



Development Tribunal – Decision Notice

Planning Act 2016, section 255

Appeal number:	23-026
Appellant:	Michael Perry Dempsey and Stephanie Christine Dempsey
Respondent:	Council of the City of Gold Coast (Council)
Site address:	1-5 Surf Street, Mermaid Beach Qld 4218 and described as Lot 19 on SP 313680 – the subject site

Appeal

Appeal under section 229(1) of the *Planning Act 2016* (PA) against the issuing of an Enforcement Notice dated 28 April 2023. The tribunal is asked to decide whether an enforcement notice ordering that the Appellants cease carrying out building work on the site and remove unlawful work, should be confirmed or set aside.

Date and time of hearing:	9.30am Friday 11 August 2023
Place of hearing:	The subject site
Tribunal:	Kasey McAuliffe-Lake—Chair John Panaretos—Member
Present:	Michael Dempsey—Appellant Michael Drummond—Agent for appellant Paul Besgrove—Builder Darren Wright—Building Surveyor Sophie Chivas—City of Gold Coast Council Broc Smith—City of Gold Coast Council Jason Rodgers—City of Gold Coast Council Zen MacKenzie—City of Gold Coast Council

Decision:

The Development Tribunal (Tribunal), in accordance with section 254(2)(d) of the *Planning Act 2016* (PA) orders that:

1. The Enforcement Notice dated 28 April 2023 be set aside; and
2. The Council of the City of the Gold Coast to remake the decision to issue the enforcement notice, if any, within 6 months.

Background

1. The appellant was issued with building development permit BP20/0515 over the subject site on 30 September 2020 referencing a range of plans for the construction of a house.
2. Building development permit BP20/0515 was issued by the certifier after receiving concurrence agency approval from the Council dated 23 October 2019 for:

A Dwelling house within the Albatross Avenue and Surf Street road front setback clearance areas and north-western side setback clearance area.
3. The concurrence agency response was given subject to compliance with plans 1.02-1.04, 2.01-2.01 and 3.01-3.02.
4. On 18 April 2023, during the house construction, Council officers inspected the site, took measurements, including the height of the retaining wall, and otherwise documented the construction on site with photographs and field notes.
5. Council subsequently issued the appellant with an Enforcement Notice dated 28 April 2023 alleging a contravention of section 163(1) of the PA in that assessable 'building work', namely a retaining wall 'east of the dwelling occupying the foreshore seawall setback', was in the process of construction and was almost complete, in the absence of a necessary development permit. Council elected not to issue a show cause notice prior to the enforcement notice.
6. The Enforcement Notice stated that the City Plan applied an alternative provision to the Queensland Development Code (QDC), namely the coastal erosion hazard overlay code 'boundary clearance provisions for structures within the waterfront development control area'.
7. The Enforcement Notice required the recipient to:
 - A. *Refrain from committing the development offence by ceasing carrying out building work on the site; and*
 - B. *Remedy the commission of the offence by removing the unlawful work.*
8. The appellant received the Enforcement Notice on 2 May 2023.
9. Form 10 Notice of Appeal was lodged with the registrar on 29 May 2023.
10. On 8 August 2023, prior to the hearing, the appellant lodged a submission with the registrar, supplementing their original grounds for appeal with two further grounds.
11. Grounds of appeal which were ultimately pressed by the appellant are that the Enforcement Notice should be set aside:
 - (a) for the council's failure to issue a show cause notice;
 - (b) as the nature of the alleged offence and the actions required by the Enforcement Notice are unclear and ambiguous;
 - (c) as the retaining wall is assessable development for which a permission is required;
 - (d) as a matter of discretion, where the Enforcement Notice identified no practical adverse consequence for the alleged breach.¹

¹ Paragraphs 7 – 8, Outline of Argument for the Dempseys.

