

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

SOUTH EAST QUEENSLAND REGIONAL PLAN (SEQRP) TIMELINE

2004	Release of the first SEQRP Mount Lindesay North Beaudesert Study Area (MLNB) identified for investigation
May 2005	Office of Urban Management (OUM) workshop held at Park Ridge SHS for MLNB area Joy Drescher (Mayor BSC) was present at wildlife corridor table
Oct – Nov 2005	OUM consultation 3 workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flagstone (first meeting) – 150 people• Park Ridge SHS (2nd meeting) – 350 people• Logan village (3rd Meeting) – 700+ people (after local residents did letter box drops) Adverts and news reports in Jimboomba Times Submissions received from the community Property owners advised they could apply for 2 year use it or lose it right to subdivide (some property owners contacted by BSC and advised of this right)
Summer 2006	Beaudesert Shire Whole of Shire Planning Project (WOSPP) questionnaire in Shire Life (BSC) Edition 3 WOSPP workshops only held in south of Beaudesert shire eg Beaudesert and Canungra Communities in the north of Beaudesert were advised that OUM would do the consultation with them as part of the OUM consultation for the SEQRP Amendment consultation. No workshops were held in the north other than May 2005 and Oct 2005.
March 2006	Draft Amendment 1 for the SEQRP (MLNBSA included) closed for community submissions (OUM) . Final version released later that year
March 2008	Local Council amalgamations take place and election for councilors
April 2008	LCC Draft Growth Management Core Matters strategic document No community consultation
Dec – March 2009	SEQRP 5 year Review (Draft SEQRP 2009 – 2031 document released for community comment) (Dept Infrastructure and Planning)
July 2009	SEQRP Plan (2009 – 2031) finalized and released (Dept Infrastructure and Planning) Next review due 2014 for community comment and consultation.

Nov 2009	LCC Greater Flagstone consultation at Flagstone school Submissions closed Dec 2009
2010	ULDA created
Oct 2010	UDAs of Greater Flagstone, Ripley and Yarrabilba announced to be fast tracked by ULDA
Dec 2010	New Beith early release DA on ULDA website
Feb 2011	Teviot Downs early release DA on ULDA website
March 2011	community consultation to start for UDA Greater flagstone (under UDLA)

DRAFT MOUNT LINDESAY NORTH BEAUDESERT STUDY AREA (SEQRP Consultation Closing 4/11/05)

Extract from Personal Submission by Anne Page

I am concerned that the proposed plan does not reflect the concerns and preferences of residents as per the community consultation process. 600 people (of the current 37 000 residents in the MLNBSA) attended one of the community consultation meetings in May 2005. This represents a 2.4% response rate. Of the original 25 000 household surveys sent out, only 1500 surveys were returned. This is a response rate of 6%. Many local residents DID NOT receive the four page information pamphlet “*Study Area Update – Setting a Vision for the Future*”.

I personally photocopied and delivered 500 letters with the proposed plan and maps attached to make residents in my local area aware of the proposed plan. I have spoken (in person or by telephone) to approximately 80 to 90 people and about 95% of these people had no prior knowledge of the South-east Queensland plan let alone the proposal for the MLNBSA. Some people that I spoke with were people over the age of 50 years who had no access to a computer and would not have been able to access the Draft Plan on the website. Consequently if they were unable to attend the community meetings they would not even have been aware of, or seen a copy of, the preferred plan. People of a lower socio-economic income level may also not have access to a computer. This is not equitable access to government information and contravenes equal opportunity and human rights’ policies.

Recommendations:

- I would like a more inclusive and comprehensive community consultation process with realistic time frames that allow the community sufficient time to consider the weight of the issues being discussed.
- I would like the proposed plan to be mailed in person to all residents of the study area and appropriate provisions be made for easy access for older people, people with disabilities and those from lower socio-economic groups.

