

**RECEIVED**  
28/01/2026  
**TOOWOOMBA  
REGIONAL COUNCIL**

## Privacy collection notice

The personal information in this form is collected by Toowoomba Regional Council for the purpose of assessing the request in this form and performing related functions. Council's privacy policy is available on the [Council website](#).

## Form introduction

Provide support, comment or objection to a development application submitted to Toowoomba Regional Council.

After submission you may be notified of the outcome of the relevant development application.

If your submission is a 'properly made submission' under the Planning Act 2016, you may have certain appeal rights in the Planning and Environment Court.

This submission, including personal contact information, will be lodged and publicly available at Development.i under the relevant development application in accordance with the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Evidence Act 1977.

I understand my submission, including personal contact information, will be lodged and publicly available at Development.i \*

## Submitter details

First name \*

Robert

Last name \*

Wagner

Phone number: \*

0428231449

Email address \*

wags.robert@gmail.com

## Address

Residential address \*

Street address \*

4 Madison Court

City \*

Glensvale

State \*

QLD

Postcode \*

4350

Is your postal address the same as above? \*

Yes

No

## Application details

### Address of application \*

#### Street address \*

300 and 390 Drayton Wellcamp Road

#### City \*

Glenvale

#### State \*

QLD

#### Postcode \*

4350

### Application number

MCUI/2025/7307

## Submission details

Information about grounds for a submission, can be [found on our website](#).

### What is your position on the development application? \*

- Support
- Object
- Neutral

### State your grounds, and the facts and circumstances relied on to support the submission. \*

I am writing to formally submit an objection/request for amendment regarding the proposed development at 300 Drayton Wellcamp Road. While the need for housing is acknowledged, the current planning documents reveal several civil design faults and overlooked environmental impacts that directly disadvantage existing residents.

We request that Council impose the following conditions to mitigate the adverse impacts on the existing residential interface:

#### 1. Mandatory "Natural Asset" Buffer (Green Belt)

a. The Stage 1 Site Plan (Ref: AU374922-02) identifies a "Minimum 4m wide easement" within proposed Lot 9001 for the construction of an acoustic fence. This narrow strip is insufficient to mitigate the visual and noise impact of a 460-lot development.

- The Issue: The current design places high-density housing almost directly against the boundaries of established low-density homes, with only a structural easement as a divider.

- The Request: We request that this 4m easement be widened to a 10-meter "Landscaped Protection Buffer." This buffer should be excluded from private lot calculations to ensure it remains a permanent green screen, as the current Weed Management & Rehabilitation Plan focuses almost exclusively on drainage areas rather than the residential interface.

b. The Weed Management & Rehabilitation Plan (Project J002153) classifies the southern boundary area as "VC2 - Non-remnant mixed pasture." We challenge the developer's use of this classification to justify a total lack of physical separation between the new lots and existing large-format residential blocks.

- The Issue: The current design provides zero meaningful separation, creating significant privacy and noise impacts for the long-standing residents of the surrounding blocks.

- The Request: We request a mandatory 15-meter "Natural Asset" Buffer, excluded from private lot calculations, along the entire southern boundary. This buffer should be used for the retention any existing mature canopy trees and supplementary "Deep Planting" to create a permanent visual and acoustic screen.

#### 2. Transitioning Density and Lot Size Matching

The Yield Breakdown reveals a significant "density shock," with Land Lease Community (LLC) sites as narrow as 11m and freehold lots as small as 300m<sup>2</sup>. This is inconsistent with the Low-Density Residential character of Western Glenvale.

- The Issue: Placing 300m<sup>2</sup>-455m<sup>2</sup> equivalent dwellings directly against established large-format residential titles creates a significant bulk and scale conflict.

- The Request: We request a "Transitional Density Zone." Any new lot sharing a boundary with an existing residential property must match the scale of the existing interface, with a minimum size of 640m<sup>2</sup> (consistent with the largest proposed freehold lots in the Yield Breakdown) to ensure a sympathetic density gradient.

#### 3. Height Restrictions and Amenity Impact of Acoustic Fencing

The Environmental Noise Assessment (Alpha Acoustics, 30 July 2025) proposes acoustic barriers ranging from 1.8m to 2.7m in height to meet traffic noise criteria.

- The Issue: A 2.7m solid wall along the boundary constitutes a significant "visual blight" and will result in overshadowing and a "prison-wall" effect for existing neighbours.

