

PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Overview

- Public consultation period: 8th February 2011 – 29th April 2011
- Total submissions received during the consultation period: 32
Of these submissions:
 - 28 were from the general community
 - 2 were from government agencies
 - 1 was from a significant landowner/developer
 - 1 was from a development consultant
- Total submissions received after the consultation period: 14. All of these submissions were from the general community.
- Total submissions received: 46
- Total written enquiries made during and after consultation period: 13

Summary of matters raised by submitters

Issue description	Summary of issues raised
Additional precincts considered suitable for higher densities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential additional precincts considered potentially suitable for higher density development include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Andergrove</i>: within the proposed Andergrove Lakes development; near The Village shopping centre and Pioneer State High School; near the shops on Bedford Road (southern end); and near Andergrove State Primary School - <i>Beaconsfield</i>: near the Emergency Services precinct and Carlisle Christian College; and near Beaconsfield State Primary School and Mackay Golf Course - <i>Slade Point</i>: near Slade Point Community Centre and Slade Point State Primary School - <i>Glenella</i>: near the BP Service Station, Glenella State Primary School, Magpies Sporting Club and Janes Creek - <i>South Mackay</i>: near Paget (low-medium density only) - <i>Ooralea</i>: around the CQ university campus
Bucasia – higher density precincts along Bucasia Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density” can include 8 storey buildings. This is fundamentally inappropriate along Bucasia Beach given the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - visual impact as viewed from the beach - inconsistency with surrounding neighbourhood character - lack of public transport currently, significant future improvement unlikely to be viable - limited usability of the beach - lack of current or future viable commercial centre

Issue description	Summary of issues raised
Coastal and climate change issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Location Principles should consider the <i>Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995</i> and refer to issues such as erosion prone areas and sea level rise. • Many areas of the region will be affected by increasingly severe and frequent weather events – higher density development should not be provided in these locations. • Increased density will result in increased congestion on storm surge evacuation routes.
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has not adequately communicated the strategy to the community and, therefore, residents have not had a fair chance to have their say. • A notification letter to potentially affected residents, newsletter or attachment to the rates notice should have been issued. • Public consultation processes for development applications should be maintained.
Density definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density should be expressed in terms of gross floor area, site cover and height rather than dwellings per hectare so that developments with 1 bedroom dwelling units are not penalised. • The strategy does not acknowledge other forms of higher density residential development such as boarding houses and retirement villages.
Density maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location principles have not been adequately translated onto the maps showing key higher density precincts and corridors. • The key higher density precincts and corridors maps are not clearly defined on the maps. • Not enough low-medium density corridors have been identified.
Density typologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The density typologies on page 66 are too prescriptive. Categorising specific densities for specific localities will encourage homogeneity and urban sprawl.
Existing parameters and projected trends maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the <i>Physical and Environmental</i> maps, the steep land layer should be more visible. • On the <i>Community Facilities and Parks</i> maps, the regional sporting precincts and sub-regional sporting precincts are hard to differentiate between.
General issues with the draft strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft strategy appears to be based on a planning response and market dynamics typical of capital cities. Future planning for the region should enhance our own unique characteristics and be relevant to our context. • The draft strategy appears to put developer's interests ahead of community interests. • Higher density development will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduce liveability (particularly for families and the elderly), character, amenity, privacy, ventilation, light and property values (although rates won't decrease); and - increase traffic congestion, car parking issues, noise, flooding, infrastructure capacity issues, social issues and rates • Residents of established existing suburbs have a right to expect that planning controls will protect and maintain existing amenity. • Higher density residential development should be restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new development areas where people know what they buying into and infrastructure can be planned and provided in an orderly and economically efficient way - inner areas of Mackay as these areas contain wide streets and old houses - precincts which already have high density residential development (Marina and City Centre) - south of the Pioneer River (in proximity to retail and employment nodes and the major sewerage treatment plant at Bakers Creek, increased traffic should not be placed on already congested bridges) • Using rates money to fund infrastructure upgrades for increased density, which will then reduce liveability, is unreasonable. • There is limited/no market for small residential lots and apartment buildings in non-premium locations. Combined with, construction costs, this means that affordable apartments in non-premium areas are unviable.

Issue description	Summary of issues raised
General issues with the draft strategy (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum lot size provisions should be maintained, not relaxed or deleted. • Zero setbacks on side and rear boundaries would result in amenity, overshadowing and privacy issues on neighbouring properties. • Relying on public transport as an alternate mode of transport is flawed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the public transport system is currently limited - buses sit in the same traffic as cars • Once the draft strategy is finalised, residents will have little ability to fight individual developments. • The draft strategy purports to respond to social considerations, however the photos used are all of product at the high end price range.
Mackay City Centre – higher densities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density in the Mackay City Centre is supported as it contains retail and commercial hubs (Canelands and the City Heart) and public transport facilities. • High density in the Mackay City Centre is supported as it would generate more economic activity for struggling City heart businesses.
Marian and Mirani – higher densities, water supply and riverfront	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 dwelling units per hectare in Marian is not high enough given that these towns are surrounded by GQAL. • Existing water entitlements in Marian and Mirani will not have capacity to service growth – additional entitlements will need to be sought from SunWater under the Pioneer Water Supply Scheme. • The Marian riverfront is identified as a regionally important natural recreation area, however increased maintained and further infrastructure should be provided.
Mount Pleasant – higher densities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is impossible to define the extent of the identified “Medium density” precinct at Mount Pleasant. • “Medium density” can include 8 storey buildings and lots less than 290m² in area. This is fundamentally inappropriate for Mount Pleasant given that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the character and visual amenity of the neighbourhood (low density, well spaced and highly presentable homes of varying design) and view corridors will be compromised - the character of the existing community (quiet, laid-back, family-oriented, prestigious, stable (non-transient)) will be compromised and social issues may arise - traffic congestion and safety in the area is already an issue (especially on Malcomson Street and Mackay-Bucasia Road) and will worsen with increased density. Local roads will not be able to cope with increased traffic, rat running and on-street car parking. Egress from properties will be difficult. - the sewerage and stormwater infrastructure networks are currently inadequate and will worsen with increased density - providing reticulated water to high rises would be difficult and expensive - telecommunications and electricity upgrades would require significant and expensive upgrades - parkland throughout the area is limited and the strategy does not identify new parkland - vacant developable land near the shopping centre is limited, more land is available elsewhere - zero setbacks on side and rear boundaries would result in amenity, overshadowing and privacy issues on neighbouring properties - property values will decrease and rates will increase - high rise development may encroach within/near the flight path. • Some low-medium density throughout the area may be appropriate if developers fund necessary infrastructure upgrades. • The cane farm at the end of Phillip Street could be a good location for higher density development. • Initiatives to increase residential densities in Mount Pleasant and the region generally are supported, given the potential impacts continued low density development will have on the built and natural environments • More footpaths are required in the Mount Pleasant area for an ageing population

Issue description	Summary of issues raised
Overall aims of the strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons justifying the need to increase densities, housing diversity and affordability are sound and the overall aims of the strategy are supported • The principle of encouraging higher densities within/near centres and public transport and walking/cycling tracks is supported
WHAM Regional Plan 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy should reference the hierarchy of centres set out in the non-statutory <i>Whitsunday, Hinterland and Mackay Regional Plan 2006</i> as this regional settlement pattern focuses on achieving compact and self-contained communities and efficient allocation of infrastructure