I have read the 107 page *Draft Study Report* for the MLNBSA and I do not believe that the proposed plan reflects the opinions of the community (p 25-26, Appendix 3 and 4). In the *Draft Study Report* it is recorded that “many who attended” the community consultation meetings in May were concerned about:

- Development eroding the semi-rural lifestyle and amenity (the primary reason why people moved to MLNBSA in the first place)
- The environment
- Protecting existing remnant areas of biodiversity
- Improving the water quality of the Logan and Albert Rivers
- Lack of services e.g. desired services included public transport, sport and recreational facilities, improved water supply and sewerage, greater variety of commercial and shopping centres

- employment and social infrastructure
- Some acceptance of the need for some development
- Concerns about property owners' rights to subdivide blocks.

From the household survey, residents identified (p 26 full *Draft Study Report*) the most important lifestyle values to retain were:

- The retention of acreage/rural living areas
- More parks, open spaces, green space and bushland
- More parks for recreational uses.

From the survey, residents identified the most important environmental values to be retained for the future as:

- More national parks, nature reserves, bushwalk trails
- Retention of native trees and native vegetation on private property
- Cycle and pedestrian paths

These survey results do not support the preferred plan and future for the MLNBSA as reported on p26:

- Retention of acreage/rural lifestyle
- More community services and facilities
- More urban and development mix.

In the community meetings held in May 2005 (at Flagstone, Park Ridge SHS and Logan Village) the same environmental concerns were addressed by residents:

**SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS' ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS FROM
MLNBSA COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS**

CONCERN	Flagstone	Park Ridge	Logan Village
1.value/acquire open space	✓	✓	✓
2. protect corridors not 'spots' for wildlife	✓	✓	✓
3.green areas need to be joined, not isolated, link green space areas	✓	✓	✓
4.reduce clearing of bush/remnants	✓	✓	✓
5.identify significant areas of bushland and acquire	✓	✓	✓
6.buffer zones between landuses			
7.preserve environment, maintain habitat and protect wildlife	✓	✓	✓
8.plan growth to preserve environment	✓	✓	✓

9. identify and protect green open space			
10. protection of creeklines and catchments, healthy waterways and riparian areas	✓	✓	✓
11. to protect good agricultural land	✓	✓	✓
12. access to water supply	✓	✓	✓
13. importance of recycling water	✓	✓	✓
14. keep acreage living		✓	
15. sustainable development			
16. protect water quality		✓	✓
17. retain biodiversity	✓	✓	✓
18. prevent higher density in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive areas			✓

19. retain rural character			✓
20. preserve natural qualities of area			✓
21. security on national park area			✓
22. reduce light pollution			✓
23. maintain parklands			
24. maintain horse trails, pony clubs			
25. maintain/protect air quality			
26. more fauna studies needed			

Source: Appendix 3 and 4, *MLNBSA Draft Study Report*

In the community survey, 1 500 of 25 000 residents responded (*MLNBSA Draft Study Report*). 36% preferred no urban subdivisions (see question 3). In question 9 (lifestyle and environmental values), residents wanted: more parks, open space; to retain acreage and rural lifestyle; parks for recreational use; more community services and facilities; and to restrict subdivision of acreage blocks. The five key environmental values identified by residents were: to provide more national parks and nature reserves; retain trees and native vegetation; provide cycle and pedestrian paths; provide more wildlife corridors linking nature reserves and parks; restoring rivers and waterways. In question 10 (other comments about the future), the 14 community values identified did not include more industrial precincts and jobs. These responses and values communicated by the public are not reflected in the proposed plan for MLNBSA.

Recommendations:

- Use the natural landscape map, unique natural features, catchments, fauna and flora information as the **basis** for developing a sustainable long term plan for the MLNBSA.
- Incorporate the protection and preservation of the environmental and rural values in the plan as desired by the community through the community consultation process.
- Retain and protect rural lifestyle, visual amenity, green spaces and bushland, remnant areas, regrowth and significant vegetation on private and public land
- Community recreation, urban development and industrial precincts must be secondary considerations to the protection and maintenance of our natural environment and ecological processes

