

**FW: Objection to Proposed Development Application - 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket Q 4069**

---

**From**  
**Date**  
**To**  
**Cc**

 1 attachment (173 KB)

Objection to Development Application - 51 Mactier Street Fig Tree Pocket date 18 May 2026.pdf;

**SECURITY LABEL: OFFICIAL**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, 18 May 2026 11:35 AM  
**To:** dalodgement <dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au>  
**Cc:** DA RECORDS  
<DA\_RECORDS@brisbane.qld.gov.au>  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to Proposed Development Application - 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket Q 4069  
**Importance:** High

---

*This email originates from outside of Brisbane City Council.*

---

Dear DA Lodgements,

Further to my original objection submitted on 10 April 2026, and in light of the new public notification period, I **attach** a further copy of my objection dated 18 May 2026 regarding the proposed development at 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket, Queensland.

This is submitted to ensure there can be no argument that my objection was not properly made during the current notification period.

Yours Faithfully

---

**From:****Sent:** Friday, 10 April 2026 2:12 PM**To:** [dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au)**Cc:****Subject:** Objection to Proposed Development Application - 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket Q 4069**Importance:** High

Dear DA Lodgements,

Please find **attached** the following for your consideration:

1. My objection to the proposed development of 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket, Queensland (also lodged online via iDevelopments);
2. The notice received in my letterbox directing submissions to be emailed to [edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au);
3. A photograph of the notice affixed to the subject property reflecting details in item 2 above, which notes the same email address of [edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au); and
4. Undeliverable notification for [edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au).

I confirm that I have today spoken with a staff member of Brisbane City Council, who advised that the email address specified in the notice does not exist.

This is a matter of concern as the published notice directs all submissions to an erroneous email address, which may have prevented affected members of the public from lodging submissions within the prescribed timeframe. Given the submission deadline is today, it is likely that the broader community has been materially prejudiced.

In the circumstances, I request that Council:

1. Order that the Applicant/Owner of 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket, republish all relevant notices with the correct email address for submissions; and
2. Extend the public notification period by a further three (3) weeks from the date that the corrected notices are republished.

Given the time-sensitive nature of this issue, your urgent attention would be appreciated.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Faithfully

---

**From:**

**Sent:** Friday, 10 April 2026 1:03 PM

**To:** [edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:edanorth@brisbane.qld.gov.au)

**Cc:**

**Subject:** Objection to Proposed Development Application - 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket Q 4069

**Importance:** High

Dear Colleagues,

Please see **attached** my objection to the proposed development of 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket, Queensland.

Yours Faithfully

Monday, 18 May 2026

Brisbane City Council  
GPO Box 1434  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

By Email: [dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au](mailto:dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au)

RE: OBJECTION TO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION A006764172  
PROPERTY: 51 MACTIER STREET, FIG TREE POCKET QLD 406G  
PROPOSAL: RECONFIGURATION OF A LOT (SUBDIVISION)

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to lodge a properly made submission regarding the proposed reconfiguration of land at 51 Mactier Street, Fig Tree Pocket QLD 4069 (Development Application A006764172) (“herein referred to as “**Application**”).

I object to this Application on the following grounds:

---

### 1. Incompatibility with Neighbourhood Character

The proposed subdivision is inconsistent with the established low-density residential character of Fig Tree Pocket, known for its large lots, open spaces, and semi-rural ambiance. Introducing smaller lots would disrupt this character, leading to a gradual erosion of the suburb’s unique identity and amenity.

As a resident of Emma Place, my family specifically chose this location for its privacy, tranquillity, and strong sense of community, where neighbours know each other and actively participate in local events. The proposed development poses a direct threat to this community fabric.

Our home was designed to embrace and reflect the natural beauty of this green, leafy suburb. We were aware that the rear portion of 51 Mactier Street comprised a significant floodplain and swamp area, which we understood Brisbane City Council would not support for development. This understanding formed a key part of our decision to settle here.

The proposed subdivision into 26 lots on a Community Title Scheme is wholly inconsistent with the established geographic and residential character of Fig Tree Pocket—particularly in relation to the larger, well-spaced properties surrounding 51 Mactier Street. Such a high-density development risks undermining the very qualities that define and make this suburb so unique.

