

June 2026

Redland City Council
PO Box 21
CLEVELAND QLD 4163

Dear Sir/Madam,

REQUEST FOR A MINOR CHANGE TO DEVELOPMENT OVER LAND AT 203 ESPLANADE,
REDLAND BAY (RCC REF MCU25/0055)

The following information relates to a request to undertake a minor alteration to the existing development approval at the above-mentioned address. The proposed alterations are considered minor (detailed below) and are an integral part of ensuring the success and longevity of the project by creating custom built housing.

Development approval

By way of a decision notice dated 11 March 2026, Council approved a Multiple Dwelling development – 12 Units, on land at 203 Esplanade, Redland Bay (Council ref. MCU25/0055).

Proposed change

The applicant proposes to amend the approved internal layout to allow the inclusion of three additional units. The building will house a total of 15 dwelling units. The reason for the change to the proposal is due to market feedback and the ability for the development to proceed to be constructed. The new unit layout provides that the approved layout of Level 4 and 5 repeats over Level 1, 2, and 5.

Minor amendments to the external façade and screening have been proposed to ensure the building construction methodology and ensure the building can be built.

Please find attached amended architectural plans that reflect the required changes.

The purpose of the request is to amend the approval to permit the change. The request is supported by:

- Amended Architectural package (for assessment purposes,
- Amended Traffic Report.

Statutory framework

This request is made under section 78 of the *Planning Act 2016* and fulfils the requirements for a minor change. The proposal is compliant with the previous approval and the Planning Scheme's intent for the area and warrants approval.

This request relates to a Minor Change to the existing development permit being defined within s78 Making and Change with the Definition of a Minor Change, defined in Schedule 2 of the Planning Act which states:

‘Minor Change means -

“(b) for a development approval—

- (i) would not result in substantially different development; and*
- (ii) if a development application for the development, including the change, were made when the change application is made would not cause—*
 - (A) the inclusion of prohibited development in the application; or*
 - (B) referral to a referral agency, other than to the chief executive, if there were no referral agencies for the development application; or*
 - (C) referral to extra referral agencies, other than to the chief executive; or*
 - (D) a referral agency to assess the application against, or have regard to, matters prescribed by regulation under section 55 (2), other than matters the referral agency must have assessed the application against, or have had regard to, when the application was made; or*
 - (E) public notification if public notification was not required for the development application.’*

The Development Assessment Rules, Schedule 1 defines substantially different development as:

‘Substantially different development -

- 1. An assessment manager or responsible entity may determine that the change is a minor change²⁵ to a development application or development approval, where – amongst other criteria – a minor change is a change that would not result in ‘substantially different’ development.*
- 2. An assessment manager or responsible entity must determine if the proposed change would result in substantially different development for a change—*
 - (a) made to a proposed development application the subject of a response given under section 57(3) of the Act and a properly made application;*
 - (b) made to a development application in accordance with part 6; (c) made to a development approval after the appeal period.²⁶*
- 3. In determining whether the proposed change would result in substantially different development, the assessment manager or referral agency must consider the individual circumstances of the development, in the context of the change proposed.*
- 4. A change may be considered to result in a substantially different development if any of the following apply to the proposed change: (a) involves a new use; or*
 - (b) results in the application applying to a new parcel of land; or*
 - (c) dramatically changes the built form in terms of scale, bulk and appearance; or*
 - (d) changes the ability of the proposed development to operate as intended;²⁷ or*
 - (e) removes a component that is integral to the operation of the development; or*
 - (f) significantly impacts on traffic flow and the transport network, such as increasing traffic to the site; or*
 - (g) introduces new impacts or increase the severity of known impacts; or*
 - (h) removes an incentive or offset component that would have balanced a negative impact of the development; or*
 - (i) impacts on infrastructure provisions.’*

Comment:

The proposed development maintains the proposed use being for the purpose of a residential apartment building that supports and maintains the existing building bulk and scale. This application focuses on repeating the floor plan across Level 1 to Level 5 by removing the recreational area internal to the building at the rear of the site on Level 1. The storage area under the recreational area on Level 1 and alteration to Level 5 to create a 15th unit. The proposal does not alter the building bulk or scale. The modern appearance and layout of the design is paramount to the success of the space and this proposal aims to retain the existing approved concept.

The proposed changes have come about in part due to market feedback and the viability of the development. The detailed design process and a focused approach to the identification of building costs provides that the alterations are over parts of the land that has no consequence to the existing bulk and scale or the apartments ability to operate.

The proposed alterations do not involve a new use as it retains the residential that is in keeping with the intention of the existing approval. To be clear, as a result of this alteration the existing scale and the site's appearance within the streetscape is, for the most part, unchanging. The proposal retains the bulk, scale and appearance of the previously approved building and too the land parcels included in the application.

The appearance of the development is unchanged to a reasonable person's eye and includes substantial recreational improvement.

The proposed works improve the development's ability to operate by ensuring the development is able to be constructed and meet the expectations of the market and the future owners aspirations. There will be no change to the traffic flow or transport network within the development as the proposed density of the development is maintained to an acceptable outcome with the support of the Traffic Impact Assessment. There are no new impacts or increase to the severity of known impacts as this development offers a holistic development that caters to the needs of its future owners. There are no incentives or offsets associated with the history of this development or its future and there will not be a significant or otherwise negatively tangible impact on the provision, location or demand of service infrastructure.

The proposed works are not considered to be in addition to the existing use rather they aim to better resource the future owners and occupants resulting better design outcomes for the community. The changes are negligible to the overall design of the development. The removal of the level 2 internal recreational space is in anticipation of the occupant's use of the extensive parkland areas that immediately surrounded the development site in addition to their individual private open space areas. The parklands surrounding the site within 300m or less, walking distance are:

- Jack Gordon Pathway (along the Esplanade)
- The Esplanade road reserve and pathway adjacent to Moreton Bay Marine Park
- Moreton Bay Marine Park
- Sel Outridge Park to the east and the extensive parkland area to the south east.
- Neville Stafford Park

- Weinam Creek Park
- Meissner Park
- Pitt Street Park

Figure 1: Parkland Areas surrounding the site.



The proposed changes are all in the scope of compliant items and remain in keeping with the intent of the design. Moreover, the assessment is such that this proposal especially, this design, has an ability to maintain the character of the previous approval whilst increasing the number of families who can enjoy the location and the immediate neighbourhood.

In light of this the Council can be assured that the proposed works would not cause a person to make a properly made submission and the development is not prohibited development, is not substantially different and remains a Code Assessable use.

The applicable law at the time of assessment was Redlands Planning Scheme, City Plan being the current town plan which provides that the relevant conditions of approval are maintained. The proposal represents the optimal outcome for the site and warrants support by Council.

The proposed works do not create works that are considered to be substantially different nor do they require assessment by additional referral agents. At the time of the original application submission, there weren't any a referral agents in the assessment of the application and this remains.

If you have any questions please contact me on 0418 773 159.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Suzanne Hembrow', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Suzanne Hembrow