

Attachment C

Redland Shire Council

**Southern Moreton Bay Islands
Local Plan**

Summary Report on Submissions to Statement
of Proposals

December 2002

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of the Report	1
1.2	Overview of Submission Responses	1
2.	State Agency Comments	4
2.1	Department of Emergency Services	4
2.2	Department of Families	5
2.3	Department of Local Government and Planning	5
2.4	Department of Natural Resources	7
2.5	Energex	7
2.6	Environmental Protection Agency	8
2.7	Queensland Transport	9
2.8	Sport and Recreation Queensland	10
3.	Environmental Management	11
3.1	Bushfire Management	11
3.2	Mosquito and Biting Insect Management	12
3.3	Acid Sulphate Soil Management	14
3.4	Terrestrial Fauna Conservation	15
3.5	Ecological Implications of Development	16
3.6	Cultural Heritage	18
4.	Economic Management/Employment Generation	20
4.1	Economic Development – General	20
4.2	Industrial Land	21
	Need for Industrial Land Areas	21
	Location of Industrial Areas	22
4.3	Centre Uses	24
4.4	Uses in Rural Areas	25
4.5	Tourism Development – General	26

4.6	Education and Research	27
5.	Infrastructure Provision	28
5.1	Infrastructure Provision – Physical/Engineering	28
5.2	Public Open Space and Recreation	30
5.3	Social Infrastructure	32
6.	Stormwater Management	34
6.1	Stormwater Infrastructure	34
7.	Population and Housing	36
7.1	Residential Development	36
7.2	Population Growth	37
8.	Miscellaneous	39
8.1	Statement of Proposals and Conservation Acquisition Strategy Planning Process	39
8.2	Statement of Proposals and Conservation Acquisition Strategy – Technical Criticism	40
8.3	Land Amalgamations	42
8.4	Criticism of Council Officers, Consultants and Planning History	43
9.	General Support	44
9.1	General Support for Statement of Proposals and ILTP	44

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the submissions received in response to the public consultation of the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Local Area Plan Statement of Proposals (SoP) and Draft Integrated Local Transport Plan (ILTP). This feedback represents the first of two key opportunities for the public to make input into the plan (the second being at the publication of the Draft Planning Scheme in 2003).

This report will detail the major issues raised by the submissions and Council's intended response.

1.2 Overview of Submission Responses

A total of 1062 submissions were received. Comments generally fall into two key categories:

- comments regarding **'general' aspects of the planning** and other matters on the Bay Islands;
- comments **requesting site specific advice** for particular areas on the Bay Islands.

This report is dedicated to 'general' comments relating to the Statement of Proposals. Separate reports have been prepared for transport issues, sewerage issues and site specific comments in the submissions.

A summary of the substantive issues, proposed responses and recommendations has been put forward under a series of topic headings, which correspond to the full submission reports on which this report is based. Where the responses put forward are deemed to satisfactorily address the issues, the recommendation of the study team is simply to note the comments. However, where the response in itself does not satisfactorily address concerns, proposed recommendations have been put forward.

Table 1 over the page provides an overview of the number of submitters who made one or more comments in relation to a particular topic, and the total number of comments under each topic. Note that Attachment A, relating to a form letter received from 191 submitters, (see Appendix A) also relates to some issues listed in this table, but is not included in the calculation of submitter and comment numbers.

Table 1. Summary of Submitter Responses by Issue

Report/Subject	No. of Submissions	No. of Comments in Submissions
Environmental Management	102	176
Bushfire Management	25	45
Mosquito Management	11	14
Acid Sulphate Soils Management	6	6
Terrestrial Fauna Conservation	18	22
Ecological Implications of Development	36	82
Cultural Heritage	6	7
Economic Management/Employment Generation	97	153
Economic Development – General	12	19
Industrial Uses	34	67
Centre Uses	26	38
Uses in Rural Areas	4	5
Tourism Development – General	11	12
Suggested Rezoning for Commercial/Mixed-Use Purposes	3	3
Educational Uses	7	9
Infrastructure Provision	202	269
Infrastructure Provision General	105	123
Public Open Space and Recreation	31	54
Suggested Acquisition for Community infrastructure	29	54
Social Infrastructure	37	38
Stormwater Management	31	55
Stormwater Infrastructure	18	42
Residential with Drainage/Access Constraints	13	13
Population and Housing	59	105
Residential Development	31	49
Population Growth	21	29
Development Pattern on Karragarra	7	27
Miscellaneous	216	373
Statement of Proposals, Conservation Acquisition Strategy, and Sewerage Options Study Planning Process	70	121

Report/Subject	No. of Submissions	No. of Comments in Submissions
Omission of Karragarra Island from Planning Process	9	29
Statement of Proposals, Conservation Acquisition Strategy, Sewerage Options Study – Technical Criticism (to be diluted into sections of other reports where relevant)	37	91
Land Amalgamations	17	20
Criticism of Council Officers, Consultants and Planning History	83	112
General Support	47	41
Site Specific Issues (Site Specific submissions are addressed in Attachment D – Review of Site Specific Submissions Report)	213	192
TOTAL	967	1364

A summary of the substantive issues and responses under subject areas related to general comments regarding the Statement of Proposals follows.

2. State Agency Comments

The following State Agencies lodged a submission in response to the Statement of Proposals for the Southern Moreton Bay Islands:

- Department of Emergency Services (Submission 241);
- Department of Families (Submission 490);
- Department of Local Government and Planning (Submission 1052);
- Department of Natural Resources (Submission 1041);
- Energex (Submission 1026 and 1055);
- Environmental Protection Agency and Queensland Herbarium (Submission 357 and 1040);
- Queensland Transport (Submission 1019); and
- Sport and Recreation Queensland (Submission 772).

State Agencies were predominantly in support of the aims of the Statement of Proposals, although some criticism was offered in relation to specific points. Key comments from the State agencies are listed below.

2.1 Department of Emergency Services

Substantive Comments

The Department of Emergency Services are primarily concerned with the location of development in relation to natural hazards, and wish to see evidence of natural hazards being considered in the determination of development areas.

The submission made the following key comments:

- A draft State Planning Policy is being prepared for Natural Disaster Mitigation. Until specific planning scheme requirements are known, all local governments are encouraged to identify and map natural hazards within their area and design planning provisions that ensure development does not put the community at risk from natural hazards. The submitter is interested to see how Council will manage this task.

Study Team Comments

- Council, in conjunction with the Department, has included bush fire risk mapping into the planning process and is creating buffer areas within the plan to limit the risk of bushfire to development. Appropriate planning provisions will be included to address the threat of bushfire on the Islands.
- In addition, the proposed plan will incorporate appropriate controls to ensure the preclusion of property from 1 in 100yr ARI overland flow paths and tidal storm surges.

- No major hazard facilities or large dangerous goods locations are proposed nor are they desirable on the Islands.

Recommendation

- Future planning should consider the provisions of the Draft State Planning Policy on Natural Disaster Mitigation.

2.2 Department of Families

Substantive Issues

The Department of Families are concerned with the achievement of equitable access to transportation, open space and the status of young people on the Islands.

The submission made the following key comments:

- Support for strategies to improve public transport accessibility and utility (e.g. integration of public transport services, being able to carry your bike on the ferry), promoting a fair system that addresses the transport needs of a range of disadvantaged groups.
- Support for strategies of providing open spaces to cater for active and passive recreational needs of the community.
- There is a minor rise in offending behaviour amongst young people on the Islands who claim that they have 'nothing to do'. The department suggests that it would be useful to involve young people and Council's youth worker in the determination of recreational needs on the Islands.

Study Team Response

- A variety of open spaces have been included in the Preferred Land Use Pattern in order to facilitate opportunities for people of all ages including the needs of young people.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.
- Council's Community and Social Planning Group are investigating options for the inclusion of young people in determining recreational needs on the Islands.

2.3 Department of Local Government and Planning

Substantive Comments

The Department of Local Government and Planning raises concerns with a number of issues affecting the planning of development of the Islands, both substantive and administrative issues. Advice is given in relation to the contents of the LAP and consistency with the Shire wide Planning Scheme. Other key comments include:

- DLGP confirms that a bridge linking the mainland to Russell Island is undesirable due to the adverse environmental effects resulting from the construction of a bridge/s to the Islands.
- State Government Population Forecasting Unit (PIFU), within DLGP are in possession of revised population figures for the Islands prepared March 2002. There are considerable variances in the figures offered by PIFU and by the Statement of Proposals. Further clarification can be provided by DLGP.
- DLGP wish to know if landowners will be required to maintain their allotments should they be unable to develop their land for urban purposes.
- DLGP trust that further consideration of Cabinet's undertaking to protect existing development rights will occur subsequent to Council's finalisation of these provisions.
- Under Section 3.5 termed 'Island Residential' states that on site vegetation is to be managed in accordance with the 'Bay Islands Bush Fire Management Plan' and Council's 'Interim Vegetation Protection Order' (VPO). Clarification is sought on whether the proposed statutory planning instrument for the Islands will replace /incorporate vegetation protection measures contained in the interim VPO.
- 'Building Codes Queensland' has recently released a document called the 'Queensland Development Code'. Code #13 of the document covers energy efficient houses in South East Queensland and is intended to be incorporate in to planning instruments.
- Council should be aware that the 'Australian Building Codes Board' is developing a national energy efficiency standard.