BEAUDESERT SHIRE COUNCIL DRAFT WOSP VISION APRIL 2007

- The community was never informed about the results of the first WOSP (Whole of Shire Planning) workshops – only a very general overview of ideas were communicated to the community. This information needs to be communicated to all Beaudesert Shire Council residents during this final WOSP stage to improve information available to the community.
- Inequitable consultation – the Northern part of Beaudesert Shire (eg North Maclean, Greenbank, Flagstone, Logan Village, Jimboomba) never got to participate in the WOSP workshops. The Beaudesert Shire Council only held workshops in the southern part of the shire (eg Canungra, Beaudesert) and the council stated that the northern part of Beaudesert Shire residents would be consulted as part of the Office of Urban Management’s investigation of Mt Lindesay North Beaudesert Study Area.
- Only 200+ Beaudesert Shire Council residents attended WOSP in the southern areas of the shire (the total population was 59 000 in BEaudesert shire at that time). The WOSP (Whole of Shire Planning) vision has been based on this ie only representing 0.33%.
- I would like to take this opportunity to thank Council for organizing the special WOSP display for Environmental Stakeholders and I would like to particularly thank Kate O’Connor for helping to facilitate this. However, I am disappointed that an opportunity did not occur last year and on several occasions rather than a one off event. In my conversation with you (Alastair Dawson CEO Beaudesert Shire Council) earlier in January 2007, when you visited me at my home, you mentioned that you were interested in establishing an ongoing dialogue with community groups. I believe that it is in council’s interests to begin regular meetings/consultation with community groups such as environmental groups to improve planning and decision making processes in Beaudesert Shire (comment sent by personal letter 15 April 2007)
- The current WOSP document does not reflect Whole of Shire Planning consultation in December 2005. The relationship between what people said then and what the Whole of Shire Planning now suggests are not the same.
- The northern areas of Beaudesert Shire were not included in Whole of Shire Planning workshops and hence have had no opportunity to contribute to a big vision. Using the excuse that the OUM planning workshops contributed to the WOSP consultation process is NOT acceptable. When questions pertaining to the town plan, IPA plan or WOSP process were raised at the OUM forums the response was always "that's a town planning issue you would have to see your local council about that". Hence local questions raised about the town plan were not answered and were not addressed by the OUM.
- Only 255 residents (of a total of 59 000 residents) attended Whole Of Shire Planning in December 2005 held in Canungra, Beechmont, Beaudesert,

Tamborine Mt, Rathdowney (Beaudesert Shire Council Whole of Shire Planning Community Workshops Report, December 2005). Why were displays not available at local shopping centres on a Thursday night or Saturday morning to bring the plan to the people?

- No supporting material or research has been made available from the environmental reports by Chenoweth. These reports should be made publicly available immediately.
- Long term residents are aware that very few if any environmental research or reports have ever been conducted particularly in the Mt Lindesay North Beaudesert area. These plans have been developed based on no or little supporting evidence. For example, sightings of rare and threatened species such as the spotted-tailed quoll in North Beaudesert have only come to light as a result of concerned residents raising the alarm to state government and Council. This information is crucial to making successful long term planning decisions about the future of especially North Beaudesert Shire which is targeted to receive the bulk of urban development and traffic movement. This is why genuine and ongoing community consultation over the long term is more beneficial to government planning processes than one off consultations.
- Collaborative involvement in planning and development is a great concept – but where is the equitable community consultation across different community groups? eg Some commercial sectors (Chambers of Commerce) and business / developer organizations have had more input into Whole of Shire Planning than others. Consultation in Whole of Shire Planning was inequitable - workshops were not held in north but were held in south.
- Inequitable access to information is a major barrier to belief in genuineness of the process– eg studies and reports for planning and Whole of Shire Planning are not made publicly available to community eg Chenoweth’s environmental studies to name one of 17 studies commissioned by council. How can the community make good decisions without access to information? These studies should be made publicly available now.
- is not a democratic and transparent process with equitable access to commissioned studies.
- The Community has never been consulted about population increase for shire.