---

### 2. Environmental Impact and Biodiversity Concerns

The site falls within environmentally sensitive overlays, including areas of high ecological value vegetation, potential bushfire-prone zones and flood-prone areas. It is without doubt that the

subdivision will necessitate clearing native vegetation, disrupting wildlife habitats, and increasing bushfire risks due to habitat fragmentation. The application lacks adequate measures to mitigate these environmental risks. Currently, from our property, we have seen a variety of wildlife, including but not limited to:

1. Tawny frogmouth owls
2. Native green tree frogs
3. Kookaburras
4. Channel-billed Cuckoos
5. Swamp Wallabies (*Wallabia bicolor*)
6. Water dragons
7. Carpet pythons, tree snakes and other varieties of snakes
8. Currawongs, curlews
9. Pheasant coucals
10. Herons

Under the *Nature Conservation Act 1992*, it is a contravention of the Act to disturb the Swamp Wallabies, a protected animal in a critical habitat, which would include, but is not limited to, destroying and disrupting, their natural habitat.

Notably, several large trees, including gum trees on the property are vital to the ecological integrity of the area. These trees—many of which are located along the boundary lines of Emma Place properties and Mactier Street—provide essential habitat for local wildlife and contribute to the overall environmental balance of Fig Tree Pocket. Their removal or disturbance, particularly to their root systems, would undermine the integrity of the large trees thus having a detrimental impact on the local ecosystem.

Furthermore, the property's proximity to the long-standing Fig Tree Pocket Equestrian Club raises serious concerns. An increase in traffic and activity resulting from the proposed additional residences could distress the horses and jeopardise the safety of riders, particularly young and inexperienced ones. This poses a direct threat to the safe operation of a cherished community institution. The preservation of such an established and culturally significant facility should take precedence over intensive residential development in the area.

---

### **3. Infrastructure Strain and Traffic Safety**

Mactier Street is a narrow road, currently accommodating significant traffic, especially during school hours due to the nearby Brisbane Montessori School. Introducing more residences would exacerbate congestion, posing risks to residents, school staff, children and emergency services.

The absence of street lighting on Emma Place, coupled with the road's steep gradient and frequent on-street parking, already results in limited visibility and restricts traffic flow to a single lane in several sections. Accommodating additional traffic generated by the proposed development would require substantial infrastructure upgrades—such as road widening, pedestrian crossings, and enforcement of clearways. These measures may be difficult to implement given the physical constraints of the area. It is already common to see vehicles parked on nature strips and footpaths during school pick-up and drop-off times at Brisbane Montessori School, creating safety hazards and further obstructing traffic. The increased volume of vehicles would exacerbate these existing issues and significantly affect the amenity, accessibility and safety of residents in the area and those residing on Emma Place.

Moreover, Fig Tree Pocket frequently experiences power and water outages. The introduction of additional dwellings would place further strain on these already unreliable essential services, necessitating major infrastructure upgrades to maintain service quality and reliability.

---

#### **4. Flood Risk and Water Management**

Portions of the site are subject to flood overlays, and any increase in impervious surfaces resulting from subdivision and development would likely elevate stormwater runoff, thereby exacerbating downstream flooding risks to neighbouring properties. The current development application lacks detailed hydrological modelling and fails to propose effective water management strategies to mitigate these risks.

The land at 51 Mactier Street features highly undulating topography and includes areas of wetlands, marsh, and swamp—land characteristics consistent with other river-adjacent properties in Fig Tree Pocket. Development on such terrain would significantly alter the natural flow of water across the site, with likely impacts on the Brisbane River, Emma Place, and potentially the Brisbane Montessori School.

To accommodate development, substantial fill and compaction would likely be required, which would disrupt existing natural drainage channels. This alteration could increase the risk of surface water pooling and localised flooding, particularly in areas such as the lower part of Emma Place (where our property is located) that already experience water accumulation during periods of consistent rainfall.

---

#### **5. Precedent for Overdevelopment**

Approving this application risks setting a concerning precedent for future subdivisions in Fig Tree Pocket, encouraging incremental developments that undermine the intent and spirit of the local planning scheme—specifically, the preservation of the suburb’s low-density residential character and ecological sensitivity.

Recent developments in the area have generally respected the existing pattern of larger lot sizes, reinforcing Fig Tree Pocket’s distinct “country-living” appeal. Those recent approved and currently proposed reconfigurations relate to the following properties:

1. 557 Fig Tree Pocket Road, Fig Tree Pocket;
2. 545 Fig Tree Pocket Road, Fig Tree Pocket; and
3. 430 Fig Tree Pocket Road, Fig Tree Pocket.

