tree canopy cover along key pedestrian corridors; • 60% summer midday shade on major footpaths; • deep planting zones of 4–6 metres; and • 30% tree canopy cover in other areas. 	<p>The amendment has been prepared to operate within City Plan, which establishes citywide requirements for subtropical building design, landscaping, deep planting, water sensitive urban design and environmental performance through relevant codes and planning scheme policies. These provisions require development to respond to local conditions, streetscape context and site constraints, and are assessed on a site-by-site basis at the development application stage. While the amendment strengthens outcomes by introducing green plot ratio requirements and supporting subtropical landscaping and deep planting, it does not include fixed</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>numerical targets for tree canopy, shade or planting widths.</p> <p>Detailed matters such as canopy coverage, shade provision, planting dimensions and species selection will continue to be assessed through City Plan codes and planning scheme policies, having regard to site conditions, infrastructure constraints, pedestrian function and long-term maintenance considerations.</p>	
121	<p>Submitter recommends the removal or amendment of the Natural Assets Local Law designation over 48 Creek Road to reflect current vegetation on site.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the suggestion to remove or adjust the Natural Assets Local Law (NALL) designation over 48 Creek Road. The NALL is a citywide environmental protection mechanism sitting outside City Plan and is not amended through a suburban renewal precinct plan.</p> <p>If a landowner considers that the mapped extent does not accurately reflect existing site conditions, Council may consider a request through the relevant mapping review process, supported by appropriate technical information such as a vegetation or ecological assessment. Submitters can contact Council on 3403 8888 or online at https://services.brisbane.qld.gov.au/online-services/council-services-and-requests/email-council to discuss the operation of the NALL on their property.</p>	No change.
036	<p>Submitter suggests implementing a funded tree planting program.</p>	<p>Street tree planting and landscaping on public land are planned and delivered through Council's citywide capital works, streetscape and maintenance programs, which prioritise works across Brisbane based on need, funding availability and strategic outcomes. The draft precinct plan does not allocate funding or establish new planting programs, as these matters are considered through Council's budget and capital works processes.</p>	No change.

3.7 Economic and Small Business

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
005, 015, 016, 036, 064, 138	Submitters support economic vitality through retaining the local shopping centre and providing opportunities for local businesses, retail and employment.	Support noted.	No change.
036	Submitter raises concerns about amenity impacts of extended business hours and the establishment of a busier, later-night centre (e.g. bars, restaurants) without proper controls that underscore provisions within the Centre or mixed use code.	The Centre or mixed use code in City Plan requires that noise or light emissions do not exceed the criteria set out in the code for nearby sensitive uses such as dwelling houses and multiple dwellings. An application to Council for the redevelopment of a centre zoned site would likely require the submission of a noise impact assessment report to demonstrate how the adverse effects of noise will be mitigated.	No change.
100	Submitter supports the plan but seeks stronger consideration of how the precinct will operate within a future circular economy, including shared infrastructure for reuse, refill systems and reduced landfill reliance.	Council is actively pursuing a range of projects and initiatives to align with the Sustainable Development Goals, aiming to make the city a cleaner, greener, and more sustainable place. Council is also dedicated to supporting the growth of the small business sector in Brisbane through economic development initiatives. The submitter is encouraged to contact Council’s Contact Centre on 3403 8888 or via: https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/about-council/contact#mail to discuss programs and support for small business within the city.	No change.
