

Date: 7 July 2026
Contact: Alex Couvaras
Location: City Development
Telephone: 07 5582 9042
Your reference: 2024-12-722
Our reference: MCU/2026/232

Southern Cross Property Holdings Pty Ltd
C/- Enhance Urban Planning (Brendon Walkinshaw)
PO BOX 7143
SOUTHPORT PARK QLD 4215

Dear Sir/Madam

Information Request

I refer to the development application lodged by:
Southern Cross Property Holdings Pty Ltd

in relation to development of land/premises described as:
Lot 2 RP86756 – 60 Dutton Street, COOLANGATTA QLD 4225

Council of the City of Gold Coast (Council) officers have reviewed the development application and supporting information and determined that further information is required to properly assess the application.

Pursuant to sections 13.2 and 13.3 of the Development Assessment Rules under the *Planning Act 2016*, the applicant may respond to this information request by giving to the assessing authority:

- 1 all of the information requested below; or
- 2 part of the information requested below; or
- 3 part of the information requested below together with a notice advising the assessing authority that it must proceed with the assessment of the application; or
- 4 a notice stating that none of the information requested below will be provided; or
- 5 a notice stating that none of the information requested below will be provided together with a notice advising the assessing authority that it must proceed with the assessment of the application.

You are advised that pursuant to section 13.1 of the Development Assessment Rules, the period for the applicant to respond to this information request is three (3) months of the date of this letter.

If no response is provided or only part of the information is provided to this request within the three (3) month period, Council will continue its assessment of the application based on the information submitted.

It would be in the applicant's best interest to address all of the information requested.

Please note that the provision of sufficient information to properly assess an application is a requirement for a favourable decision.

Council's Project Team

The assessment of this application will be undertaken by the following Council project team.

Assessment Manager Alex Couvaras Planner (07) 5582 9042 Acouvaras@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Planning Coordinator Adam Brown Coordinator Planning Assessment - South 0481 461 065 akbrown@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Architecture Allen Lucini Senior Architect (07) 5582 8874 alucini@goldcoast.qld.gov.au
Landscape and Open Space Georgina Rankine Landscape Planner (07) 3732 4723 grankine@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Transport Assessment John Neal Transport Officer (07) 5582 8023 jgneal@goldcoast.qld.gov.au	Civil Engineering David Crosswell Senior Civil Engineer 07 5582 9351 dcrosswell@goldcoast.qld.gov.au

INFORMATION REQUEST

Preamble

As outlined below, City Officers have concerns with the current design of the proposal, having regard to setbacks (stairs), site cover and visitor car parking location. It is acknowledged that Multiple dwellings are an envisaged land use within the Medium density residential zone code. Notwithstanding, improvements are required to the current design in order to address the Medium density residential zone code and the Multiple accommodation code.

Noting the scope of these issues, it is strongly recommended that the applicant arrange a meeting with City Officers to discuss alternative design outcomes prior to responding to Council's Information Request.

Planning Assessment and Architectural Assessment

1. Setbacks and site cover

Medium density residential zone code – Performance outcomes PO1 and PO2

Multiple accommodation code – Performance outcomes PO3, PO4, and PO10

City Officers are concerned with the following aspects of the built form:

- The approximately 64.5% site cover for Level 1 which the applicant has calculated to be 58.1%. Notwithstanding, the calculation has been made by excluding the planter boxes and other projecting elements of the built form.
- The 1.5 metre stair core setbacks to the southern side boundary.

These elements of the development coalesce to result in an intense and dominant built form that is inconsistent with the envisaged character for the zone. Overall, the development achieves a poor interface with neighbouring dwellings, does not promote sub-tropical urban design, and does not achieve an appropriate balance between the built form and landscaping.

Accordingly, the applicant is requested to submit amended drawings which:

- a. Increase the southern setbacks to the stair core on Level 2 (2.1m) to align with the level above (Level 3).
- b. Substantially reduce the site cover and visual bulk of the development to allow for a more appropriate balance with landscaping.

