

**The Development Manager  
Brisbane City Council  
GPO Box 1434  
Brisbane QLD 4001**

<https://pdonline.brisbane.qld.gov.au/masterviewUI/modules/ApplicationMaster/default.aspx?page=wrapper&key=A004466185>

I am writing to object to the proposed application to build a five storey, 12 unit retirement village at 32 Primrose Street, Sherwood.

In principle, development of the site as retirement living for independent ex-RAAF personnel is supported. The plan however, fails to meet many of the acceptable and/or performance solutions of the *City Plan 2014* Codes in particular, the Multiple Unit Dwelling Code.

- at just 17ms, the proposal does not meet the minimum block width of 20ms for a multiple unit dwelling, which adversely contributes to the lack of building separation, inadequate side set-backs and boundary landscaping;
- the building is excessively long at over 40ms, well above the maximum allowable 30ms;
- the building is not oriented to overlook the street but to overlook the adjoining low and low to medium density dwellings to the north and south;
- the proposal fails to achieve the minimum required building separation to the southern, low density building, providing approx. 3ms of separation, well below the minimum required 12ms for habitable rooms;
- the proposal fails to achieve the minimum required building separation to the northern low to medium density building, providing approx. 11ms of separation less than the minimum required 12ms for habitable and non-habitable rooms;
- the proposal's bulk and scale is significantly out of keeping with surrounding homes, townhouses and units and lacks the required design elements such as variation in materials, finishes and colours, verandahs, roof line and pitch and other features that contribute to reduce the bulk and scale - the block like style significantly detracts for the adjoining heritage place, a Church;
- the proposal fails to use traditional or lightweight materials, relying on rendered masonry, which adversely contributes to the excessive bulk and scale;
- the building design will overshadow the adjoining low rise Chapel Gardens retirement village impacting on residents' access to sunlight, warmth in winter and cooling breezes in summer. Further investigation of the overshadowing impacts including preparation of shadow diagrammes should be prepared (not on PD Online);
- the proposal fails to provide any indoor communal or social facilities as required under the Residential Care Facility Code - as a result often frail and elderly residents will have no all-weather community spaces to enjoy fellowship and activities;
- the proposal does not provide any dedicated internal walking paths with elderly residents walking across the driveway to access the entry to the complex and the recreational areas – this is dangerous;
- the proposal to include only 8 carparks for 12 units is grossly inadequate for a complex of this size – as the applicant states this is for residents who “live independently” and many will have at least one car;
- the proposal to provide only 2 visitors carparks for 12 units is grossly inadequate for a complex of this size and such a busy street;
- car parking is not located under the building, as stated, but extends well within the side set-backs on both the northern and southern sides – nor is the boundary fully landscaped to the southern side – adversely impacting on the adjoining low density Chapel Gardens dwellings;

- Sherwood Road has restricted parking as a major road and Primrose Street is already full with on-street parking and cannot cope with a huge increase in on-street parking, as would result from the applicant's proposal;
- the design creates habitable rooms (bedrooms) overlooking adjoining properties to the south overlooking Chapel Gardens;
- the location of the rubbish facilities in the front set-back on the adjoining boundary with the low density Chapel Gardens retirement units is not supported – this will be noisy and smelly and adversely impact on the adjoining homes, which are within 1m of the bin storage area;
- the location of the pump room within the front setback is not supported;
- the large design feature in the front set-back is not supported and should be landscaped;
- a large garbage truck has no area to manoeuvre safely onsite and may be a hazard to pedestrians – this is a busy pedestrian street; and,
- circulation aisles do not meet the minimum required by Council's Transport and Parking Code.

The proposal is overly bulky and poorly oriented and appears to have inadequate car parking and communal social and recreational facilities for the type of retirement complex proposed.

The design is likely to adversely impact on the amenity of the adjoining Chapel Gardens retirements village and heritage listed Church.

This proposal should be substantially revised or refused.

**Signature:**

**Name:**

**Address:**

**Date:**