Study Team Responses

- Administration and LAP drafting advice set out in the submission will be followed in consultation with DLGP.
- Latest PIFU population figures will be used in determining future needs assessments.
- The issue of managing undevelopable lots needs to be considered. Currently, owners are required to maintain lots with their own resources, or reimburse Council for the cost of maintenance. Council envisages no changes to these practices.
- Despite numerous attempts DLGP have not provided any further advice or information regarding how they intend to protect existing development rights on the Islands in accordance with Cabinet recommendation.
- At this time Council has not resolved whether it will retain the interim VPO or incorporate its provisions into the LAP.
- The development of assessment requirements for residential development will consider the Queensland Development Code and provisions regarding energy efficiency.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

2.4 Department of Natural Resources

The Department of Natural Resources submitted the following comments:

The SMBI SOP does not follow the same framework as the Redland plan and does not identify NR&M's role in a number of important issues, as follows:

- The Acid Sulphate Soils section highlights the issue but does not mention NR&M's interest (e.g. advice agency role - Schedule 8, IPA).
- The issue of 'existing road reserves no longer required...' has been mentioned, however NR&M has a legislated role in road closure.
- Vegetation management is covered, however the VM Act 1999 should be mentioned with NR&M's statutory responsibilities. Please note that this would also apply to areas concerning Conditions of Waterways, Groundwater, and Open Space/Reserves.
- The 'Preferred Land Use Map' for each of the 5 Islands appears to be in line with current State land use intentions.

Study Team Response

- The DNRM's roles in Acid Sulphate Soils Management, road closures, and under the Vegetation Management Act 1999 are acknowledged.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

2.5 Energex

Substantive Issues

The submission from Energex outlined the electricity reticulation infrastructure existing and planned on the Islands, for inclusion into the planning process. Energex are also concerned with development encroaching on power line easements. An Electricity Infrastructure Code developed for inclusion in Council's planning scheme in order to trigger code assessment for encroaching developments.

Study Team Comments

- Energex's Electricity Infrastructure Code will be incorporated in the Shire-wide Planning Scheme which will have effect on the Bay Islands.

Recommendation

- Information submitted by Energex, including the Electricity Infrastructure Code will be incorporated into the planning process.

2.6 Environmental Protection Agency

Substantive Issues

The outcomes of the SoP were generally supported. However the EPA are particularly concerned with the threats posed by sewage treatment and disposal and water transport. EPA seek a rationale for development on the Islands based on the ability of natural systems to support the proposed sewerage and water transport system. Other key comments include:

- The Statement of Proposals provides no certainty for cultural heritage protection. The scheme needs to address cultural heritage issues by including an appropriate thematic layer, development triggers and planning codes. There is legal recourse for Indigenous people through the Land and Resources Tribunal to apply for injunctions to prevent interference with culturally significant items, and such actions may not only lead to development, but also generate considerable legal costs.
- It is unclear how the vision for the Islands (which is supported) will be reconciled with the levels of population forecast for them. The potential impact of future development on Moreton Bay Marine Park, particularly at the scale anticipated on the Islands, is likely to be significant. In particular, EPA is concerned about the increase in sewage generated by future Island development as well as future transport infrastructure and establishment of additional transport servicing nodes in the marine parks.
- The strategy to concentrate transport interchanges at the four existing ferry terminals on the Islands rather than constructing additional facilities is supported.
- EPA is particularly concerned about the impact of future transport infrastructure and establishment of additional transport servicing nodes in the Marine Parks.
- The work carried out on the Gold Coast Waterways Management Plan needs to be integrated with and/or informed by the current work on the SMBI Integrated Local Transport Plan. The Plan extends roughly to the Shire's northern boundary. Inadequate attention has been given to the need to address disposal of dredge spoil in either the transport strategy or the SoP.
- EPA is aware that an options paper for the proposed sewerage of the Islands is still under development. Given the vision and question of sustainable communities on the Islands, it is recommended that the option of land disposal of all treated waste water be seriously considered as an approach to addressing and reconciling such loads with population capacity and the Island's vision. Section 3.3.2 nominates preferred treatment options. This is pre-emptive as all feasible/prudent options have not yet been assessed. Discharge to Moreton Bay would only be considered following full assessment of disposal and then only if appropriate levels of treatment can be assured and appropriate discharge sites identified as feasible and prudent, given the Moreton Bay Marine Park values. EPA is particularly concerned about the increase in sewage generated by future Island development.

Study Team Response

- Cultural heritage has been identified as an issue to be addressed by the LAP. Provisions will be drafted for public review during exhibition of the draft LAP. Provisions will also be consistent with those to be applied across the Scheme. Special provisions will be

prepared for indigenous cultural heritage, an issue which is not covered by the Shire-wide planning scheme.

- Sustainable levels of development on the Islands, as advanced by the Island vision, will be achieved primarily through the management of human impacts on the ecology and the protection of ecologically significant areas from further development, as opposed to arbitrary measures based on population size.
- No further transport nodes will be included in the LAP or considered as part of the ILTP. Further, the ILTP has indicated that future water transport activities will be subject to periodic monitoring to determine environmental impact and required mitigation measures.
- Disposal of dredged material is a broader issue outside the scope of the LAP. Council will continue to work with QT to assess potential solutions to this issue.
- The management of sewage to be generated is the focus of the Sewerage Options Study, which will determine the management approach and implementation programme most suitable for the maintenance of public health and the ecology of the Islands. Specific options for treatment and disposal are the focus of the Sewerage Options Study.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

2.7 Queensland Transport

Queensland Transport submitted the following comments:

- QT is concerned regarding references to demand responsive services in the draft ILTP. The introduction of a new demand responsive bus service could impact detrimentally on existing operators. QT recommends contacting the existing taxi operators on Macleay and Russell Islands regarding proposed demand responsive services before calling the expression of interest. QT has already spoken to these parties and they have indicated serious consideration of investment in larger vehicles to accommodate the proposed service (a light bus having up to 12 seating positions, including the driver's position, to provide a taxi service). One of the issues identified is the potential impact of a demand responsive bus service on the existing taxi operators. The obvious benefits of working with the existing operators (who have indicated a willingness to participate) are:
 - Would comply with “demand responsive” type services under the *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994*.
 - Local rapport with residents and local knowledge of the area
 - The only commercial costs for the existing operators would be an upgrade of their current vehicles.
 - No requirement for Redland Shire Council to find a funding source (i.e. Queensland Transport – refer 3.4.2 Recommended Actions for Buses PT14)
 - Less chance of losing the existing taxi service at the expense of a demand responsive bus service, therefore upsetting the balance of transport options required as the population increases.

Study Team Response

- The ILTP implementation of demand responsive services will include further consultation with existing and potential operators to determine a legal and equitable solution to the task of providing demand responsive services on the Islands.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

2.8 Sport and Recreation Queensland

Sport and Rec Queensland are satisfied with the provisions of the SoP.

Study Team Response and Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

3. Environmental Management

3.1 Bushfire Management

Substantive Issues

A total of 45 out of 176 comments on environmental management relate to bushfire management. There are significant concerns raised over the Bushfire Management Strategies. Many submitters are concerned that the preservation of vegetation will actually contribute to increased bush fire risk i.e. that the Bushfire Management Plan and the Vegetation Protection Order are contradictory.

- Some submitters encourage a regime of regular controlled burning to reduce fire risk and the consolidation of firebreak areas.
- Submitters are concerned that a real danger is presented by the lack of maintenance on Council-owned blocks.
- General concerns are raised over maintenance issues, including the compliance of slasher contractors with regulations.
- Some submitters claim that bushfire management is being used as a tool to acquire more properties, particularly to consolidate Council land holdings.
- Some submitters infer that bushfire management requirements are onerous and perhaps unnecessary.
- One submitter requests permission to clear their land and will hold Council responsible for any damage caused through fire damage in the future.
- One submitter claimed that a fire hydrant sign in Bilbungra Street Russell Island is not accompanied by a functional fire hydrant.

Study Team Response

Bushfire Management investigations have identified large portions of the Southern Moreton Bay Islands as having a major bushfire hazard rating. Mitigation methods proposed are consistent with the Draft State Planning Policy – Natural Hazard Mitigation.

The aims of the bushfire management strategy are:

- To protect areas of very high conservation significance; and
- To protect life, property and the environment from the risk of bushfire associated with areas of very high conservation significance.