12. Alternatively, the **appellant** submits that, if the Tribunal accepts that an Enforcement Notice should be given, that the action required by the Notice is inappropriate and that the appellant should be given an opportunity to regularise the retaining wall.
13. On 11 August at the tribunal hearing, **Council** tabled an extensive written submission, supplemented by complex oral submissions.
14. On 11 August 2023, the tribunal issued the following orders:
 1. *on or before 4pm Monday, 14 August 2023, the Appellant provide to the parties and the Tribunal copies of the photographs relied upon in the oral hearing;*
 2. *on or before 4pm on 18 August 2023, the Council provide to the parties and the Tribunal:*
 - a. *the written submissions relied upon by the Council in the appeal; and*
 - b. *a brief (maximum 2 page) submission on the application of the Human Rights Act 2019 to the Appeal (if any), addressing in particular sections 5(2), 24, 25(a), 48 and 13.*
 3. *on or before 4pm 1 September 2023 the Appellant provide to the parties and to the Tribunal any written submissions in response;*
 4. *on or before 4pm 8 September 2023 the Council provide to the parties and to the Tribunal any written submissions, limited to new matters raised in the submissions subject of order 3.*
15. On 14 August the **appellant** lodged the photos the subject of the tribunal's order 1 above which were tabled at the hearing.
16. On 18 August 2023, **Council** lodged further submissions responding to items 2(a) and 2(b) of the tribunal's orders, incorporating a number of documents described as:
 - 1 *Written submissions relied upon by the Council in the appeal; and*
 - 2 *Submission on the application of the Human Rights Act 2019 to the Appeal.*
 - 3 *Bundle of material considered by the decision maker;*
 - 4 *Bundle of additional material relied upon.*
17. On 28 August, the **appellant** requested an extension of time to respond to Council's submission due to its 'lengthy and legally complex' nature, to which the tribunal agreed.
18. On 11 September, the **appellant** lodged submissions and associated Annexures in response to the Council's submissions.
19. On 14 September, Council requested an extension of time to make its further submissions under Order 4 in response to the appellant's submission, contending that '*The response submissions raise new matters and provides new evidence which was not previously provided as part of Mr Dempsey's grounds for appeal and was not provided at the hearing*' to which the tribunal acceded.
20. On 22 September **Council** lodged a further '*written submission in reply*'.
21. On 27 September 2023, the appellant requested an extension of time to respond to Council's submission, to which the Council objected on the following grounds:
 1. *Council's reply submissions provided on 22 September 2023 are wholly responsive to the Appellants' written outline of argument provided on 11 September 2023 and do not raise new issues;*
 2. *the parties have now had a reasonable opportunity to be heard in the appeal at both a hearing of the appeal (on 11 August 2023), and subsequent exchange*

of written submissions. We note that the parties have both had the opportunity to deliver two written documents outlining their positions:

- i. the Appellants – the Notice of Appeal and Written Outline of Argument; and*
 - ii. Council – Written submissions and Written submissions in reply;*
 - 3. the resolution of the appeal ought not to be unnecessarily delayed by the production of a further submission in circumstances where:*
 - i. the parties have had a reasonable opportunity be heard; and*
 - ii. delaying the resolution of the appeal, and therefore indirectly allowing the subject Work to remain in place, will facilitate the ongoing occurrence of the detriment described at paragraph 5.4(d) of Council's Reply submissions.*
- 22. The tribunal subsequently acceded to the appellant's request, subject to the following qualifications:*
 - 1. Mr Dempsey may provide any further submission he wishes to make by no later than **4pm on Friday 6 October 2023**, with the following limitations:*
 - a. the submission is limited to two (2) pages;*
 - b. the submission addresses only new matters arising out of the Council's Written Reply.*
 - 2. Any submission by Mr Dempsey which does not arise out of the Council's Written Reply will not be considered by the Tribunal.*
- 23. On 6 October, the **appellant** lodged the requested submission with the registrar.*

Issues to be addressed

- 24. There was very little agreement between the parties on several relevant matters of fact and issues of law.*
- 25. Consequently, the matters for determination in this Appeal are as follows:*
 - (a) The scope of the tribunal's jurisdiction with respect to particular grounds of appeal;*
 - (b) Whether Council was required to issue a show cause notice as a prerequisite to the enforcement notice as specified by section 167(2) of the PA and whether such a decision is within the tribunal's jurisdiction;*
 - (c) Whether the enforcement notice is sufficiently specific in describing the alleged offence and in its orders, to be valid;*
 - (d) Whether the retaining wall represents development for the purposes of the Building Act and the PA; or*
 - (e) Whether the retaining wall is accepted development under the Building Act and consequently the PA. This requires a determination of whether the retaining wall exceeds 1 metre in height and whether the sides and front of the retaining wall represent separate, discrete retaining walls or a single continuous retaining wall.*
- 26. As a result of the Tribunal's finding on points (a) – (c), there is no need for the balance of the matters to be determined.*