Note: *This is to be read in conjunction with Information Request Items 2, 4 and 5.*

2. Design and appearance

Multiple accommodation code – Performance outcomes PO3 and PO4

The built form of the proposal appears awkwardly proportioned, provides limited modulation and does not achieve a high-quality appearance along all façades. Specific reference is made to the following:

- The western elevation has a stark interface with Dutton Street, with disproportionate window openings, a lack of articulation, insufficient visual interest and no opportunity for casual surveillance.
- The general building aesthetic is inconsistent to the northern and southern elevations. The northern façade has a predominantly linear appearance and a lack of articulation. The south elevation has poor composition and sheer walls. The cumulative impact of reduced setbacks and sheer walls results in a bulky and dominant built form.
- The proposal does not achieve sufficient differentiation between individual dwelling units, support for shading and climate protection, or contributes to the visual interest to the streetscape and character of the local area.

Accordingly, it is requested that the applicant provide additional variation to the building appearance and an improved front façade. City Officers suggest that the applicant consider the following:

- Further variation in the built form by way of an improved overall composition;
- Design consistency around all facades;
- Dwelling offsets;
- Considered modulation in the wall plane;
- Recesses;
- Architectural elements (i.e., blade walls, window hoods) to support differentiation.

Note: *This is to be read in conjunction with Information Request Items 1, 2 and 5.*

3. Privacy

Multiple accommodation code – Performance outcome PO7

City Officers have concerns with the potential for overlooking onto the adjoining premiss to the north of the site. Specific reference is made to the first floor balconies and the rooftop terrace. Accordingly, to address Performance outcome PO7 of the Multiple accommodation code, the applicant is requested to:

- a. Submit additional information demonstrating how the current balcony and rooftop terrace design appropriately protects adjoining privacy by including proposed balustrade material; or
- b. Submit amended drawings with an alternative design that reduces sight lines onto the adjoining premises. In this instance, it is recommended that the applicant consider the following amendments:

- i. Increase the width of the first floor planter boxes so that there is a greater separation between the balconies and the OMP of this level.
- ii. Increase the extent to which the rooftop terrace is recessed behind the blades/OMP on the rooftop level.

Landscape Assessment

4. Frontage Landscaping

Medium density residential zone code – Performance outcomes PO1 and PO2

Multiple accommodation code – Performance outcome PO1

The setbacks and site cover of the development do not meet Acceptable outcomes AO1 and AO2 of the Medium density residential zone code. In addition, the front setbacks do not meet Acceptable outcome AO1 of the Multiple accommodation code. To address the corresponding Performance outcomes, the proposal is required to provide adequate landscaping that contributes to streetscape character and appropriately balances the built form.

Accordingly, City Officers request an amended Statement of Landscape Intent (SLI) and architectural drawings demonstrating the following:

- a. Removal of all frontage fencing to ensure the proposed 1.2 metre wide landscaped garden bed directly adjoins the road verge and allows for landscaping to be highly visible from the street. The removal of fencing is necessary due to the narrow width of the landscape strip and to ensure clear, unobstructed visibility of planting to enhance streetscape amenity.
- b. City Officers note inconsistencies between the SLI, architectural drawings, and specialist reports regarding the location of hardstand and bicycle parking. Bicycle parking within the frontage setback area is not supported. Updated and consistent plans are requested to demonstrate that the frontage is free of hardstand and infrastructure and accommodates one (1) large evergreen canopy tree planted a minimum of 0.5 metres inside the frontage boundary and a minimum 3 metres from built form.
- c. The proposed planter boxes contribute to the perceived bulk of the development. Accordingly, these are requested to be reduced to a soil depth of 600mm and incorporate cascading and shrub plantings. This approach will assist in softening the built form, improve visual amenity, and ensure planting viability given the limited vertical clearances of the current design.

Note: *This is to be read in conjunction with Information Request Items 1, 2 and 5.*

5. Side boundary planting

Medium density residential zone code – Performance outcomes PO1

To address amenity impacts to adjoining properties, the applicant is requested to reconsider the built form and hardstand configuration along the northern boundary. A continuous landscaped garden bed with a minimum width of 600mm is requested to be provided for the full extent of this boundary to accommodate a row of dense screening shrubs. This planting is required to mitigate overlooking and privacy impacts to the adjoining Dwelling house. The proposed bin store is requested to be relocated so that it does not encroach upon or compromise this landscaped strip.