Risk from bushfire to assets can be minimised by:

- identifying and excluding development from inappropriate areas,
- reducing the hazard through clearing of vegetation or by control-burning;
- Requiring development to be constructed in accordance with AS3959 Building in Bushfire Risk Areas.

The proposed Special Protection Areas have been inspected in consultation with the Queensland Rural Fire Service. Additional management buffers are proposed where:

- Fire management activities can not be located solely within Conservation areas without impacting considerably on the values of those areas;
- Access for fire management purposes is restricted due to topography or drainage constraints.

It should be noted that regular burning alters vegetation composition and ultimately the conservation significance of an area. As such, frequent burning of large areas is inconsistent with the objectives of the SoP and should not be relied upon as the sole mitigation measure.

The proposed Special Protection Areas have been designed to improve Council's maintenance requirements by consolidating conservation land and minimising isolated allotments.

Recommendation

That the above comments be noted.

3.2 Mosquito and Biting Insect Management

Substantive Issues

A total of 14 out of 176 comments on environmental management relate to mosquito management.

- Most submitters wish to see further strategies put forward by Council in response to the mosquito problem. Spraying is suggested by some submitters.
- Submitters are concerned that the reduced extent of development proposed for the Islands will contribute to the preservation of mosquito breeding areas. This could be a considerable problem given the incorporation of overland flow paths and a 'natural' stormwater drainage regime in the plan. Submitters are concerned that providing opportunities in this way will promote the spread of dangerous diseases (RRV, BFE and MVE infections).
- Natural drainage solutions should not exacerbate mosquito breeding areas.
- Mosquito nuisance should not be used as a ruse to depopulate Residential A areas.

Study Team Response

The need for mosquito management has been recognised on the Islands. Mosquito breeding areas are generally thought to be the undevelopable estuarine, and poorly drained areas the extent of which could only be reduced through high impact and inappropriate drainage and earthworks. Research made available for the Revised SMBIPLUS indicated that the breeding area of some species of mosquito are still relatively unknown and further research is required before an appropriate management strategy can be determined.

Mosquito management has been addressed in the Revised SMBIPLUS. This revised document puts forward several strategy responses:

- “adopt measures during construction phase activities to minimise the inadvertent creation of mosquito breeding areas, such as creating areas where water can pond;
- ensure the stormwater management strategy minimises the inadvertent creation of mosquito breeding areas;
- introduce building controls to ensure dwellings incorporate insect screens;
- in conjunction with the State government, institute a mosquito/midge awareness program tailored to non-resident land owners.”

The Supplementary Planning Study also scopes a number of strategies which might be employed to combat the mosquito nuisance:

- “where possible, reducing the population potentially exposed to mosquitos;
- ensuring construction does not inadvertently create ponds which may be used by breeding mosquitoes;
- creation of densely vegetated buffers between residential areas and breeding sites (reducing potential for wind dispersal);
- placement of non-sensitive land uses between residential areas and breeding sites;
- filling of potential breeding sites during and after construction operations;
- prevent objects from blocking overland flow, thus creating potential breeding sites;
- create possibilities for wave action at any water impoundment or still water site (wave action prevents breeding processes);
- preventing the growth of vegetation on the surface of still water areas;
- actively minimising mosquito breeding in irrigation, sewage effluent and stormwater channels;
- discharging stormwater flow by sheetflow into regularly flushed areas, preferably at high tide, or into large (30m width) streams via settling ponds to remove silt and rubbish;
- managing the mosquitoes through continuation of existing environmentally acceptable chemical/biochemical methods.”

It should also be noted that research indicates that mosquitos breed more prolifically in water-holding containers in backyards than in wetland areas. In most wetland areas, natural predators such as water bugs, water beetles and dragon fly larvae eat the mosquito larvae. Once established many of these natural predators mitigate the mosquito problem.

Recommendation

- The LAP should incorporate some of the above mechanisms to manage mosquito nuisance, chiefly the requirement to avoid water ponding on construction sites or in natural drainage corridors and requirements for fly screens on buildings. However, the most effective measures are likely to be delivered through Council's mosquito control programmes. The need for further research of mosquito breeding areas has also been identified and is recommended.

3.3 Acid Sulphate Soil Management

Substantive Issues

A total of 6 out of 176 comments on environmental management relate to acid sulphate soil management.

- Comments relate to a lack of publicly available information on Acid Sulphate Soils Management.
- Submitters are concerned regarding the implications of Acid Sulphate Soils for development.
- One submitter is opposed to strenuous requirements as Acid Sulphate Soils can be treated with lime.

Study Team Response

State Planning Policy 2/02 Planning and Managing Development Involving Acid Sulphate Soils, requires that Redland Shire Council must within its planning scheme:

- identify areas with a high probability of containing acid sulfate soils;
- include planning strategies that, as far as practicable, give preference to land uses that will avoid or minimise the disturbance of acid sulfate soils; and
- include detailed measures, to manage the impacts of Acid Sulphate Soils where they are encountered.

Investigations on the Islands have identified Acid Sulphate Soil Risk areas. These areas have been defined on the basis of a combination of:

- areas below 5m AHD;
- areas underlain by Quaternary sediments; and
- areas containing marine or wetland vegetation (melaleucas, saltwater couch, mangroves etc.

An Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan will be incorporated into Council's shire-wide planning scheme and Bay Islands LAP in response to the need to responsibly manage development in risk areas. This Management Plan proposes varying levels of management response depending on the likely severity of the problem. Acid Sulphate Soils can be treated and are not likely to preclude development. Recommended treatment measures represent

contemporary best practice in the management of Acid Sulphate Soils for the benefit of development and the ecology.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

3.4 Terrestrial Fauna Conservation

Substantive Issues

A total of 22 out of 176 comments on Environmental Management relate to Terrestrial Fauna Conservation.

- Many comments relate to the preservation of Glossy Black Cockatoo habitat. Most comments are in support of retaining and enhancing the habitat of this species, however some submitters suggest that she-oaks, the primary feed tree for the birds, are highly combustible and presents a major fire danger.
- A number of submitters expressed concerns over the designation of 'Glossy Black Cockatoo Investigation Area' over their properties on the Preferred Land Use Map.
- Other comments relate to the protection of the false water rat, including site specific details.
- Some submitters are very concerned about the impact of domestic animals on Island terrestrial fauna.

Study Team Response

- Since the exhibition of the Statement of Proposals further investigations have been carried out in relation to Glossy Black Cockatoos. These investigations have revealed:
 - the Islands are considered to contain a key population of the birds;
 - feed resources are the most likely limiting factor to population size;
 - the Macleay Island food resource is insufficient to maintain the birds, who travel to and from North Stradbroke Island;
 - preserving feed trees through the use of conservation reserves is unlikely to be necessary, as they are a pioneer species that will die out with time, and feed trees can be a major component of urban gardens;
 - future management requires community education, continuation of the community monitoring programme, promotion of feeding and nesting trees within residential properties, training of Council staff, Rural Fire Brigade and community on the species ecological requirements, discouragement of galah feeding by humans, facilitation of feeding and creation of watering holes through infrastructure design, continued research and management of the population;
 - management strategies include vegetation protection to address the protection of nesting trees, research on the correlation of nesting trees with other floristic values and strategies to encourage the retention and establishment of the feed trees.

- The LAP can include measures to protect known nesting trees (which have been identified in the recent investigations) but the other suggested management strategies will require addressing through other Council programs.
- In relation to other species, areas identified for Special Protection will make a significant contribution to protecting habitat especially for species such as the False Water Rat.
- While controls have been placed on domestic animals in some mainland residential estates, such controls have not been considered for the Bay Islands. The retrospective introduction of such controls is not likely to be endorsed by the community and would be seen as unreasonable. The need to increase the community's awareness of the threats caused by pets is acknowledged.
- The Department of Natural Resources and Mining recognise that She-oaks are considered a fire-retardant species. For further information on this matter please contact the Department of Natural Resources and Mining or visit their website at www.nrm.qld.gov.au.

Recommendations

- Environmental Management to provide further recommendations prior to workshop.
- Include measures in the LAP to protect known habitat trees of the Glossy Black Cockatoo.
- Investigate incorporating planning controls into the LAP to protect feed trees.
- Remove the proposed Glossy Black Cockatoo Investigation Area and incorporate the area predominantly into the proposed Island Residential zone in the draft LAP for public comment.

3.5 Ecological Implications of Development

Substantive Issues

A total of 82 out of 176 comments on environmental management relate to the ecological implications of development.

Comments in this category cover a wide range of topics relating to the relationships between Island ecology and levels of development. Comments can be grouped under the following headings:

Pattern of Development

- The need to reach an ecologically sustainable population.
- The need for maintenance of Island lifestyle and landscape amenity.
- The proposed strategy does not address the fact that the Islands will be largely urbanised.
- The need to be consistent with the Moreton Bay Strategic Plan and higher level national planning strategies.
- The pattern of subdivision and market demand are still dictating the pattern of inappropriate and unsustainable development.