014, 036, 092, 094, 096, 105, 106, 109	Submitters are concerned the revitalisation of the area may lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased vacancy through increased rents and lack of affordable commercial spaces; • inactive frontages; • undermine long term economic sustainability; • jeopardise long standing small business; and 	Council acknowledges the success of small businesses in the Mt Gravatt centre area. The draft precinct plan includes provisions for fine grained tenancies, active frontages and laneway linkages, which aim to attract and retain small businesses. Council does not regulate rental agreements, contracts, or leases for commercial property. Commercial leases are regulated through Queensland Government legislation. The Queensland Small Business	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact the viability of economic uplift. 	<p>Commissioner provides support, including services such as dispute resolution, for small businesses. Submitters are encouraged to contact the Queensland Government for further guidance on options to support different long-term rental arrangements for tenants.</p> <p>Council is also dedicated to supporting the growth of the small business sector in Brisbane through economic development initiatives. Submitters are encouraged to contact Council's Contact Centre on 3403 8888 or via: https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/about-council/contact#mail to discuss programs and support for small business within the city.</p>	
091	<p>Submitter is concerned that vacant commercial land is not being redeveloped and suggests discouraging land banking by increasing holding costs for long-term vacant commercial properties to encourage occupation or redevelopment.</p>	<p>The concerns raised by the submitter are noted. Mechanisms such as those being suggested are generally outside the planning framework and fall within the remit of other levels of government. The planning system can influence land use outcomes through zoning, development controls, and strategic policy, but it does not directly regulate land ownership.</p>	No change.

3.8 Site-specific Zoning, Mapping and Code Provisions

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
064	<p>Submitter supports the inclusion of mixed-use development within the draft precinct plan area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	No change.
029, 127	<p>Submitters requests the plan boundary be extended to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 536 Newnham Road, Upper Mt Gravatt; and 	<p>The properties are not located in proximity to the draft precinct plan area. On that basis, it is not appropriate to include these site within the boundary of the draft precinct plan.</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> commercial sites located on Lumley Street, Upper Mt Gravatt. 		
056, 079	Submitters request the inclusion of Norman Creek/Glindemann Creek and the Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve in the precinct to address objections based on perceived lack of green space.	Norman Creek, Glindemann Creek and the Mt Gravatt Outlook Reserve are located outside the draft precinct plan boundary and are protected and managed through existing planning controls and Council programs. No changes to planning provisions for these areas are proposed as part of the amendment.	No change.
092, 138	Submitters support extending the medium and low-medium zones a further 1 to 2 street blocks beyond the draft precinct plan area to encourage a wider variety of housing stock and provide further options for future developments. This includes a suggestion from one of the submitters to include the church site in Rover Street, currently designated as a Community facility, within the Medium density residential zone.	No changes to the draft precinct plan boundary or to the zones for properties outside of the draft precinct plan are proposed.	No change.
030, 036, 118, 119	<p>Submitters wish to see staged or incremental zoning to avoid rapid, corridor-wide redevelopment. Concern is raised about the uncertainty on redevelopment timeframes and at what pace the suburb will redevelop.</p> <p>A submitter questions the initial data analysis of the precinct area and if the likelihood of redevelopment was a consideration when identifying the boundary.</p>	The identification of Mt Gravatt centre and the boundary of the draft precinct plan was informed by City Plan's Strategic framework and areas with the greatest long-term potential for renewal, including access to public transport, services, infrastructure and opportunities for change over time. As with other centres across Brisbane, redevelopment is likely to be incremental, occurring progressively over time as sites become suitable for change.	No change.
043	Submitter suggests extending the precinct planning approach south toward Coles, The Village Shopping Centre and the	Council has commenced the preparation of a separate draft precinct plan for Upper Mt Gravatt which includes the areas identified in the submission.	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	Westfield Mt Gravatt shopping centre end of Logan Road noting that the Upper Mt Gravatt area currently lacks diverse hospitality, social and placemaking opportunities.		
007, 008, 010, 054, 055, 081, 136	Submitters support the revitalisation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shopping facilities and car dealerships along Logan Road; • Mt Gravatt Hotel; and • former Central Fair Shopping Centre site. 	Support noted.	No change.
015, 065, 086, 099	Submitters state it is unrealistic to contemplate demolition of the Mt Gravatt Plaza which would compromise the current commercial, service and social function of the shopping centre. Concern is raised that any loss of retail floorspace or displacement of services would affect access to essential facilities for the wider community. One submitter suggest that additional planning/development bonuses be included for the Mt Gravatt Plaza site.	The purpose of the draft precinct plan is to review current City Plan provisions and identify long-term opportunities for change that align with Council’s strategic intentions under the Suburban Renewal Precincts program. The plan provides a framework to guide redevelopment outcomes should site owners choose to pursue change in the future. Any future redevelopment proposal would be subject to detailed assessment to ensure continued provision of services, appropriate staging, and minimisation of disruption to the centre’s ongoing role and function.	No change.