Jurisdiction

27. Council has issued an enforcement notice regarding, what the Council says, is building work which is assessable development where the necessary development permit has not been issued and is not in effect².
28. The Enforcement Notice relates to the matter listed at Schedule 1 section 1(2)(b)(ii), namely the absence of a *development approval for operational work associated with ... a retaining wall...* Consequently, the appeal against the issuing of the enforcement notice falls within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal pursuant to Section 229 and Schedule 1 section 1(2)(h) of the PA.
29. Much time was spent in written submissions and at hearing on whether particular grounds of appeal, in whole or in part, are outside of the Tribunal's jurisdiction³. Ultimately, all but one of those grounds were not pressed.⁴
30. The only remaining ground which the Council submits is outside of jurisdiction is the ground concerning the Council's failure to issue a show cause notice⁵.
31. The Council submits that whether a show cause notice is issued "*does not concern matters relating to the Building Act and is therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the Tribunal in this appeal.*" Whilst that may be the case, the line between matters under the Building Act and those under the Planning Act is not so bright. Indeed, the document enlivening the appeal is Enforcement Notice issued pursuant to s167(5) of the *Planning Act*, and no complaint is made regarding the Tribunal's jurisdiction in that regard.
32. No complaint is raised as to whether the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider grounds of appeal relating to whether a notice complies with the mandatory requirements of s168(3) of the PA. The Enforcement Notice alleges, in essence, that work done on the site is assessable development as it is not accepted building work for which a development permit is not required.⁶ That is a matter to be determined under the PA as it relates to the BA.⁷ The Tribunal is of the view that where, as has occurred here, an enforcement notice is issued regarding a matter under the PA to the extent that matter relates to the BA, the compliance of that notice with s168 of the PA is a matter within jurisdiction for the Tribunal⁸, being a matter which involves a decision to give an enforcement notice in relation to a matter under the PA, where that matter relates to the BA.⁹
33. We are satisfied that the issue of a show cause notice appears to be within jurisdiction of the Tribunal. If we were wrong about that, as a consequence of the findings below regarding the content of the Enforcement Notice, this matter being outside jurisdiction would not alter the outcome of this Appeal.
34. No complaint is raised regarding whether the balance of the grounds ultimately pressed by the appellant are within jurisdiction.

² Section 163 of the PA

³ See Council Submissions 4.5 – 4.20.

⁴ See 10, Outline of Argument for the Dempseys.

⁵ See Council Submissions 4.13 – 4.16.

⁶ See Council's submissions 5.1 – 5.3.

⁷ See 1(g) Schedule 1 PA.

⁸ See discussion with respect to the scope of "matter" in [45] – [47] *Brisbane City Council v Brand & Anor* [2022] QPEC 35 per Kefford DCJ.

⁹ See 1(g) and 1(h) Schedule 1 PA.

Decision framework

35. Pursuant to section 253(3) of the PA the enforcement authority that gave the notice (Council) must establish that the appeal should be dismissed.
36. The tribunal is required to hear and decide the appeal by way of a reconsideration of the evidence that was before the authority that made the decision appealed against (section 253(4) of the PA).
37. The tribunal may nevertheless (but need not) require information for tribunal proceedings or consider other evidence presented by a party with leave of the tribunal under section 246 of the PA.
38. The tribunal is required to decide the appeal in one of the ways mentioned in section 254(2) of the PA.

Material considered

39. The material considered in arriving at this decision was:
 - (a) Form 10 Notice of appeal, grounds for appeal and correspondence accompanying the appeal lodged with the Tribunals registrar on 29 May 2023.
 - (b) The concurrence agency response building development application BP20/0515 along with plans 1.02-1.04, 2.01-2.01 and 3.01-3.02
 - (c) Building development permit BP20/0515 dated 23 October 2019 including conditions of approval and approved plans.
 - (d) Enforcement Notice issued by Council over the subject site and dated 28 April 2023.
 - (e) The appellant's submission of 8 August 2023.
 - (f) Verbal submissions made by both parties at the hearing of 11 August 2023.
 - (g) The appellant's suite of photographs lodged on 14 August.
 - (h) Council's submission of 18 August responding to the tribunal's orders of 11 August.
 - (i) The appellant's submission and associated Annexures of 11 September.
 - (j) The Council's submission of 22 September.
 - (k) The appellant's submission of 6 October.
 - (l) The City of Gold Coast Planning Scheme.
 - (m) The Queensland Development Code (QDC).
 - (n) The Human Rights Act 2019.¹⁰
 - (o) The Building Act 1975.
 - (p) The Planning Act 2016.