- Natural features must be preserved for future generations.

Conservation Areas

- The LAP must protect existing wetlands.
- The strategy should focus on the 'non-negotiables' – terrestrial fauna habitat, tourist and fisheries resources, remaining wetlands, landscape vistas, and cultural heritage sites.
- Clearing for the purposes of bushfire management diminishes ecological values.
- Protection of indigenous vegetation and need for the revegetation and proper management of conservation areas.
- The area off Thompson's Point is one of the most important seagrass meadows in the Bay and needs protection from development while maintaining public access to foreshore.
- There are inconsistencies between proposed Special Protection Areas and Regional Ecosystems Mapping produced by DNRM.
- View that High Conservation areas should be managed similarly to Very High Conservation areas.

Foreshore Areas

- Impacts from sea level rise should be taken into account.
- The foreshores need to be protected from inappropriate development.

Study Team Response

Pattern of Development

- Balancing the components of economic, social and environmental sustainability was an expressed outcome of the SMBIPLUS and the LAP. Following the outcome of baseline studies, and with input from the community, a vision for how life on the Island should be at some time in the future was developed as an expression of how these components should be balanced. This vision became a guiding principle for the formulation of the SMBIPLUS, and received widespread support from the community.

The ability to maintain an "Island lifestyle" (characterised by spacious development, a landscaped environment, little traffic, clear air and immediate proximity to the Bay) was a prominent element of the vision. Any strategy which delivered this vision would need to include measures for reducing the development area of the Island. Policies such as land pooling and increasing minimum lot sizes were considered in the SMBIPLUS and assessed as not being feasible or appropriate.

The approach adopted to achieving sustainable development was to generally leave the existing subdivision pattern intact but exclude development from areas most susceptible to environmental degradation, and the retention of which was important for the protection of the diversity of species on and around the Islands. For example, the retention of natural overland paths to enable filtering and infiltration of stormwater flows and reduce stormwater infrastructure costs was considered important. Also, areas of very high conservation value have been identified and proposed for protection.

- The SMBIPLUS and LAP also envisage measures to lessen the impacts of development in those areas where the subdivision was essentially retained, ranging from the introduction of open space corridors, retention of clearing controls and introduction of design and siting requirements. While it is not possible to ‘undo’ the original subdivision pattern, the SMBIPLUS and LAP will afford protection to those areas of ecological significance and provide a framework for environmental management and provision of services.

Conservation Areas

- Connectivity between conservation priority areas is not a priority in itself. The imperative with conservation priority areas is to identify those areas that hold special significance on account of the presence or combination of certain designated flora/fauna species.
- Controls currently exist to protect indigenous vegetation on the Islands, namely through Council’s Vegetation Protection Order. This control will be reviewed. At this time Council has not resolved whether it will retain the interim VPO or incorporate its provisions into the LAP.
- There are no proposals that should impact on the seagrass areas off Thompson’s Point.
- There has been a comprehensive review and checking of conservation values in response to VMA mapping and residents’ concerns and amendments will be reflected in the LAP.
- Areas of high conservation priority status will be subject to the same management practices as those areas subject to very high conservation priority status. Both these areas have in fact been combined and designated Special Protection.

Foreshore Areas

- The Council has adopted a minimum development level of RL2.4. This level is significantly above the Highest Astronomical Tide level of RL1.6 which equates to the 1 in 100 year Storm Surge Level for Moreton Bay. In addition, a further 0.3m freeboard is required as the minimal floor level for development.
- Apart from these minimum development levels, vegetated areas along the foreshores considered to have conservation status have been designated for Special Protection. The existing subdivision pattern does not enable complete preservation of foreshore areas.
- Planning controls will be included in the LAP to restrict the use of cut and fill in building designs.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

3.6 Cultural Heritage

Substantive Issues

A total of 7 out of 176 comments on environmental management relate to cultural heritage.

- Submitters generally support the management and preservation of cultural heritage, though this should be in consultation with landowners.
- Some submitters support increased controls in this area, including a special planning process for cultural heritage management incorporated into the LAP.

Study Team Response

- Detailed research for the SMBIPLUS has identified a number of European and Indigenous cultural heritage sites on the Islands.
- The management of cultural heritage is a Shire-wide issue and will be addressed by provision in the new Planning Scheme. The Bay Islands have a rich Indigenous cultural heritage and the SMBIPLUS included a strategy for the management of these heritage values. Elements of this Strategy will need to be included in the LAP while other elements, such as the need to increase the community's awareness of the Indigenous cultural heritage, will need to be addressed in other Council programs.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

4. Economic Management/Employment Generation

4.1 Economic Development – General

Substantive Issues

A total of 19 out of 200 comments on economic and employment issues were of a general nature.

Submitter opinion is mixed on the direction that economic activity on the Islands should take. Many are in favour of expanding the Island economy, to promote the tourism industry and improved services to cater for the predicted population increase. Some submitters see the bridge as the key to desirable economic development (this is further discussed in 'Implications of Bridge Development' in Report #4 - Transport). Other submitters are against significant developments in the Island economy, due to a perceived lack of viability and on account of its threat to Island amenity. Some comments include:

- No more business development is required on the Islands, many businesses on the Islands have already gone flat from lack of customers and high prices.
- The more work opportunities created on the Island through the provision of higher order services, the greater will be the need to source them on the mainland and the net result will be a compounding of the impact on the transport infrastructure.
- Any examination of Island economics should include the hinterland as part and parcel of a bridged economic community.
- The strategy of limitation of development on the Islands being compatible with Island commerce and community becoming "self sufficient" is a pipe dream. The reality is that the Islands will remain very dependent on mainland supplies.
- The suggestion that Island economic development is "of little concern" to residents (as suggested by the SMBIPLUS) and the development of a self-sufficient Island economy are rebutted.

Submitters generally promote the concept of home based industries as an appropriate form and scale for economic activity.

Study Team Response

- The SMBIPLUS Economic Development Strategy recognised that the economic activities on the Islands are generally population servicing activities, and that the Islands ability to attract population supporting economic activity is limited due to access constraints. This is both an impediment to the growth of economic development as well as a characteristic that contributes to the uniqueness of the Islands.

The SMBIPLUS strategy recognises that provision will need to be made for the growth of population serving activities such as convenience retailing, service trade uses and

education facilities. The LAP will designate centres for the location of such activities and make provision for appropriate home based industries.

The SMBIPLUS also identifies likely or possible population supporting activities as being activities to serve the day tripper and tourist market (i.e. bed and breakfast establishments, holiday cabins), marina facilities and education/research activities. Again the LAP will provide opportunities for these activities such as these.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

4.2 Industrial Land

A total of 67 out of 200 comments on economic and employment issues related to proposed industrial areas. 47 of these comments were made in protest to the position of the Supporting Industry Node on Macleay Island.

Need for Industrial Land Areas

Substantive Issues

The submitters seek clarification on the real need for industrial activity and the kind of industries that are intended. Suggestions for suitable industrial activities (provided by one submitter) include landscaping, concrete batching plants, nurseries, cabinet manufacturers, garden shed supplier, and small engine mechanics.

Other comments include:

- There is a possibility of a mismatch between the nature of work provided and Island demographics, resulting in more people commuting to work on the Islands.
- There appears to be little rationale for the need for such industrial activity on the Islands for the extent to which it is warranted. The introduction of industries with “off-site impact” goes against the notion of peace and quiet on the Islands.
- Support for a larger supporting industrial area near the Island Village Centre on Russell Island.

Study Team Response

- The aim is to provide suitable areas for industries and service trades that serve the Islands future population. This is based on an identified need for industrial land, as detailed in the Supplementary Planning Study. The Supplementary Planning Study identified the need for industrial areas on the Islands based on ultimate population estimates and a significantly reduced rate of industrial land provision (1ha per 2,000 people, as opposed to 3ha per 1,000 people on the mainland, to allow for demographic trends). Required rates of provision for the study are shown below:

Island	Predicted Ultimate Population	Ultimate Pop. As % of current pop.	Services Trades and Employment Generating Uses Land Requirement
Macleay	6746	430%	3.37ha
Lamb	1498	364%	0.75ha
Karragarra	524	472%	0ha
Russell	13506	766%	6.75ha

- Some of this requirement will be met through allowing low impact service industry development within Island Multi-Purpose Centres. Additional land has been identified as Supporting Industry Nodes, the purpose of which are to provide a location for population serving industries that are not compatible with other centre uses. No major population generating industrial activities are intended for the Bay Islands.
- Typical 'industrial' uses Multi-Purpose Centres may include:
 - Glass cutting or silvering;
 - Computer processes;
 - Dry cleaning or dyeing;
 - Making (Bread, Jewellery, Keys, Millinery, Saddles, Felt Goods, Oars, Sports Equipment other than ammunition, vehicles and water craft, String or string goods);
 - Repairing (Boots or Shoes, Cameras, Clocks or Watches, Clothing, Leather goods, Locks, Pedal cycles);
 - Screenprinting;
 - Tailoring;
 - Upholstering vehicles or furniture.
- Typical industrial uses in Supporting Industry Nodes may include:
 - 'light' or 'general' industries, subject to the appropriate level of planning assessment (e.g. auto-mechanic, panel beating, boat repairs)
- Areas would also be designated in the LAP to accommodate the outgrowth of home based enterprises.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

Location of Industrial Areas

Substantive Issues

Submitters are concerned about the location and amenity of industrial development. Most submissions seem to agree that any industrial activity must be carefully located, to be accessible for workers but not to the extent that significant amenity problems are created.