095	Submitter requests that for any new development on the lot immediately south of the refurbished historic Scurrs building (at 1437 Logan Road), that it be required to adopt a complementary building form. New development should respond sensitively to the scale, character and heritage value of the existing building.	The amendment includes built form provisions that apply to centre and residential land and are intended to manage bulk, scale and interface outcomes. These provisions promote slender tower forms, through controls such as maximum tower site cover and width, minimum tower separation distances and setbacks, which assist in ensuring new development is appropriately scaled and articulated in relation to adjoining development. The Scurrs Building at 1437 Logan Road is not identified under City Plan’s Heritage overlay. Development	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		proposals on adjoining sites will be assessed against City Plan’s design and built form provisions. These require development to respond appropriately to surrounding context, including the scale and character of existing buildings, and to achieve high-quality architectural and streetscape outcomes.	
105	Submitter notes the site occupied by the Queensland Fire Department (1191 Logan Road) is identified as a community facility and queries whether this classification is current or whether a more appropriate land use classification should apply.	The Community facilities (Emergency services zone precinct) includes sites for emergency services such as the one occupied by the Queensland Fire Department. The zone is consistent with other emergency services sites under City Plan. The zone will remain unchanged.	No change.
073, 074, 075, 080, 084, 089, 090, 097	Submitters request that land in Grenfell Street and Raffles Street remain in the current zones.	<p>Council has reviewed submissions and in response proposes zone and building height changes, for the parcels bounded by Lauder Street, Selborne Street, Raffles Street (southern side) and Creek Road.</p> <p>In this location maximum proposed building heights have been reduced from 8 storeys to 5 storeys for identified properties by retaining the Medium density residential zone (current City Plan zone), rather than progressing with the advertised High density residential zone.</p>	Change.
067	Submitters are supportive of the housing choice identified for the Mt Gravatt central core sub-precinct (NPP-002a).	Support noted.	No change.
122	Submitter requests to reduce the size of the Mt Gravatt central core sub-precinct NPP-002a due to areas being subject to flooding. The area between Creek Road and Broadwater Road should remain in its existing zoning.	<p>The Flood overlay code in City Plan applies tailored development requirements depending on the type, frequency and depth of flooding, including overland flow paths. The land between Creek Road and Broadwater Road is predominantly affected by the Overland flow flood planning area sub-category.</p> <p>Development within this area remains subject to Flood overlay assessment, including requirements relating to</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>building siting, minimum floor levels, flood resilience, access and minimisation of flood impacts.</p> <p>The draft precinct plan does not remove or alter the operation of the Flood overlay code.</p>	
<p>047, 061, 062, 072, 086, 099, 122</p>	<p>Submitters oppose the rezoning of the Low density residential zoned area, generally bordered by Broadwater Road, Dykes Street and Creek Road to the Low-medium density residential zone, with key concerns being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the surrounding road network and existing local infrastructure is not designed to accommodate additional traffic and on-street parking demands that would be generated; • the increase in building heights, and the potential increase to 4 storeys from the More Homes Sooner: Low-medium density residential review will impact the character, safety and functionality of this area; and • recurring sewage and stormwater overflows affecting properties on Wardle and Marlene Streets with recent development worsening issues in this location. Specifically, Submitters request no zone changes or height increases be undertaken on Wardle, Whitney and Pettigrew Streets until infrastructure is upgraded and proven to be effective. 	<p>Council acknowledges submissions regarding the area generally bordered by Broadwater Road, Dykes Street and Creek Road. The area has been identified as suitable for low-medium density residential development due to its proximity to the Mt Gravatt Centre (within approximately 400 metres), access to services, and adjacency to existing Medium density residential zoned land.</p> <p>The proposed zone change supports increased housing choice near the centre, consistent with City Plan, and enables housing types such as townhouses and low-rise apartments. Traffic, parking and infrastructure impacts are managed through the development assessment process in accordance with City Plan requirements, with redevelopment expected to occur incrementally over time.