Extract from the SUBMISSION BY LOGAN AND ALBERT CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

CONSULTATION CONCERNS

1. Only property owners in the footprint of the proposed area from Laravale to Kagaru have been notified of this consultation phase when all residents of Beaudesert and South-east Queensland will be impacted on e.g. heavy vehicle movement, reduced safety on roads, reduction in air quality, noise pollution impacts, loss of visual and scenic amenity from Cedar Vale/Cedar Grove to Kooralbyn.
2. Community meetings were originally only planned to be held during working hours and all meetings were held in Beaudesert.
3. The length of time for public consultation has been too short.
4. Misleading the public by referring to this area as Bromelton. Long time residents of Beaudesert only associate the Bromelton area with existing industrial uses that were proposed for a smaller industrial area.
5. The original area for Bromelton on the South East Queensland Regional Plan covered the Sandy Creek area and the immediate area of Bromelton (north to Dunn Rd and east to Bromelton House Rd and south to Gelita). The Beaudesert Shire Council's 1996 Strategic Plan identified the noxious industry area to be located north of Josephville through to just north of Boonah-Beaudesert Rd.
6. Beaudesert Shire submissions to the OUM about Bromelton did not include public support for an industrial area of this size.
7. Developers are buying land now and will pressure state and local government into allowing development before the '50 year land bank' that state government is advertising
8. State government and local government have had more than 2 years to comment on the plan and the public is only being given 3 weeks (now revised to 4 weeks)
9. No supporting state or local government studies or background research has been made available to the public during the consultation period e.g. public support for this project, studies by Beaudesert Shire Council, EIS. How can the community make informed long term decisions without access to information? These studies should be made publicly available.
10. Detailed studies need to be done before any final decisions are made about industrial areas from Kararu to Laravale.
11. Baseline data and comprehensive environmental studies and population studies are needed before any decision on further development occurs
12. Natural landscapes should be the first layer of planning

13. Cultural heritage planning is also needed - to record, map, celebrate and preserve; indigenous heritage and history and non indigenous heritage and history should also be recorded, mapped, celebrated and preserved.

SEQRP REVIEW May 2009 (Submission Extract from Logan and Albert Conservation Association)

NO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION – NORTH MACLEAN ENTERPRISE PRECINCT

2.1 Beaudesert Shire Council

- There has **never been any community consultation** by the past Beaudesert Shire Council about the concept or specific location of a proposed North Maclean Enterprise precinct.
- In the **1996 Beaudesert Strategic Plan** there was a vague statement in the text of **4.6.6 Rural Residential Objective 5 (c)** but there was no supporting location marked on any supporting maps

“A proposal to establish a single area for light industries, warehouses and bulk stores with larger than average land area requirements may be favourably considered in the Maclean area outside the existing or proposed urban centres subject to compliance with the following criteria” (Beaudesert Shire council Strategic Plan 1996)

- When the proposal for the North Maclean Enterprise Precinct was proposed by OUM in the MLNBSA Investigation Study in October 2005, this was the first time the community was aware of this proposal. During the OUM consultation in 2005-2006, many residents were not aware of the Investigation and did not have the opportunity to comment.
- The Beaudesert Shire Council **Whole of Shire Planning** consultation **did not consult with the communities** in the North Beaudesert area about their preferred future for development and growth in their local area. Consequently people in North Beaudesert were again denied the opportunity to object to the proposed North Maclean Enterprise Precinct. The majority of people who attended the workshops were from the southern part of Beaudesert.
- **No background needs assessment or supporting reports or studies** were ever presented by Beaudesert Council for public scrutiny from October 2005 to January 2008 to support the location of the proposed North Maclean Enterprise Precinct despite ongoing community requests for this information and Freedom of Information requests.
- On **13 March 2007** the Beaudesert Shire Council Ordinary Meeting Minutes record “there is no need or justification for the North Maclean Enterprise Precinct”(Beaudesert Shire Council File Reference 090-080-000005)
- On **11 May 2007** a letter was sent by Mr Steve Chadwick of Beaudesert Shire Council to Mr Lindsay Enright (OUM) **to request that “the investigation area (North Maclean) be removed from the SEQ Regional Plan”**. A reply dated 6 July 2007 by Mr Enright to Mr Alastair Dawson(CEO Beaudesert Shire Council)

advised that “ No further amendments to the SEQRP will be considered during this review process. A formal review is the most suitable process by which to consider issues such as a change to the North Maclean Investigation Area .

2.2 Logan City Council

Despite the Beaudesert Council recommending **the removal of the proposed North Maclean Precinct to the OUM in May 2007**, Logan City Council resurrected this issue in 2008 again **without any community consultation process** and on the assumption that the Beaudesert Council had already received community support for this proposal.