General

- There is a contradiction in allowing supporting industrial activity in and around areas marked for high conservation priority.

Macleay Island

- A large number of comments relating to industry were made in opposition to the proposed Macleay Island industrial area at Wandoo Avenue. The proposed location of the Supporting Industry Node on Macleay Island has been very strongly opposed by a large number of submitters. The Industrial area is seen as an undesirable addition to an ecologically sensitive area (Glossy Black Cockatoo habitat), existing residential area, and area of high scenic amenity. Submissions received provided sufficient analysis to warrant further consideration of this location.

Russell Island

- The Council depot in the Island Multi-Purpose Centre in Russell Island should be moved to a Supporting Industry area.
- The Supporting Industry Node on Russell Island should be expanded.

Study Team Response

- Any industrial areas are to be buffered from surrounding development and therefore may adjoin Special Protection Areas. The LAP would place controls on development in these areas to ensure the values of the Special Protection Areas are protected.
- The issues associated with locating a Supporting Industry Node on the proposed location (Wandoo Avenue) on Macleay Island are acknowledged. Alternative locations are being considered and opportunities for co-locating with a future STP at either the Kate or Lonicera Street sites, have not be discounted. However, it should be noted that opportunities for the location of these areas are very limited.

A possible location is part of the Council stockpile area near Nunkeri Drive, however Council's future requirements for land in this area have yet to be finally determined.

- The planning merit of expanding the Supporting Industry Node in and around Sandra Street on Russell Island to lessen impacts on residential areas and allow for a more flexible industrial area is acknowledged. The eventual relocation of Councils depot on High Street to alternative locations within the proposed Supporting Industry Node would be supported by the proposed provisions of the LAP.

Recommendation

- Relocate the proposed Supporting Industry site on Macleay Island. Investigate locating this designation within the Council owned land at Nunkeri Drive.
- Expand the proposed Supporting Industry site around John and Robert Streets on Russell Island.

4.3 Centre Uses

Substantive Issues

A total of 38 out of 200 comments on economic and employment issues related to centre uses on the Islands.

The key issue to centre uses is their location. Many submitters are concerned about the location of centres relative to the transport system and in the case of local centres, the ability of people to make convenient shopping trips.

Other comments include:

- The trend for Island residents to shop on the mainland and therefore the need to provide adequate space for car parking/traffic management at ferry terminals i.e. not crowding the terminals with centre and residential uses.
- The need for commercial development in the southern end of Russell Island and northern end of Macleay Island is put forward.
- The need for commercial consolidation at the existing general store site on Macleay Island is put forward by a submitter willing to expand the site and is supported by other submissions.
- The northern Island Multi-Purpose Centre on Macleay Island should be scaled back to a Local Centre scale.
- The rearrangement of commercial locations on Lamb Island is strongly opposed by a number of submitters.
- It is theoretically possible that tourist accommodation in the Island Multi-Purpose Centre which is incompatible with existing centre development could be allowed.

Study Team Response

- The additional convenience centres on Macleay, Russell and Lamb Islands will provide Island residents with an alternative to the Island Multi-Purpose Centres at the ferry terminals. Careful consideration will need to be given to carparking and access arrangements around these centres.
- The LAP will make provision for a convenience centre towards the southern end of Russell Island, at the intersection of Centre Road and Kurrajong Road. It is not intended to provide a higher order centre at the southern end of Russell Island as these are to be focused around jetty terminals so they are accessible to residents from all Islands.
- The SoP indicated the Multi-Purpose Centres on Macleay Island, around the jetty terminal and the other extending between Cabriole Crescent and Nunckeri Drive along High Central Road, adjacent to a proposed Supporting Industry Node. Investigations have indicated this latter area may not be suitable for either of these uses, given the nature of development recently approved nearby (bed and breakfast establishment). Further, it is intended that the uses envisaged in Multi-Purpose Centres should be accessible to residents from all the Islands, hence they need to be within walking distance from the ferry terminals. In view

of this, it is proposed to amend this designation to a Convenience Centre (Local Shop) and reduce its site area.

- The existing Convenience Centre designation on High Central Road south of the school will be increased to allow some further expansion.
- It is considered that no other commercial centres should be provided on Macleay Island as they will undermine the viability of those proposed above.
- The SoP depicted a more central location for a convenience centre on Lamb Island than the originally designated site (zoned 'Shopping'). However, given the stated aspirations of the owners of the original site on the intersection of Crest Haven and Lucas Drive, and that only one site is likely to be viable, the original site should be designated in the LAP.

Recommendation

- The original shopping site designated on Lamb Island be retained as an Island Multi Purpose Centre.
- The northern multipurpose centre on Macleay Island will be scaled back to two lots and be zoned as Local Centre.
- The existing Convenience Centre designation on High Central Road, Macleay Island south of the School be increased in size.

4.4 Uses in Rural Areas

Substantive Issues

A total of 5 out of 200 comments on economic and employment issues related to uses in rural areas. The two key points raised by these submitters were:

- Concern over potential loss of remaining rural areas; and
- Need for clarification of circumstances under which rural land would change use.

Study Team Response

- It is not intended to permit further residential subdivision on the Islands. Other uses for rural areas could include research or perhaps some low key tourist related activity. The scale of activity would need to be compatible with the Island setting.
- Analysis has indicated there is likely to be a shortage of large open space areas and some rural sites have been identified on the Preferred Land Use Map as possible future open space areas.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

4.5 Tourism Development – General

Substantive Issues

A total of 12 out of 200 comments on economic and employment issues related to tourism developments on the Islands.

- The submitters are concerned with the lack of opportunities for tourism development. Ideas for tourist activities/infrastructure include Golf Courses, Resorts, Art and Craft and Indigenous History Centres, Accommodation, Waterfront Eateries (if sites could be found), Recreational boating, Walking and Bike Trails, Marine Research Facilities (open to public) and a Botanic Garden on Russell Island (Queensland’s Australian Native Fauna Garden).
- There is a need to define appropriate forms of visitor accommodation (e.g. Bed and Breakfast) and visitor related activity for the Islands.

Study Team Response

- The SMBIPLUS Economic Development Strategy recognised the potential for tourism development on the Islands consistent with the Island vision. The strategy acknowledges that opportunity exists on all Islands (although less so on Karragarra due to its size) for the development of facilities for day visitors and tourism related uses. Day trippers, in particular, are poorly catered for on the Islands. There is need for facilities and tourism related enterprises in walkable distance from the jetties. Opportunity for kiosks, Island interpretation centres and outlets for Island produce should be available and accessible to Island visitors. Also, natural recreation sites further afield need to be linked with improved paths, trails and public transport. Areas which may encourage tourist visitation to the Islands include:
 - the ferry terminal areas located on each Island;
 - Rocky Point, Russell Island;
 - Lions Park, Russell Island;
 - Karragarra Island Community Park, Karragarra Island;
 - Pioneer Park, Lamb Island;
 - Coondooropa Park, Macleay Island;
 - Corroborree Park, Macleay Island;
 - Thompson’s Point, Macleay Island; and
 - Pat’s Park, Macleay Island.
- The establishment of cottage industries on the Islands has occurred and could be further developed and integrated with tourism development.
- Greater benefit to the Island economy could be expected from longer stay tourism. Bed and breakfast facilities, holiday cabins and eco-resorts offering “retreat” opportunities for mainlanders would be compatible with the Island lifestyle, offering visitors the chance to experience for brief periods of time the lifestyle residents enjoy. Bayside restaurants could also be appropriate uses if properly sited.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

4.6 Education and Research

Substantive Issues

A total of 9 out of 200 comments on economic and employment issues related to education and research.

- Submitters were generally in favour of using the Islands for educational purposes for students at all levels, but particularly for tertiary environmental protection students.

Study Team Response

- Educational uses are generally desirable development on the Islands. A Marine Research Station on the Islands will be considered in the longer term.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

5. Infrastructure Provision

5.1 Infrastructure Provision – Physical/Engineering

Substantive Issues

A total of 123 out of 269 comments on infrastructure provision were of a general nature.