</p> <p>Urban Utilities has been consulted on the draft precinct plan, and Council will continue to work with servicing providers to ensure infrastructure planning aligns with future growth.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>066</p>	<p>Submitter requests 21 Whitley Street be included within the High density residential</p>	<p>In the draft precinct plan (as advertised), the land at 15, 21, 23 and 25 Whitley Street was retained in the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<p>zone and allowed a maximum building height of 8 storeys. The site is currently zoned Community facilities (Community purposes) and used for a combination of community and on-site residential care purposes. The suggested zone and height limit is the same as that proposed for other sites in Whitley Street.</p>	<p>Community facilities (Community purposes zone precinct), recognising its ongoing role in providing community services. The land was also included within the Mt Gravatt central residential sub-precinct (NPP-002c), with a maximum building height of 8 storeys proposed.</p> <p>The amendment (post consultation) retains the listed properties on Whitley Street in the Community facilities (Community purposes zone precinct) to support artistic, cultural, social and community uses. The maximum building height of 8 storeys proposed for the site is maintained. On this basis, no change to the zone is proposed.</p>	
095	<p>Submitter suggests preserving the existing medium density zoning of properties in the streets east of Logan Road and south of Vulcan and Cortis Streets.</p>	<p>The amendment retains properties east of Logan Road and south of Vulcan and Cortis Streets in the High density residential (Up to 8 storeys zone precinct), as advertised, rather than the Medium density residential zone. This reflects the proximity of these sites to the Mt Gravatt District centre and surrounding higher-intensity land uses. The proposed zoning supports an appropriate transition from the centre and enables increased housing supply in a well-serviced location.</p>	No change.
060	<p>Submitter recommends rezoning the entirety of properties facing Logan Road and Creek Road to the Mixed use zone to allow for commercial and retail uses on the ground floor.</p>	<p>The amendment proposes that properties fronting Logan Road and Creek Road be zoned predominantly within the District centre zone, with some sites included in the High density residential (Up to 8 storeys zone precinct).</p> <p>These zones are intended to operate together to deliver the outcomes sought by the amendment, including supporting commercial and retail activity in appropriate locations, while also enabling new housing close to public transport, services and infrastructure. Ground-floor commercial and retail uses are already supported where</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		suitable through the District centre zone. On this basis, no change to the proposed zoning is considered necessary.	
088	Submitter supports renewal along Logan Road in principle but raises concern that the Mt Gravatt East core sub-precinct (NPP-005a) is not an appropriate location for the scale of development proposed specifically objecting to the zone and 12-storey height limit. The submission indicates that development in this area should be substantially scaled back, with stricter limits on building height, density and land use intensity to protect residential amenity.	Council has reviewed the submission and proposes to reduce the advertised maximum building height in the Mt Gravatt East core sub-precinct (NPP-005a) from 12 storeys (as advertised) to 10 storeys through changes to the proposed building height table. This refinement is intended to better respond to residential amenity considerations while continuing to support renewal outcomes consistent with the role of the centre.	Change.
081	Submitter raises concern that land within Mt Gravatt East residential sub-precinct (NPP-005c) along Logan Road is currently occupied by motor vehicle retailers, some of which have recently invested in their premises. The submission indicates that a transition to high density residential development in this area is unlikely in the foreseeable future.	<p>Council acknowledges submissions noting that land within the Mt Gravatt East residential sub-precinct (NPP-005c) along Logan Road is currently occupied by established motor vehicle retail uses.</p> <p>The purpose of the draft precinct plan is to review current City Plan provisions and identify long-term opportunities for change that align with Council’s strategic intentions under the Suburban Renewal Precincts program. The plan provides a framework to guide redevelopment outcomes should site owners choose to pursue change in the future.</p>	No change.