¹⁰ There was ultimately no need to consider matters arising under the *Human Rights Act 2019* in light of the findings below regarding the issue of the Enforcement Notice, but the Tribunal thanks the parties for their helpful submissions on this point.

Findings of fact

40. The tribunal makes the following findings of fact:

- (a) The subject site is a beachfront site subject to the City of Gold Coast Planning Scheme, zoned Medium density residential, and development on the site is regulated by the Coastal hazard erosion overlay code (**the Code**).
- (b) The appellant has enclosed the beachside curtilage of the house with a retaining wall comprising two side walls (north and south), a south eastern truncation, and an eastern wall fronting the beach, creating a turfed level yard to roughly the floor level of the house.
- (c) The Tribunal observed that many of the neighbouring properties appear to have fence or retaining wall structures approximately in line with the foreshore seawall line, though the Tribunal has no evidence regarding the particular circumstances of those structures.
- (d) The Code's required outcome AO1 for assessable development (Table 8.2.4-3) prescribes a setback of 8.1 metres from the foreshore seawall line shown on the Coastal erosion hazard overlay map.
- (e) Performance outcomes for AO1 include:
 - (a) *Ensure the protection and maintenance of the foreshore seawall (boulder wall); and*
 - (e) *Ensure unimpeded access through to neighbouring properties for seawall maintenance.*
- (f) The existing seawall is covered by beach sand, thus not visible under normal conditions, but it is acknowledged that it aligns approximately with the beachfront boundary of the subject site.
- (g) The 8.1 metre setback line approximately aligns with the beachfront façade of the house.
- (h) The tribunal accepts the appellant's claim, based on an RPEQ engineer's certification that the wall is a 'lightweight timber structure' with no strip footings. The height of the wall is disputed by the parties.
- (i) Under schedule 1 of the Building Regulation 2021, "*total height of the wall*" is taken from "*finished ground level*", which for a retaining wall:
 - (a) *means the ground level adjacent to the footing system of the wall at the completion of construction and landscaping; but*
 - (b) *does not include the footing for the wall.*

In this case, the wall is supported by isolated (post) footings. Architectural drawing a-5.1.01 A contains sections depicting the footing system, with natural ground line (N.G.L.) in diagrams 02 and 04 below the top of the footings, while finished ground level (F.G.L.) is above the top of the footings. The F.G.L. is also described as "approximate extent of sand dune in accordance with op works approval" and "line of existing dune extent".

- (j) Loose beach sand, by its very nature, defies regulatory rigidity. The tribunal's site inspection revealed that the dune level was variable along the length of the wall and

of course, the level is transitory. Hence, the tribunal finds that the height of the wall is variable both below and slightly above 1 metre.¹¹

- (k) The tribunal accepts that no "*surcharge loading*" applies to the wall.
- (l) The Council attended the property on 18 April 2023 and took photographs of the wall. The Tribunal accepts that as at 18 April 2023, the Wall subject of the proceedings appears to be complete, or virtually complete in the photographs provided to the Tribunal. Figure 1 of the Enforcement Notice, said to have been taken on 10 April, also appears to show a complete or near complete retaining wall.
- (m) The Council issued the Enforcement Notice on 28 April 2023.

Was a show cause notice required?