- The Request: We request that Council reject the use of maximum-height solid barriers on shared boundaries. Instead, the developer must be forced to increase the building setback for the new homes, allowing the noise to dissipate naturally and keeping fence heights to a standard 1.8m residential height.

#### 4. Asset Protection Zone (APZ) and Safety Separation

The Bushfire Management Report identifies the need for Asset Protection Zones (APZ). In high-density designs, developers often attempt to place these safety zones inside private backyards, which leads to the removal of all privacy-providing vegetation.

- The Request: We request that the required Asset Protection Zone (APZ) be integrated into the 15m "Natural Asset" Buffer discussed in Point 1 b. This area must be a dedicated, non-buildable corridor managed by the LLC or Council, ensuring that no permanent structures (sheds, carports, or dwellings) can ever be built within 15 meters of our shared property lines.

#### 5. Privacy, Topography, and Overlooking

The Stage 1 Site Plan indicates significant site coverage (47.4% for LLC areas). Combined with "cut and fill" earthworks, new dwellings may sit at a higher elevation than existing homes.

- The Issue: "Cut and fill" operations may result in new dwellings sitting at a significantly higher elevation than existing homes, leading to direct overlooking and drainage runoff issues.
- The Request: We request a condition that all dwellings bordering the southern boundary be restricted to Single-Storey only.

#### 6. Wildlife Corridor and Ecological Connectivity

The subject land forms part of a broader peri-urban landscape that currently supports established wildlife movement between remnant vegetation, drainage lines, and large-format residential and semi-rural properties to the south and west.

- The Issue: Existing residents regularly observe koalas, eastern grey kangaroos, and deer moving through and foraging across the southern interface of the site. These animals rely on low-disturbance corridors for safe movement between habitat patches.

The current proposal pushes high-density development directly to the southern boundary, with no meaningful ecological linkage provided. While the Weed Management & Rehabilitation Plan focuses primarily on drainage corridors, it fails to address east-west fauna movement, which will be effectively severed by fencing, built form, lighting, traffic, and domestic animals associated with a large development.

- The Risk: Without a designated wildlife corridor, the development will:

- o Sever known fauna movement routes used by koalas, kangaroos, and deer
- o Increase wildlife-vehicle strike risk on internal estate roads and Drayton Wellcamp Road
- o Increase stress, injury, and mortality rates for protected and non-native but established fauna
- o Intensify human-wildlife conflict for both existing residents and future occupants
- o Result in cumulative ecological degradation inconsistent with Council's environmental, biodiversity, and liveability objectives

- The Request: We request that Council mandate a dedicated Wildlife Corridor along the southern interface, co-located with the proposed 15-metre "Natural Asset Buffer" outlined in Point 1(b), creating a minimum combined corridor width of 15-20 metres.

This corridor must:

- o Be excluded from private lot yield and remain in shared ownership or Council ownership
- o Be permanently non-buildable
- o Prioritise the retention of existing mature canopy trees, including known koala feed species where present
- o Be supplemented with endemic canopy and understory planting suitable for local fauna movement and shelter
- o Prohibit solid fencing, excessive night lighting, and unrestricted domestic animal access
- o Be managed under a legally binding Vegetation, Fauna, and Corridor Management Plan

This integrated approach supports the safe movement of koalas, kangaroos, and deer, while also delivering a meaningful visual, acoustic, and privacy buffer for existing residents and reducing long-term conflict between wildlife and urban development.

**Conclusion** The current plan seeks to maximize yield at the direct expense of the established community's privacy and lifestyle. We urge the Toowoomba Regional Council to mandate a wider separation and a more sympathetic density transition to ensure this development respects the existing western Glenvale landscape.

Attach any documentation in support of the grounds raised in your submission

Browse

Ctrl+Click to select multiple. Upload limit of 10MB.

Phone 131 872 | Email [development@tr.qld.gov.au](mailto:development@tr.qld.gov.au) | Copyright © Toowoomba Regional Council | [Privacy](#)



# Development - Have Your Say On A Development Application

Fees

There is no fee for this application.

## Declaration

I understand and acknowledge that:

- The information provided is true and complete.
- Council may determine not to accept this if any information or supporting documents are incomplete or false.
- This is submitted during the formal public notification period (noted in public notification material within the development application).
- I acknowledge Queensland State Laws will accept this communication as containing my signature within the meaning of the Electronic Transactions (Queensland) Act 2001.

## Signature

I agree with the declaration \*

Full name of applicant

Robert Wagner

Date

28/01/2026

## Form process

After you submit this form a Council officer will review your representations and may be in contact depending on the nature of your submission.