- Logan Council has not provided local residents with access to their council submissions to the SEQRP 2008/9 despite other councils having done this prior to the 1 May closing date.
- Logan City Council councilors were banned in 2008 from commenting on the North Maclean Enterprise Precinct. Three councilors have divisions in the North Maclean location and 2 of the 3 councillors have been listening to community comments about the proposed precinct while 1 councillor has refused to speak with the community about their concerns. This process also highlights the inadequate and insufficient community consultation that has occurred to date since 2008.
- The community has requested from Logan City Council since 2008 access to any needs assessment, background reports or studies for the proposed North Maclean Precinct however, no such documents have been presented to the community for public scrutiny.

2.3 Community Survey - North Maclean Precinct

A **survey in 2006 of 920 residents in the North Beaudesert** area (was MLNBSA or the suburbs added to Logan City Council in the 2008 council amalgamations) conducted by the North Beaudesert Shire Action Group (a community group) revealed **only 11% support for the North Maclean Enterprise Precinct**. Reasons given by those who opposed the proposal included :

- Most people wish to retain their current lifestyle
- People chose current lifestyle based on unpolluted air, water and environment; lack of noise; wooded countryside with abundance of wildlife and relaxed rural-residential amenity.
- Residents are concerned about air pollution contaminating tank water, their only source of water for the majority of local residents in this area .
- Residents who moved to North Beaudesert for health reasons are concerned about the health problems they are likely to develop.
- Many residents surveyed consider the proposed North Maclean Enterprise Precinct as unnecessary because there is industrial floorspace & land still available at nearby locations such as Park Ridge, Wacol, Acacia Ridge, Beaudesert, Jimboomba and Bromelton in the future.
- Residents proposed that an enterprise precinct should be located in an area where it cannot cause difficulties for existing residents and has room for future growth. The existing land use in North Maclean/Munruben is rural residential with smaller acreage blocks. Any proposed enterprise precinct will have considerable

social and environmental impacts of the existing community and residents in and adjacent to the area.

- Residents are concerned about the lack of infrastructure, especially water. Industry uses more water than residents.

BROMELTON SDA

NOVEMBER 2007

Extract from the SUBMISSION BY LOGAN AND ALBERT CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

CONSULTATION CONCERNS

9. Only property owners in the footprint of the proposed area from Laravale to Kagaru have been notified of this consultation phase when all residents of Beaudesert and South-east Queensland will be impacted on e.g. heavy vehicle movement, reduced safety on roads, reduction in air quality, noise pollution impacts, loss of visual and scenic amenity from Cedar Vale/Cedar Grove to Kooralbyn.
 10. Community meetings were originally only planned to be held during working hours and all meetings were held in Beaudesert.
 11. The length of time for public consultation has been too short.
 12. Misleading the public by referring to this area as Bromelton. Long time residents of Beaudesert only associate the Bromelton area with existing industrial uses that were proposed for a smaller industrial area.
 13. The original area for Bromelton on the South East Queensland Regional Plan covered the Sandy Creek area and the immediate area of Bromelton (north to Dunn Rd and east to Bromelton House Rd and south to Gelita). The Beaudesert Shire Council's 1996 Strategic Plan identified the noxious industry area to be located north of Josephville through to just north of Boonah-Beaudesert Rd.
 14. Beaudesert Shire submissions to the OUM about Bromelton did not include public support for an industrial area of this size.
 15. Developers are buying land now and will pressure state and local government into allowing development before the '50 year land bank' that state government is advertising
 16. State government and local government have had more than 2 years to comment on the plan and the public is only being given 3 weeks (now revised to 4 weeks)
- 9 No supporting state or local government studies or background research has been made available to the public during the consultation period e.g. public support for this project, studies by Beaudesert Shire Council, EIS. How can the community make informed long term decisions without access to information? These studies should be made publicly available.
14. Detailed studies need to be done before any final decisions are made about industrial areas from Kararu to Laravale.

15. Baseline data and comprehensive environmental studies and population studies are needed before any decision on further development occurs
16. Natural landscapes should be the first layer of planning
17. Cultural heritage planning is also needed - to record, map, celebrate and preserve; indigenous heritage and history and non indigenous heritage and history should also be recorded, mapped, celebrated and preserved.