- 41. Section 167 of the PA requires that a show cause notice "must" be given, setting out the matters identified in 167(2). Section 167(4) then provides that "[a]fter considering any representations made by the person as required under the show cause notice, the enforcement authority may give the enforcement notice...".
- 42. Section 167(5) sets out the circumstances in which these mandatory requirements are able to be displaced. The Council appears to rely only on 167(5)(b).¹²
- 43. It relevantly provides:
 - (5) *An enforcement authority need not give a show cause notice to the person, before giving the person an enforcement notice, if—*
 - ...
 - (b) *the enforcement authority reasonably believes it is not appropriate in the circumstances to give the show cause notice (because the notice is likely to adversely affect the effectiveness of the enforcement notice, for example).*
- 44. The Council submits that it was not appropriate to issue a show cause notice as:
 - (a) the work was near complete, and would be complete by the time that the 20 business days in which a response to a show cause notice would be provided;
 - (b) the work had the potential to impact on the coastal area and seawall;
 - (c) the Council was of the view that the work would not be accepted if an application were made; and
 - (d) issuing the Enforcement Notice quickly would avoid the Appellants wasting money finishing the work.
- 45. The Council has provided two photographs of the Works, taken on 18 April 2023. They show a retaining wall which seems complete, with only landscaping works remaining. The Enforcement Notice was then issued 10 days after that. In light of that evidence, the Tribunal finds that the work was likely complete as at the date of the inspection. In those circumstances, the Tribunal does not accept the Council's submissions that not issuing a show cause notice was appropriate in order to ensure that a step was taken prior to completion of the works.

¹¹ The question of whether the retaining wall constitutes development does not entirely hinge on the height of the wall.

¹² See 4.16 Council's Submissions.

46. With regard to the impact to the coastal area and seawall, Council asserts that the work would not be accepted if the appropriate application were to be made in any event and that no show cause notice was required as a result. There are three difficulties with this:
- (a) the submission does not explain why that would impact upon the appropriateness or otherwise of issuing a show cause notice;
 - (b) the submission denies the appellant's right under the planning scheme to make a case for Council assessment against the performance outcomes and purpose of the Code, of an alternative solution to the accepted outcomes; and
 - (c) the neighbouring properties have what appears to be similar structures in similar placement relative to the seawall, suggesting that, in the event the work is assessable, a solution can be found.
47. The Council's submission that the work would not be accepted, as articulated, does not relate to a matter contemplated by s167(5).
48. Council's argument that the issue of an enforcement notice was necessary to prevent wastage of resources on completing the wall could have been applied equally to the issue of a show cause notice.
49. The tribunal is not persuaded that the matters identified by Council are circumstances in which it would not be appropriate to issue a show cause notice. The work was for all intents and purposes, complete, and the issue of a show cause notice would have put the appellant on notice of the Council's concerns in the same way as the Enforcement Notice.
50. Indeed, a show cause notice (and any response to it) would provide opportunity for the parties to ventilate and resolve many of the factual disputes and ambiguities raised in the appeal.

Is the Enforcement Notice valid?

51. Section 168(3) and (4) of the PA requires that an enforcement notice must state:
- (3) *The notice must state -*
 - (a) *the nature of the alleged offence; and*
 - (b) *if the notice requires the person not to do an act—*
 - (i) *the period for which the requirement applies; or*
 - (ii) *that the requirement applies until further notice; and*
 - (c) *if the notice requires the person to do an act—*
 - (i) *the details of the act; and*
 - (ii) *the period within which the act must be done; and*
 - (d) *that the person has an appeal right against the giving of the notice.*
 - (4) *The notice may require demolition or removal of all or part of works if the enforcement authority reasonably believes it is not possible or practical to take steps—*
 - (a) *to make the development accepted development; or*
 - (b) *to make the works comply with a development approval; or*
 - (c) *if the works are dangerous—to remove the danger.*
52. Per section 168(5), contravention of an enforcement notice attracts a penalty.