By contrast, the proposed subdivision of 51 Mactier Street, introduce significantly smaller and narrow lots ranging from approximately 400 to 800 m<sup>2</sup> would increase population density, intensify traffic congestion, and likely lead to a decline in surrounding property values. This would particularly affect residents of Emma Place, where the tranquil, semi-rural lifestyle is a key aspect of the suburb’s identity and appeal.

---

#### **6. Inadequate Community Consultation**

Given the significant impact of this development, more extensive community consultation is warranted. Residents should have ample opportunity to voice concerns and contribute to decisions affecting the suburb's future.

---

## **7. Noise and Air Pollution to Adjoining Properties**

The proposed development would significantly increase both noise and air pollution, affecting not only the properties immediately adjoining 51 Mactier Street but also those in close proximity to the site. The scale and duration of construction activity would have a substantial impact on residents' daily lives, particularly given the prolonged nature of such a project.

Residents can expect ongoing disruption from large trucks, construction machinery, and tradespeople operating from 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM on weekdays—potentially over a period of 3 to 7 years, depending on the construction timeline for each individual lot. This extended period of disturbance would materially affect the amenity and peaceful enjoyment of nearby homes, and in particular my families use and enjoyment of our property.

Emma Place, a narrow street with a single-lane easement leading down to our property, is already ill-equipped to handle existing traffic volumes. There is limited capacity for vehicles to turn around safely, resulting in regular instances where cars, vans, or larger construction vehicles become trapped. This often leads to damage to private property, as vehicles attempt multi-point turns or unlawfully use gated driveways to exit the street. Despite repeated requests to Brisbane City Council for signage indicating that Emma Place is not a suitable area for turning or through-traffic, no action has been taken to date. This proposed development would exacerbate these current, ongoing issues.

---

## **8. Burden on Public and Private Schools**

Fig Tree Pocket State School is a small, close-knit primary school that provides a nurturing environment for local children. However, it lacks the capacity to accommodate a significant influx of new students. Similarly, nearby secondary schools such as Kenmore State High School and Indooroopilly State High School are already operating at or near capacity.

A substantial increase in the local population—such as that proposed by this development—would place unsustainable pressure on these educational facilities, in addition to further straining local roads and essential infrastructure. The cumulative effect would negatively impact the quality of schooling, increase traffic congestion, and diminish the overall liveability for current residents.

The provision of a new public high school should be a fundamental consideration in Brisbane City Council's assessment and approval of proposed lot reconfigurations in Fig Tree Pocket and the surrounding suburbs.

It would be remiss of the Council to disregard the foreseeable strain that such intensified development will place on existing infrastructure and community resources. Without adequate planning for educational facilities, these developments risk imposing significant and lasting burdens on the broader community.

---

## **G. Impacts on use and enjoyment of Property**

My home was designed and constructed on the understanding that the rear portion of 51 Mactier Street, is subject to watercourse and flood overlays, which restrict development in that area. This portion has effectively functioned as a natural buffer or nature strip and was not intended to be developed.

The proposed subdivision, specifically proposed Lot 26, which is situated directly opposite my property, would fundamentally alter this long-held expectation and significantly impact the use and enjoyment of my home. It would result in a substantial loss of privacy and amenity for my family, including my young children, through direct overlooking into our living areas and bedrooms.

Further, proposed Lot 26 appears to fall within the existing watercourse and flood overlay. I strongly object to any development within this portion of 51 Mactier Street, which has historically functioned as a natural buffer and should remain undeveloped.

In addition to privacy concerns, the development would result in dust, noise, and air pollution during construction and subsequent occupation, negatively affecting health and the ongoing enjoyment of our property. These impacts are inconsistent with the Low-Density Residential zone outcomes and the Flood and Environmental Significance overlays under the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, which aim to protect residential amenity, maintain privacy, and preserve environmental quality.

---

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Brisbane City Council refuse Development Application A006764172 in its current form. The proposal is inconsistent with the Low-Density Residential zone outcomes, the Environmental Significance and Flood Overlays, and other relevant codes in the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, as well as the provisions of the Planning Act 2016 (Qld).

Should Council consider approval, I request the imposition of stringent conditions to protect neighbourhood character, mitigate environmental risks, and preserve community amenity.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours sincerely,