Note: *This is to be read in conjunction with Information Request Items 1, 2 and 4.*

Transport Assessment

6. Car parking

Transport code – Performance outcome PO2, PO14 and PO19

The submitted drawings show one visitor car parking space located at the rear of the site. Despite this, if the visitor space is occupied, there is insufficient room available for a vehicle to turn around within the site and exit in a forward gear.

It is neither safe nor appropriate for a visitor vehicle to reverse the full length of the driveway, noting the driveway operates as a shared environment for vehicles and pedestrians. In addition, the access location is at the bottom of a hill and close to an intersection, where reversing out is unsafe due to restricted sight lines from traffic, parked vehicles and landscaping. This increases conflict with turning vehicles, reduces reaction time for other road users, and disrupts traffic flow, heightening the risk of collisions with pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. This does not demonstrate compliance with Performance outcome PO14 of the Transport code, which requires that all vehicles are able to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

In addition, the proposed bin storage area at the front of the site restricts access and manoeuvring to visitor parking space V1. Accordingly, the proposal does not demonstrate compliance with Performance outcome PO19 of the Transport code.

Therefore, the applicant is requested to:

- a. Submit amended drawings relocating both visitor car parking spaces to the front of the site in a clearly visible location, thereby eliminating the need for a turnaround bay
- b. Provide a swept path analysis prepared and certified by a RPEQ, demonstrating that a B85 vehicle can enter and exit each visitor parking space in accordance with AS2890.1 requirements.

Further Advice

The following items are not required to be addressed for Council to make a decision on the application. However, they identify matters that Council is likely to condition or amend in red in the decision notice based on the current information provided. Applicants may choose to submit updated information for consideration prior to decision if they prefer an alternative outcome.

1. Car park design

Transport code – Performance outcome PO19

City Officers note that the proposed driveway width of 6.1 metres currently provides sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of the garage parking spaces. Despite this, should the driveway width be reduced to accommodate a landscaped buffer along the northern boundary, Transport officers will require the submission of vehicle swept path analysis. This analysis must demonstrate that a B85 can access all garage and visitor parking spaces in accordance with AS2890.1 requirements.

2. Vehicle crossing conflict with existing infrastructure

City Officers have identified that the proposed vehicle crossing conflicts with existing utility infrastructure within the road reserve, including telecommunications infrastructure and a possible electrical pit.

It is recommended that the applicant liaise with and obtain written confirmation from the relevant service authorities (e.g. Telstra, Energex, NBN Co) to confirm whether the affected infrastructure can be relocated, modified, or otherwise accommodated to facilitate the proposed access.

Advice Note

The applicant is advised that should Council give further advice about the application (in accordance with s35 of the DA Rules) to resolve outstanding items not adequately addressed within the information request response, the applicant will be requested to complete a 'Notice to Stop the Current Period' for the above-mentioned application until the items within the further advice are adequately addressed. Alternatively, the applicant may choose to provide a reasonable extension to the Decision period, as advised by the Assessment manager. If the applicant does not stop the Current Period or provide a reasonable extension to the Decision period, Council officers will proceed with assessing and deciding the application based on the information provided in the information request response, which could result in an unfavourable recommendation by Council officers.

Notice to Stop the Current Period Form:

<https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/Applicanttemplate9.0-Noticeaboutstoppingthecurrentperiod.doc>

DA Rules extract:

s35.1 An assessment manager or concurrence agency for the application may, at any time before the application is decided, give further advice about the application to the applicant.

s35.2 Further advice may include advice about how the applicant may change the application.

Response format

As this application was lodged electronically, please direct all future correspondence regarding this application in the required PDF format i.e.:

- **Supporting documents** (separate the supporting documents into individual PDF appendices)
- **Plans** (combine as one single PDF)
- **Specialist reports** (separate each specialist report into individual PDF appendices)

Do not password protect the PDF.

The electronic response should be forwarded to mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au with the Assessment Manager Alexander Couvaras copied into the email acouvaras@goldcoast.qld.gov.au.

Please note - All submissions made in relation to the development application are publicly viewable on the Council's City of Gold Coast's Development.i: cityofgoldcoast.com.au/findDA.

Contacting us

Should you wish to clarify any issues contained in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Planning Assessment on 07 5582 8866.

Yours faithfully



Adam Brown

Coordinator Planning South

For the Chief Executive Officer

Council of the City of Gold Coast