Comments in this category relate to a wide variety of infrastructure services. Submitters provide suggestions on which infrastructure is required most urgently and ways of best implementing infrastructure plans.

Infrastructure financing is an emotive issue on the Islands. The primary issue in relation to charging is the perceived poor level of service provision in relation to rates paid. The submitters are highly sceptical of Council rates and wish to see where earlier rates have been spent. The submitters believed that Council has exploited the Islanders.

Rates are viewed as being far too high and disproportionate to rates paid on the mainland. The submitters believe that rates should be commensurate to services provided and made consistent with mainland rates structures.

Submitters are opposed to any further infrastructure charges and want to see the return of monies levied on landowners who have had their lands acquired.

Submitters are keen to know whether the State or Federal Government will contribute to infrastructure development.

Opinions expressed in the comments include:

- Sewerage needs to be a priority.
- Infrastructure and services provision needs to be better coordinated and not peppered across the Islands.
- Why should the road system on Russell Island be designed to limit extensive maintenance when Islanders pay the same rates as the mainland?
- A higher population is required to make service provision economically sustainable.
- Owners have paid enough for infrastructure in the past and do not deserve another round of charges – where have the existing charges for electricity and water gone to?
- Infrastructure identified by the 97/98 special rate is required for the sustainable future of the Islands and still needs to be financed.
- “Alternative funding” presumably means levies. NOT a popular option.
- Rates being paid are disproportionate to property values and have paid for services which don't exist.

Study Team Response

- The SMBIPLUS proposed an Infrastructure Strategy for the Island the essence of which included:
 - the progressive introduction of reticulated sewerage;
 - the progressive upgrading of the Island road network to appropriate standards consistent with the projected levels of traffic and the objective of minimising the need for ‘engineered’ stormwater systems; and
 - the progressive provision of water and electricity services.
- As part of the implementation of the SMBIPLUS, a Sewerage Options Study is now underway to explore feasible options for the Island and to gain broad community and agency support for a preferred sewerage scheme.
- Co-ordination of infrastructure is made difficult on the Islands as the subdivision has already occurred and development can occur anywhere on the Islands. There is no basis for the logical sequencing or staging of infrastructure. However, the Sewerage Options Study will determine priority areas for the eventual introduction of sewerage based on development density and public health/environmental risks.
- Also, Council has a program for road upgrading which is generally based on traffic volumes but which is under constant review.
- It is acknowledged that infrastructure costs per household are likely to be lower the larger the number of households (as opposed to population) on the Islands. However, substantial areas of the Islands warrant protection if the ecological biodiversity on the Islands and surrounding marine environment are to be preserved. Infrastructure costs can also be reduced through concentrating development and the original SMBIPLUS envisaged large areas of the southern end of Russell Island as being precluded from development (for environmental and cultural reasons) which would have reduced infrastructure requirements in that area.

While the revised SMBIPLUS has amended this strategy, a similar level of development will be achieved as a result of the ongoing transfer of lots to Council, particularly on Russell Island. It may be possible, through a range of strategies, to again achieve some concentration of development to reduce infrastructure costs.

Also, the State Government has acknowledged the unique circumstances of the Bay Islands and has indicated higher than normal subsidies for infrastructure (sewerage) may be forthcoming.

- The issue of how infrastructure is to be funded is still unresolved. However, it is likely to be from a range of sources including user charges, special rates, general revenue and grants. The same funding principles that apply to mainland infrastructure are likely to be applicable.
- Council has already introduced a differential rate for lots on the Islands with insurmountable drainage constraints. This would preclude development, including the 511 lots that are currently zoned Residential A. The LAP will amend the zoning on these lots.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.
- Mechanisms for funding infrastructure should be investigated following adoption of preferred sewerage option and finalisation of the preferred land use plan for the Islands.

5.2 Public Open Space and Recreation

Substantive Issues

A total of 54 out of 269 comments on infrastructure provision related to public open space and recreation.

Many comments were received in relation to the provision of open space. Key comments included:

- That there is a lack of public open space and recreation provision in the current plans.
- Open space areas are not within walking distance of all residential properties.
 - In response to this, some submitters support the creation of pocket parks
- Foreshore parks (preferably continuous areas along foreshore) should be provided in order to improve access to the water.

A number of submitters are in favour of converting the Macleay Island Quarry Site into playing fields for the Islands.

Study Team Response

- The Open Space Study within the Supplementary Planning Study recommended a **standard rate** of provision of **5ha of public open space per 1000 people**. With the exception of Karragarra Island, existing open spaces have been identified as insufficient to meet future demand. Further parkland had to be identified in order to provide an appropriate quantity of park land as well as an appropriate mix of recreational opportunities. The table below demonstrates the ultimate rate of provision based on current supply for the Island group:

Park Type	Hectares of Parkland per 1000 people (based on existing supply of parkland)		
	2001	2016	Ultimate Population
Local			
Informal	3.4	1.5	0.5
Recreation	0.7	0.3	0.1
District			
Recreation	0.2	0.1	0.0
Sport	4.6	2.1	0.7

Regional			
Recreation	0.2	0.1	0.0
Sport	1.1	0.5	0.2
TOTAL	10.2	4.6	1.6

- In response to the identified shortfall, further parkland was identified at the rates of supply described in the table directly below.

Island	Current Supply	Proposed Additional Supply	Total Supply
Macleay (& Perulpa) Island	14.79	9.07	23.86
Lamb Island	4.88	0	4.88
Karragarra Island	8.58	0	8.58
Russell Island	8.27	17.14	25.41
TOTAL	36.52	26.21	62.73

- This has led to rates of provision as identified in the table below.

Island	Current ha of parkland per 1000 people	2016 ha parkland per 1000 people	Ultimate ha parkland per 1000 people
Macleay (& Perulpa) Island	9.9	8.6	3.5
Lamb Island	12.6	8.1	3.3
Karragarra Island	80.9	57.2	16.4
Russell Island	5.2	5.8	1.9
TOTAL	10.2	7.9	2.8

- As the above table demonstrates, even with the extra provision of public open space provided in the Statement of Proposals, there is a need to provide further public open spaces to meet the benchmark. This shortfall will be addressed by the progressive provision of 'pocket parks' on the Islands from Council owned land (including areas acquired for bushfire and land management) thus further improving public accessibility to public open spaces). In addition, water based recreational opportunities on the Islands will be optimised.
- It is important to note that parkland spaces that restrict free public access have been included in the analysis (eg. the Macleay Island Golf Club). The inclusion of these lands, influences rates of provision shown (particularly the rates of provision shown for Macleay Island, where the inclusion of the Golf Club increases the rate of provision considerably).
- The support among Macleay Island residents for the conversion of the Council-owned quarry site into public open space is acknowledged. Council are also considering relocation of the transfer station to this site and there is need to locate an Industry Support node somewhere on the Island. These options are all under consideration. The issues

associated with the conversion of the current rural site into a playing field are acknowledged.

- The need for greater foreshore access and foreshore parks is acknowledged and is being reviewed.
- The proposed land use plans did not depict future pocket parks as the intention was to provide these as the need is identified.

Recommendations

- Finalise the review of the open space across the Islands and include in the LAP.

5.3 Social Infrastructure

Substantive Issues

A total of 38 out of 269 comments on infrastructure provision related to social infrastructure.

Submitters promote the immediate development of social infrastructure on the Islands. Services mentioned include: ambulance, police, public toilets, Medicare, Centrelink and public libraries. One submitter also stressed the need for employment generating opportunities to counter the dependence on social welfare. The need for a multi-use 'Administrative centre' on Russell Island, incorporating a number of various emergency, government and commercial uses was also put forward.

Other comments include:

- Insufficient regard has been given to the aging demographic and needs of the aged.
- The proposed strategy does not recognise the levels of usage which Island facilities will receive in future.
- Community facilities may need to vastly exceed mainland standards if the Islands become a retirement haven.
- The studies are lacking a realistic long term perspective in terms of facilities demand.
- The submitters are divided as to the range of amenities required on Karragarra Is. While some wish to see the maintenance of the status quo, others are in favour of the introduction of low level commercial facilities e.g. small shops, licensed café, cottage industries, a second park, and a meeting hall.

Study Team Response

- The SMBIPLUS included a Human Services Strategy based on the anticipated level of development and population characteristics for the Island which is to be progressively implemented through a range of Council programs. Fundamental to this strategy was:
 - the need to recognise the Islands group as a single community for the purposes of providing human services and facilities;
 - services and facilities should be located in Centres walkable from the jetty terminals, so that they are accessible to residents from all Islands;

- the duplication of facilities and services on the Islands should be minimised whenever possible, although it is recognised some emergency services should be located on each Island;
- recognition of the role of the transport system in providing affordable and convenient access to higher order services and facilities on the mainland.