3.9 Processes and Other Matters Raised

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
036, 050, 067, 076, 135	Submitters recommend strengthening proposed provisions by:	The precinct plan will be implemented through amendments to the Mt Gravatt corridor neighbourhood plan, which will form part of City Plan when adopted. City	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing clear written links in the draft precinct plan to the Strategic framework; • providing quantitative benchmarks in performance outcomes; • outlining clear and enforceable development guidelines to ensure new development aligns with community expectations and maintains the area’s character; • clarifying how Council will uphold design standards and ensure high-quality urban development in the local area; and • identifying how development outcomes will be effectively monitored as the precinct evolves. 	<p>Plan establishes a clear relationship between the Strategic framework and the development codes used to assess development applications.</p> <p>City Plan codes and precinct-specific provisions articulate the desired character and built form outcomes identified through community consultation and strategic planning. These provisions are applied and enforced through Council’s development assessment process to ensure development achieves high-quality, context-responsive outcomes.</p> <p>Council continually reviews and updates City Plan through its amendment program, including through initiatives such as the Suburban Renewal Precincts program, to ensure planning provisions remain effective, enforceable and responsive as centres evolve over time.</p>	
085	<p>Submitter requests redevelopment to be coordinated rather than on a site-by-site basis and calls for stronger master planning, design integration and developer contributions to public spaces, links, landscaping and streetscapes.</p>	<p>City Plan provides the statutory framework to coordinate development outcomes across the city. Zones, overlays, neighbourhood plans and development codes operate together to establish clear expectations for built form, land use, design integration and public realm outcomes, including where redevelopment occurs on a site-by-site basis.</p> <p>The draft precinct plan strengthens this approach by identifying key development sites where structure planning is to be undertaken in accordance with the Structure planning planning scheme policy to achieve coordinated development outcomes.</p> <p>Trunk infrastructure and public facilities needed to support growth are planned through Council’s Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP), with infrastructure</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		charges levied on new development to contribute toward delivery of parks, transport, stormwater and community infrastructure. Together, these mechanisms support coordinated, high-quality redevelopment while allowing change to occur progressively over time. For further information regarding infrastructure charges, please view the <i>Brisbane Infrastructure Charges Resolution (No. 14) 2025</i> .	
030	Submitter believes the plan is out of step with current market conditions and unlikely to drive meaningful change.	<p>The amendment is intended to guide the long-term evolution of the centre over the next decade and beyond. The outcomes sought will be delivered progressively through the implementation of City Plan, including zoning, building height controls, active frontage requirements, arcades and design provisions, together with future centre-based projects delivered through mechanisms such as the Local government infrastructure plan and Council capital works programs.</p> <p>This approach provides flexibility to respond to changing market conditions over time while establishing a clear vision for the renewal of the precinct.</p>	No change.
004, 014, 030, 036, 051, 054, 055, 061, 067, 076, 104, 108, 111, 118, 119, 120, 121	Submitters request that background strategies be undertaken covering a number of areas including transport and parking, social and housing, 3D modelling and shadow analysis, open space, economic impacts, cultural and art, wildlife and habitats, and stormwater modelling.	As part of the precinct planning process, background research was undertaken to help inform the draft outcomes and determine viable development options and design provisions. More detailed technical studies are undertaken at the development application stage, where site-specific impacts and mitigation measures can be properly assessed.	No change.
036, 067	Submitters request an acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians in the plan by referring to Mt Gravatt by its traditional name 'Kaggur-mabul', meaning 'place of the echidna' and incorporating place-naming, art and interpretive elements.	Council is committed to recognising and representing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures. As part of its commitment to achieving better recognition and celebration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and culture, Council has produced the Innovate	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
		<p>Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) which will guide the ongoing efforts toward reconciliation.</p> <p>Consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups and Traditional Custodians, initiatives for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander public art, and support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses is detailed in Council's Innovate RAP.</p>	
006, 008, 036, 056, 095, 112, 116, 141	<p>Submitters raise concerns that social housing, rent caps and/or affordable housing should be included within the plan to combat housing supply issues.</p>	<p>Council is addressing housing diversity, affordability and choice through a range of initiatives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilitating suburban renewal precinct plans to increase housing supply; • supporting community housing providers to deliver affordable housing developments in the city; • supporting multigenerational family households by enabling secondary dwellings (e.g. granny flats) to be constructed within residential areas; • facilitating a wide range of homelessness support initiatives; and • offering 100% reduction in infrastructure charges for social and affordable housing multiple dwelling developments through the Brisbane Housing Supply Incentive Policy. 	No change.