53. While the Enforcement Notice does state that the removal of “the unlawful work” is required as it is not practical or possible to make the works accepted development, or to remove danger, it does not clearly and expressly define the “work” to which it is said to relate.
54. Relevantly, the Enforcement Notice:
- (a) states “...*assessable development, being building work has been carried out at the premises without all necessary development permits being in effect for the development as required by the Planning Act.*”
 - (b) states “*A retaining wall has been constructed to the east of the dwelling occupying the foreshore seawall setback.*”
 - (c) Figures 1 and 2 show top-down satellite imagery of the site. Figure 1 shows an arrow pointing to a point on the part of the retaining wall on the eastern boundary, described as “*subject retaining wall*”. Figure 2 shows the Foreshore seawall line in red.
 - (d) Figure 3 is a photograph, taken from the South of the property, “*showing retaining wall structure within the foreshore setback*”.
 - (e) requires:
 - A. *Refrain from committing the development offence by ceasing the carrying out of building work on the site; and*
 - B. *Remedy the commission of the offence by removing the unlawful work.*
55. There is a retaining wall extending from the dwelling along northern boundary, continuing unbroken down the eastern boundary, and then extending along the southern boundary until meeting with the dwelling again. The Enforcement Notice does not make plain if it is intended to refer only to a part of that retaining wall, or to the entirety. The action required refers only to removal of “the unlawful work”. Though it seems by the Council’s submissions that it is intended to refer only to the part of the retaining wall located within the seawall foreshore setback, such is not made plain on the face of the Enforcement Notice.
56. The Council submits that it is now reasonably plain to what work the Enforcement Notice is intended to refer. While that may be so, that is not sufficient. Contravention of the Enforcement Notice is an offence attracting penalty. It is appropriate that what a recipient is required to do to ensure they do not fall afoul of that is plain on the face of the document.
57. An enforcement notice which does not clearly specify what part or parts of a structure are to be removed does not properly set out “*the nature of the alleged offence, and the details of the actions required with respect to it, with sufficient certainty and particularity so that a person of ordinary intelligence and experience can ascertain from the document exactly what is needed*”¹³. The Enforcement Notice should be set aside on this basis.

Is the retaining wall accepted development?

58. In light of the Tribunal’s findings above, there is no need for the Tribunal to determine whether or not all or part of the wall is accepted development, though we are grateful to

¹³ *Benfer v Sunshine Coast Regional Council* [2019] QPEC 006 at [95] per Kefford DCJ, emphasis added.

the parties for their detailed submissions on this point. Whilst no finding will be made, the Tribunal makes the following observations:

- (a) Under section 5 of the Building Act, erection of a structure constitutes 'building work'.
- (b) Under section 20 of the Building Act, all building work is 'assessable development' unless it is 'accepted development' under section 21(2) or a regulation made under the PA.
- (c) Section 21(2) declares building work to be accepted development for the PA if it is prescribed by regulation and, where required, complies with 'relevant provisions'.
- (d) Building Regulation 2021 schedule 1 paragraph 3(1) declares a retaining wall to be 'accepted development' where it is no more than 1 metre in height and the wall is no closer than 1.5 metres to a building or another retaining wall.
- (e) The north and south portions of the retaining wall closest to the front of the dwelling are within 1.5 metres of the dwelling, though the balance is not.

59. It appears that at least some of the retaining wall(s) may not be accepted development, irrespective of the position with respect to the seawall line.

Conclusion

60. It is proper that the Enforcement Notice should be set aside given the lack of show cause notice and ambiguity in the Enforcement Notice as issued. While ideally the Tribunal would then substitute its own decision regarding the content of the Enforcement Notice, the lack of engineering evidence regarding what would be necessary to remedy the effect of any offence means that the Tribunal is not appropriately placed to do so.
61. Having set aside the Enforcement Notice, s254(2)(d) requires that the Tribunal order that the Council remake the decision by a stated time. The difficulty here is that a number of intervening steps may occur which could materially affect the matters to be addressed by any remake notice, content of such a notice, or indeed whether it must be issued at all. The Appellant may wish to make an application with respect to all or part of the retaining wall. Alternatively, were the Council to issue a show cause notice, the response to that notice would have to be considered before an enforcement notice is re-issued. And in either example, of course, it is possible that upon consideration the Council may decide that enforcement action is no longer necessary. In those circumstances a longer time in which the Council is to remake the decision is appropriate.

Kasey McAuliffe-Lake
Development Tribunal Chair
Date: 10 April 2025

Appeal rights

Schedule 1, table 2, item 1 of the *Planning Act 2016* provides that an appeal may be made against a decision of a Tribunal to the Planning and Environment Court, other than a decision under section 252, on the ground of -

- (a) an error or mistake in law on the part of the Tribunal; or
- (b) jurisdictional error.

The appeal must be started within 20 business days after the day notice of the Tribunal decision is given to the party.

The following link outlines the steps required to lodge an appeal with the Court.

<http://www.courts.qld.gov.au/courts/planning-and-environment-court/going-to-planning-and-environment-court/starting-proceedings-in-the-court>

Enquiries

All correspondence should be addressed to:

The Registrar of Development Tribunals
Department of Housing and Public Works
GPO Box 2457
Brisbane Qld 4001

Telephone 1800 804 833

Email: registrar@epw.qld.gov.au