The LAP will make provision for areas suitable for the location of community services and facilities, consistent with the SMBIPLUS and provide opportunities for integration with the transport network. The ILTP recognises the role transport plays in providing access to services and facilities on the Islands and the mainland.

- The potential of Karragarra Island to support any commercial development is questionable. However, opportunities for the establishment of a Local Shop should be provided in the LAP.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

6. Stormwater Management

6.1 Stormwater Infrastructure

Substantive Issues

A total of 42 out of 55 comments related to stormwater infrastructure in general.

Criticism of Council strategies occur throughout the submissions. Some submitters see the use of a 'natural' overland stormwater drainage system as irresponsible, in terms of creating a safety risk for children, creating mosquito habitat, consuming developable land and causing greater sediment runoff to the Bay. The strategy is seen as a cost cutting technique, discrimination against Islanders and a punitive method to depopulate the Islands.

Generally there is very little support among submitters for the proposed stormwater management strategies, though some submitters accept that land subject to tidal inundation or unable to fulfil normal engineering requirements should be acquired in order to effectively manage stormwater.

There is a view that Drainage Problem lots have largely been disturbed and it is questionable they can act as green belts, ecological buffers and stormwater filters. They are slashed to reduce fire hazard.

Study Team Response

The Islands were originally subdivided with minimal regard to stormwater drainage and overland flow paths. As a result large number of lots were affected by stormwater runoff, (flooding and tidal inundation leading to the comprehensive identification and categorisation of drainage problem lots and stormwater management strategy in the SMBIPLUS).

A key element of the stormwater management strategy was the retention of natural overland flow paths wherever possible since:

- They provided opportunities for the natural treatment of runoff and removal of pollutants prior to entering the sensitive receiving waters of the surrounding Moreton Bay Marine Park;
- They provide opportunities for the retention of vegetation corridors that provide some articulation to the original over zealous subdivision pattern, and contribute to retention of the landscape amenity;
- They minimise the requirement for costly engineered structures which also tend to concentrate flows, increase runoff velocities and lead to erosion.
- The proper management and treatment of stormwater runoff from development on the Islands is one of the fundamental levels of achieving sustainable development. The intertidal and marine environments and freshwater wetlands are particularly vulnerable to impacts from urban runoff.

- The retention of natural drainage systems and incorporation of appropriate stormwater treatment measures is not only regarded as contemporary best practice but makes a significant contribution to the achievement of the Island vision established as part of the SMBIPLUS.
- Consistent with the above, a stormwater management report has been prepared for the Islands that recommends a range of measures for incorporation in the LAP to protect the quality of runoff into the Bay. These include buffer areas, filter strips, detention basins, etc. The approach is consistent with both Council's Urban Stormwater Management Plan and SEQ Regional Water Quality Management Strategy which advocate the use of water sensitive urban design and use of 'hard' engineering measures only where warranted.
- Issues such as safety risk for children and the need to avoid creating mosquito breeding areas are acknowledged and would be addressed in a detailed stormwater management strategy for the Islands.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

7. Population and Housing

7.1 Residential Development

Substantive Issues

A total of 49 out of 105 comments on population and housing related to residential development.

Some submitters are opposed to any requirements that do not precisely mirror current mainland Residential A requirements.

Other submitters believe that the Islands should have special residential design requirements, to ensure that the housing is attractive and compatible with the local ecology (including mosquito protection requirements). These submitters also tend to promote the development of a distinct Island character and incentives for sustainable designs.

Many comments were tabled regarding the undesirable nature of some homes on the Islands, with particular reference to removal homes.

Many submitters are concerned about constraints to development e.g. plot ratio, special design standards for bushfire risk areas, effects of potential acid sulphate soils.

Comments include:

- The need for planning controls to ensure retention and restoration of indigenous vegetation and sustainable housing design;
- Council should have a policy to encourage landowners to landscape accordingly, and even reward them with free native plants. Landscaping plans could be submitted as part of development applications;
- Small house construction on the Islands could lead to the creation of slums;
- An ‘appropriate’ building standard should be strictly maintained by Council;
- In relation to section 3.2.2 of the Statement of Proposals, there is an emphasis on maintaining local housing character. Up to the present time, “local character” has been “poorly maintained weekend shacks”, often confused with the Island vision;
- Freedom of architectural choice must not be interfered with. It is only with this choice now, as in the past, that “island character” develops;
- Need incentives for low environmental impact building and design features in residential areas;
- Council should incorporate planning provisions for energy efficient design.
- Expansion of existing residential development in the Special Protection area must not constitute a Material Change of Use

Study Team Response

- The Island vision formulated during the preparation of the SMBIPLUS and a guiding principle in the preparation of the LAP states in part "...The built form (one the Islands) is distinctive and reflects a style and character consistent with the Island lifestyle sought by most residents...".
- While some submitters believe residential design requirements should mirror those on the mainland, this appears to be a minority view and one that is inconsistent with the Island vision.
- It is intended that a number of design elements for new housing and land be introduced as part of the LAP in recognition of, and to assist in preserving, the existing residential and landscape character. These are likely to relate to minimising cut and fill, building materials, retention of vegetation etc. Further work is still required on such controls. These developed controls will be subject to review and public comment.
- These controls would relate to both new dwellings and removal dwellings and help address current issues related to the construction of substantial housing.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted

7.2 Population Growth

Substantive Issues

A total of 29 out of 105 comments on population and housing relate to the issue of population growth.

- With the exception of submitters who support a bridge, submitters are generally concerned about the projected population levels and the Islands' ability to accommodate such populations in a sustainable manner.
- Submitters who support a bridge generally infer the need for a style of development that reflects traditional low density residential subdivisions.
- Submitters are concerned that planners are not paying attention to the likely future demographic profile of the Islands (predominance of active retirees).
- Some submitters see the protection population for Karragarra Island (524) as too high.

Study Team Response

- The SMBIPLUS provides a framework for sustainable development on the Islands. The approach adopted to balance the three components of sustainability was not to determine a population threshold for the Islands, but rather identify the environmental features most vulnerable to the impacts of development and propose measures to protect these values. In so doing, the resultant areas for development could yield an ultimate population of around 22,000 residents.
- The revised SMBIPLUS yields a similar level of development and subsequent ultimate population on the Islands.

- The likely demographic characteristics of the population have been considered in determining possible future population levels and implications for facilities and services (such as open space). The SMBIPLUS acknowledges that it will not be possible for service agencies to provide a comprehensive range of facilities and services for the Islands' population due to competing demands on the mainland. The SMBIPLUS recognises that the Islands will always remain reliant on the mainland for higher order facilities and services, and that an Island lifestyle involves a trade off with the convenience offered by a mainland suburban lifestyle. The LAP will provide the mechanism for implementing many of the strategies outlined in the SMBIPLUS for managing growth on the Islands such as:
 - the stormwater management strategy
 - the conservation strategy
- Other strategies will be implemented through other Council programs and initiatives including the ILTP and the Sewerage Options Study
- The approach to sustainable development adopted by the SMBIPLUS is to identify vulnerable environmental attributes and incorporate measures to protect them rather than setting arbitrary population thresholds.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

8. Miscellaneous

This report was assembled primarily to address technical and ethical criticisms against the Statement of Proposals and Council administration of the Bay Islands, but also covers other topics e.g. Land Amalgamations.

Criticisms of the Consultants, Council, and State Government were received. The nature of criticisms varied widely.

8.1 Statement of Proposals and Conservation Acquisition Strategy Planning Process

Substantive Issues

A total of 121 out of 373 miscellaneous comments relate to the planning process.

Criticisms in this section relate primarily to the design, management, and objectives of the planning process, as well as the general thrust of the plan. Some key areas of concern include:

- Council failing to conduct appropriate community consultation, including:
 - timely written notification to all landholders;
 - the lack of direct community involvement in plan making;
 - failure to directly listen to people “on the ground”;
 - a lack of technical information provided to the public, particularly in relation to acquisitions; and
 - lack of opportunity for mainland landowners to provide input into the process.
- The lack of consultation for residents of Karragarra Island and the general omission of Karragarra Island from detailed consideration under the plan;
- It seems that any ‘protection’ by planners of long term, sustainable interests on these Islands has been compromised by short term pressures of public demand e.g. litigation issues over land holdings. The opportunity to plan for the Islands future is being spoiled by a lack of boldness, understanding and creativity, and an emphasis on bureaucratic process and keeping people off the Island.

Study Team Response

- The Statement of Proposals is based on the outcomes of the SMBIPLUS. The SMBIPLUS involved an extensive public consultation and engagement process. As part of that process, all Island land owners were sent information. Community input from all major stakeholder/interest groups was obtained and considered in the preparation of the SMBIPLUS.
- Consultation associated with the SMBIPLUS activities to date included the distribution of five community newsletters, the formation of a community reference group, the holding of

an Island summit, the provision of a freecall Council information line, and a wide range of information made publicly available over the Council websites. In addition, Council undertook a major consultation exercise as part of the Moving Forward package of measures adopted in May 2001. The latest consultation activities in relation to the Statement of Proposals has included three public open days (two held on the Islands) and the current review of public submissions. No attempt has been made to obscure knowledge from public view. The display and invitation for feedback on the SOP is part of the consultation process and provides opportunity for feedback from people “on the ground”.