011, 036	<p>Submitters support additional public art and retaining of the current informal street art (e.g. murals and graffiti on Mt Gravatt Shopping Centre).</p>	<p>The comments raised are acknowledged. Feedback regarding the provision of public art and the retention of existing informal street art, including murals and graffiti at the Mt Gravatt Shopping Centre, has been referred to Council's Public Art team for consideration.</p>	No change.
020, 036, 055, 067, 071, 088, 091, 107, 122, 141	<p>Submitters raise concerns about the community consultation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the timing and conduct being at the end-of-year period and being rushed and insufficient; • there should be further consultation; 	<p>Community consultation on the draft precinct plan was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and the <i>Minister's Guidelines and Rules</i> from 14 November to 14 December 2025.</p> <p>Supporting this consultation was the following:</p>	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all property owners should be individually notified of changes made; • all submitters should receive clear point-by-point feedback; • the tone and language used in the draft precinct plan; • the extensive use of promotional adjectives that may limit impartial understanding of the proposals; • the use of ambiguous or subjective terminology such as “slender towers;” • the online maps being too complicated to navigate; • the limited accessibility to the draft precinct plan materials e.g. Storymap and the City Plan online submission portal; • transparency regarding the information and supporting evidence for this plan; and • engagement tools need to be simplified for inclusivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an electronic public notice appeared in The Courier-Mail; • web pages providing details of the draft precinct plan published and maintained from 14 November 2025 onwards; • letters sent to all residents, absentee owners and businesses in the precinct plan area; • corflutes and tri-fold pole wraps placed on display across the area during public consultation; • an email sent to City Plan update subscribers on 14 November 2025; • a summary document explaining the project, vision and key proposed changes released online to support public consultation on the draft precinct plan; • an online StoryMap showing a summary of the proposed changes, including interactive maps of sub-precincts, zones, building heights and proposed improvements to places was prepared to support public consultation on the draft precinct plan; and • 3 Talk-to-planner sessions held on Wednesday 3 December 2025 (2 sessions) and Saturday 6 December 2025 (1 session) at the Mt Gravatt Showgrounds. <p>Prior to formal consultation, Council conducted a survey gathering information about what residents wished to see in the area. This online survey ran from 9 June to 14 July 2025 and helped to inform the draft precinct plan. Comments made about the content of the consultation period have been noted for when Council is preparing future precinct plans.</p>	
091	Submitter is concerned about uncertainty over the future of the Griffith University Mt Gravatt campus and its impacts.	The Griffith University Mt Gravatt campus is located outside the boundary of the draft precinct plan. The future use of the campus is currently being investigated	No change.

Submission reference	Submission summary	Response	Change
	Submitter requests precinct planning to consider cumulative effects and protect green space and wildlife.	by the Queensland Government following the closure of Expressions of Interest in early 2026.	
039, 082	Submitters are concerned about litter on residential streets in Mt Gravatt East linked to parking overflow from Logan Road businesses. There is also a lack of public bins on nearby streets. Concerns are also raised about maintenance and customer service, citing unaddressed tree trimming, pothole repairs and unwanted bin provision.	The suggested comments are noted but are not within the nature of matters being considered by the draft precinct plan. To report an issue, the submitter is encouraged to contact Council’s Contact Centre on 3403 8888 or via: https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/about-council/contact#mail	No change.
023	Submitter requests changing the plan name to Mt Gravatt Central.	The suggested comments are noted but no change is required. The name ‘Mt Gravatt Centre’ has only been used for this precinct plan project as part of the amendment package for City Plan.	No change.
014, 036, 114	Submitters request: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased police presence; • provision of community programs; and • improved lighting and surveillance. 	Police resourcing and community programs are delivered by the Queensland Government through operational and service provision mechanisms and are not directly regulated through the amendment. However, the built form and public realm outcomes facilitated by the precinct plan are intended to support crime prevention by improving visibility, activity and natural surveillance across the centre.	No change.
038, 102	No content provided in submissions.	Not applicable.	No change.

4 Conclusion

The submissions received have been considered in the development of the amendment.

The amendment includes specific provisions relating to development provisions and figures contained in City Plan and is now subject to review by the Queensland Government.