

Our ref: DEV2025/1587

27 January 2026

Roubaix Properties Pty Ltd
C/- Burchills Engineering Solutions
Att: Mr Jack Shao
Jack.shao@burchills.com.au

Dear Applicant

PDA Decision Notice

Notice given under section 89(1) of the Economic Development Act 2012

Priority Development Area (PDA):	Greater Flagstone PDA
PDA Development Type:	Operational Works for Bulk Earthworks and Vegetation Clearing
Property Location:	4745-4759 and 4761-4773 Mount Lindesay Highway, North Maclean
Property Description:	Lots 7 and 8 on RP137101

On 27 January 2026, Economic Development Queensland (EDQ) decided to refuse the above PDA development application.

The reasons for the refusal are in the Statement of Reasons enclosed with this decision notice.

If you require any further information, please contact Nicole Tobias on 3452 6752 or by email at Nicole.tobias@edq.qld.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Amanda Dryden
**A/ Group Director, Established Growth
Development Services
Economic Development Queensland**

Cc: Logan City Council – email - council@logan.qld.gov.au

Statement of reasons

The application for a PDA development approval made by Burchills Engineering Solutions on behalf of Roubaix Properties Pty Ltd for the Operational Work for Bulk Earthworks and Vegetation Clearing (the **development application**), with respect to land at 4745-4759 and 4761-4773 Mount Lindesay Highway, North Maclean described as Lots 7 and 8 on RP137101 is refused.

1. The proposed development is inconsistent with the Greater Flagstone Priority Development Area Development Scheme (8 October 2011) (the **Development Scheme**), and, in particular, the following provisions:
 - i. Section 2.2 – Vision, in that:
 - (a) *North Maclean* - the development application does not facilitate or generate substantial mixed industry or business uses to support employment opportunities for the wider catchment area including Flagstone, Yarrabilba, Greenbank Central and the extensive rural residential areas.
 - ii. Section 3.0 – UDA-wide criteria, in that:
 - (a) Section 3.3.4 – *Employment opportunities* – the development application does not propose to deliver a range of employment opportunities including accessible employment opportunities including industry, research and technology facilities or warehouses. The development application does not propose to deliver commercial or trade retail activities that support small scale industry and servicing the local employment population of North Maclean.
 - (b) Section 3.3.8 – *Natural and cultural values* – the development application does not propose to respond to the constraints of the land, delivering protection of significant environmental and ecological values, or Remnant Endangered vegetation which the developer has not proven to be non-viable vegetation.
 - (c) Section 3.3.8 – *Koala conservation* – the development is to respond to the constraints of the land and deliver protection of significant environmental and ecological values and is to avoid (to the greatest extent possible) the clearing of areas mapped as High Value Bushland on the relevant State Planning Policy
 - (d) Section 3.3.9 – *Community safety and development constraints* – the development application has not demonstrated that the proposed bulk earthworks will result in people and property remaining safe from potential flood hazards.
 - iii. Section 3.4 – Zone provisions for the *Industry and business zone*, in that:
 - (a) The development application does not propose to provide any industrial activities including low and medium impact industry, research and technological industries, knowledge creation, entrepreneurial activity and service industry activities.
 - (b) The development application works do not contribute to the amenity, built form, landscaping and streetscape for enhancing the industrial character of the area.

2. The proposed development is inconsistent with relevant State interests indicated under the State Planning Policy, and in particular:
 - i. State Interest – *Biodiversity* –
 - (a) The development application does not demonstrate that matters of state environmental significance are identified, and development is located outside of areas to avoid adverse impacts.
 - (b) The development application does not demonstrate that where adverse impacts cannot be reasonably avoided, they are minimised with appropriate justification.
 - ii. State Interest – *Natural hazards, risk and resilience* – (3), (4), (5) and (7)
 - (a) The development application does not avoid the natural hazard area and requires significant site modification to reduce the risk to people and property to achieve an acceptable or tolerable risk, including flood risk.
 - (b) The site does not have a legal access and evacuation route in the event of an emergency which may hinder disaster management response opportunities.
 - (c) The regional and local flood study report submitted has identified potential flood hazards and hydraulic impacts outside the site but does not explain how these impacts will be managed. Modelling results also show additional flood impacts in the land in private ownership.
 - (d) The application has failed to demonstrate adequate mitigation measures to ensure that the bulk earthworks will not adversely impact the surrounding area, including the Mount Lindsay Highway.
 - (e) The development application proposes significant vegetation removal on site. The development does not preserve or improve the natural processes and protective role of existing landforms and vegetation due to the extensive site modifications proposed.
3. The proposed operational works without an industrial development outcome or legal point of access is out of sequence development.
4. Conditions of approval could not be imposed to achieve consistency with the Development Scheme.

**** End of Package ****