- Karragarra Island has not been excluded from or discounted by the planning process. Karragarra Island residents have been given opportunities to participate in consultation activities outlined above. The residential strategy and intention for appropriately scale tourism uses within the residential areas (e.g. bed and breakfast establishments) applies across all Islands. Transport strategies for Karragarra will respond to the relatively small travel distances on the Island. Opportunity for a local shop to be established on Karragarra will be recognised within the draft LAP.
- Council’s commitment to sound environmental management of the Islands is genuine. The Statement of Proposals has put forward planning ideas that aim to be responsive to the needs of the Islands. However, it should be recognised that there are some fundamental components to both the LAP and SMBIPLUS that are not negotiable. Much of the criticism and negative comment is targeted at these components. These include:
 - access to the Islands will be by water based transport, there is no proposal for a bridge;
 - the Islands’ extensive natural attributes need to be protected in order to protect the ecological processes of the surrounding marine park; and
 - protection of areas and natural processes will necessitate acquisition of allotments due to the ill conceived original subdivision pattern.

It should be noted that planning for the Islands is made more difficult by the developed nature of the area. Given the existing pattern of subdivision, the presence of existing development and an established community, opportunities for “bold” planning are constrained somewhat by legal and technical realities.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.
- Opportunities be provided within the LAP to allow consideration for the establishment of a local shop on Karragarra Island.

8.2 Statement of Proposals and Conservation Acquisition Strategy – Technical Criticism

Substantive Issues

A total of 91 out of 373 miscellaneous comments relate to technical criticisms of planning work.

The comments provided in this category tend to be more technical in nature, directly challenging the assumptions and content of the planning documents. While some of the comments in this category are purely technical (e.g. incorrect map scales, expression of definitions), others indicate a deep rift between Council plans for the Island and the submitter views. Comments and criticisms of the Island vision feature prominently. Lacking confidence in technical information e.g. Drainage Investigations, is also expressed. Other criticisms relate to contextual interpretation of the Statement of Proposals e.g. arguments over whether the Islands were inappropriately subdivided.

Comments include:

- The Island vision is too often taken as “existing”, and efforts are made to resist change on the basis that it destroys the Vision. Little of the Vision exists. The LAP is an opportunity to address the complete lack of previous planning, and appropriate land use allocation.
- It is unsure whether “Planning to ensure the maintenance of the unique Island lifestyle” can be achieved so best leave it out.
- There is some concern about the designation of Island Residential. Some submitters expressed dismay at being treated differently to mainland residents.

Study Team Response

- Any technical errors in the materials produced to date will be corrected prior to the release of further work. This includes:
 - incorrect map scales;
 - further explanation of terminology;
 - improving clarity of street names on maps.
- The Island vision underpins the SMBIPLUS and the LAP. This vision was well received in extensive community consultations on the SMBIPLUS, with over 70% of written newsletter responses indicating agreement. A number of submitters believe the Island vision is unachievable and that Council should ‘bite the bullet’ and allow the Islands to develop into mainland style suburbs. Such a development outcome was not supported by the consultation process carried out for the SMBIPLUS and is not considered to be sustainable ecologically.
- The attraction of the Islands is the alternative lifestyle they offer and this has been widely acknowledged by both resident and non resident landowners. The SMBIPLUS also acknowledges the ongoing development on the Islands will bring about change, but the challenge is to manage the change to protect the unique lifestyle offered and the natural environment. As mentioned above, a number of fundamental planning principles underpin the achievement of the Island vision, including:
 - access to the Islands will be by water based transport, there is no proposal for a bridge;
 - the Islands’ extensive natural attributes need to be protected in order to protect the ecological processes of the surrounding marine park; and
 - protection of areas and natural processes will necessitate acquisition of allotments due to the ill conceived original subdivision pattern.

- On the same theme, it is not considered appropriate to adopt the same intent for residential development on the Islands as on the mainland. A distinctive residential character has already emerged on the Islands which contributes to the Island lifestyle and image. It is intended to encourage this trend and draw a distinction between mainland suburbia and Island residential.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

8.3 Land Amalgamations

Substantive Issues

A total of 20 out of 373 miscellaneous comments relate to land amalgamations.

- Submitters provide both support and opposition to the amalgamation programme.
- Those in support of the amalgamation programme promote the environmental benefits of the programme. Supporters are keen to know what incentives are available and if Council land in residential areas is available for acquisition. Some regard the range of incentives as insufficient to achieve a significant number of amalgamations, particularly between neighbouring properties.
- Those opposing the amalgamations often insist that the current lot sizes on the Islands are sufficient. Those opposed believe that Council is using amalgamations primarily as a tool to reduce the Island population. This is deemed to be undesirable as it will drive up service costs per lot.

Study Team Response

- It is not intended that the LAP make land amalgamations mandatory on the Islands. Amalgamations are only encouraged through providing an improved procedure for those who do decide to amalgamate land.
- Council has already agreed to subsidise the amalgamation by title of properties on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands which are currently zoned Residential A and are not affected by insurmountable drainage problems.
- Council will provide the following assistance with respect to the amalgamation of eligible properties:
 - arranging for the compilation and/or survey of the relevant properties; and
 - completing all necessary legal work for the amalgamation.

Council will not pay Title Office fees but has made a request to the State Government for the waiver of these fees.

Recommendation

- That the above comments be noted.

8.4 Criticism of Council Officers, Consultants and Planning History

Substantive Issues

A total of 112 out of 373 miscellaneous comments are criticisms of Council officers or Consultants involved in the Bay Islands.

A wide range of criticisms are directed at Council and the Consultants. The overriding implication is that Council is more interested in grabbing land and retarding development of the Islands rather than taking a facilitative approach.

Comments include:

- The planning process is not action-implementation oriented. Why don't Council planners actually *do* something listed in the Summary of Issues and Responses to help the landowners.
- Councils have been allowed to be a law unto themselves and particularly in Queensland since the Local Government Act of 1993. Unconscionable treatment of ratepayers in the Redlands Shire must be addressed urgently.
- Victims of the process have understandably been vociferous in their calls for justice and humanitarian concern. Unfortunately they fail to comprehend how it is that the principles involved in this land "acquisition" programme lack both principles and humanitarian concern.
- The Council is very good at changing laws but not very good at doing things.
- The Statement of Proposals is based on the severe and hysterical containment of people, their rights to access their property and to use their land in a fair dinkum Australian way. It is based on the radical wants of the Council to do as little as possible aided and abetted by the green movement and not the balanced needs of the community.
- What does Council propose to do about compensation for the gross neglect of Duty of Care precepts? This question has not been posed rhetorically.
- The Council Voluntary Purchase Scheme appears to be a collusion between supposedly independent bodies: Council and the Department of Natural Resources and Mines.

Criticisms are also directed at the history of development on the Islands, alleged previous Council and State Government mismanagement, and the unscrupulous actions of property developers.

Study Team Response

- These comments in the main reflect the long standing disenchantment that exists between some groups and individuals on the Islands and Council. The issues raised are beyond the scope of the LAP process, but highlight a number of social equity concerns that need to be considered as part of any acquisition or compensation strategy.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.

9. General Support

9.1 General Support for Statement of Proposals and ILTP

Substantive Issues

A total of 41 comments express support for the direction of planning documents relating to the Bay Islands.

The submitters are generally pleased with the range of initiatives which have been put forward by Council and with the levels of research which have gone into producing the information. Some submitters are impressed by the quality of the presentation format.

Some submitters have offered support under the proviso that their land on the Islands is not detrimentally affected by the proposals.

The submitters support amalgamation initiatives and would appreciate further effort by Council to help increase landholdings.

Many submitters are pleased that the outstanding issues are finally being addressed by Council.

Comments include:

- The submitters support the concept of the LAP, particularly the acquisition of land for public open space and special protection (provided the landowners are fairly compensated)
- The submitters do not want to see significant compromises on ecological sustainability in the final plan
- The Bay Islands have been in need of an integrated plan since the 1970's. This proposal looks like several steps in the right direction and the Council are to be congratulated for commencing to address this long-standing problem (of uncoordinated development)

Study Team Response

- Much of this support for the Statement of Proposals appears to be based on the plan's emphasis on protecting the Island environment and lifestyle, as well as the security that the plan provides for future development.
- The fact that some provide support in principle or concede that many aspects of the plan are respectable may indicate wider merits of the plan not commonly acknowledged by its critics.

Recommendations

- That the above comments be noted.