

Southern Moreton Bay Islands Planning Study

Review of Submissions following Exhibition of the Draft Planning and Land Use Strategy and Recommendations for the Final Strategy

November 1998

Gutteridge Haskins & Davey Pty Ltd

ACN 008 488 373

15 Astor Terrace Brisbane 4000

GPO Box 668 Brisbane Qld 4001 Australia

Telephone: (07) 3258 3600 Facsimile: (07) 3832 4592 Email: bnemail@ghd.com.au

© Gutteridge Haskins & Davey Pty Ltd 2002

This document is and shall remain the property of Gutteridge Haskins & Davey Pty Ltd. The document may only be used for the purposes for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

Document Status					
Rev No.	Author	Reviewer	Approved for Issue		
			Name	Signature	Date
	J Honey	R Swider	J Honey		10/12

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Key Issues and Responses	2
2.1 Individual Land Owners	2
2.2 Interest Groups.....	9
2.3 Government Agencies	13
3. Analysis of Response Sheets.....	16
3.1 General.....	16

Attachments

- 1 Summary of Individual Submissions and Response**
- 2 Summary of Interest Group Submissions and Response**
- 3 Summary of Whole of Government Submissions and Response**

1. Introduction

The draft Southern Moreton Bay Islands Planning and Land Use Strategy was put on public display from 24 August to 9 October 1998. The following material was made available for public viewing:

- the draft strategy document
- the planning report
- background technical reports were made available on request
- maps displaying the main features of the strategy.

Displays were established at Redland Shire Council's Customer Service Centre at Cleveland and on Russell, Macleay and Lamb Islands.

Redland Shire Council established a call centre to manage telephone enquiries from the public. An internet site was also established by Council which enabled visitors to obtain specific information on individual lots and review all background information.

Prior to the public exhibition, Newsletter No. 5 was mailed out to landowners and residents. This newsletter contained a summary of the main aspects of the study, and included a response sheet seeking feedback from the community on how well the draft strategy responded to key issues. Other written feedback on the draft strategy was also invited.

Response

Some 14,000 newsletters were distributed and around 917 responses were received, comprising 765 response sheets (718 [93.8%] of which were useable) and 152 written submissions. This represents a response rate of around 6%, which compares to the response rate of 3.5% for the Redland Shire Strategic Plan.

The call centre received 679 phone enquiries while Council Officers and the Study Team received a further 55 enquiries. Council Officers continue to receive telephone and written enquiries.

Report Structure

The following section of this report (Section 2) presents a distillation of the key issues that were raised in the written submissions from individuals, interest groups and government agencies.

Section 3 presents an analysis of the returned response sheets and key findings.

A summary of all submissions received and response thereto is provided in Attachments 1 - 3.

2. Key Issues and Responses

2.1 Individual Land Owners

This section summarises the *key* issues raised by individual landowners or residents in the written submissions (including the response sheets), together with the Study Team's response to these issues. Where necessary, a recommendation has been made for an amendment to the Strategy or for further follow-up action. A more comprehensive summary of the submissions received and responses is included in Attachment 1.

A number of respondents questioned the basis for determining the relative significance of each of the conservation priority areas.

Response: The conservation priority categories were principally based on the floristic significance of the vegetation polygons in each area. The major exception was those areas of mixed eucalypt forest. Whilst being of low floristic significance, these areas were upgraded to the moderate (medium) conservation priority category on the basis of their significant habitat potential. These areas, particularly at the southern end of Russell Island, represent relatively large (although not undisturbed) tracts of vegetation.

The basis for precluding development from the medium conservation priority areas was questioned, especially in those instances where the terrestrial flora assessment indicated those areas had low conservation significance.

Response: The conservation priority classifications were based on an assimilation of both floristic and faunal significance, as explained above.

The medium conservation areas were precluded from development for a number of area-specific reasons. Those at the southern end of Russell Island were precluded on the following grounds:

- because of their overall conservation significance and potential for regeneration;
- due to the contribution these areas could make to the protection of important freshwater wetlands and intertidal ecosystems at the southern end of Russell Island;
- the acquisition of these areas provides the only real opportunity to significantly alter the future development pattern on the Island and achieve lower ultimate population levels;

- these areas have the lowest overall development density on all the Islands and represent the only areas where there is potential to make significant savings in infrastructure provision; and
- these areas also have high cultural heritage significance which could be protected by precluding further development.

At the northern end of Russell Island, the medium conservation areas have been protected as they will make a significant contribution to the future residential amenity of what is likely to become the most intensively developed area on the Island. They also provide additional buffering between residential development and the natural drainage corridors.

The medium conservation priority areas on Macleay and Lamb Islands were precluded from development since:

- there were no areas of high conservation priority on Macleay Island and only relatively small areas on Lamb Island, and the community was concerned that without protection of the medium conservation categories their Islands would be stripped of much of their natural value;
- all vegetation contributes to the visual landscape and protection of these areas was considered important on this basis; and
- a high proportion of the areas designated medium conservation were on relatively large holdings on which further subdivision was precluded.

Recommendation: The basis for determining land precluded from development be clearly explained in the final Strategy and subsequent advice to landowners.

There has been insufficient base line environmental research to justify the acquisition of hundreds of lots on environmental grounds.

Response: The flora and fauna assessments carried out were comprehensive although not exhaustive. Not every vegetation polygon was separately surveyed and fauna surveys were not carried out over a range of seasons to provide a complete inventory of fauna species. Nonetheless, the level of research was sufficient to clearly indicated the overall value of the Islands' terrestrial and intertidal ecosystems in the context of their setting in the Moreton Bay Marine Park. Any reduction in extent of development would make a positive contribution to protection of the Islands' native habitats, wetland systems and intertidal ecology.

The conservation areas have been based on aerial photography that no longer accurately reflects vegetation cover.

Response: It has always been recognised that the edges of the conservation areas would need to be subject to final survey prior to finalising lots for acquisition.

Recommendation: This should be carried out as part of the Acquisition Strategy.

There is a strong feeling from landowners whose land has been identified for acquisition that the strategy is inequitable, that they alone are being burdened with the responsibility of delivering a sustainable development strategy for the Islands. The strategy leaves no where for these people to move.

Response: The impact on some landowners of this strategy is recognised. It should be noted that until the strategy is formally adopted, all these landowners within the conservation priority areas are able to lodge development and building applications which will be assessed on the current planning requirements. It is considered that a fair acquisition price should be paid for their lots that reflects market value prior to the impact of the study. Further actions in relation to this issue are beyond the terms of reference for this study.

A social equity package should be prepared for those landowners where land is to be acquired that better reflects the investment made and their monetary contribution to the funding of development in Redland Shire.

The Study Team recognises that there will be people financially affected as a result of this strategy. While this could be regarded as the risk associated with investing in property, many landowners have paid a substantial amount of rates based on there being a future capability for residential development. As this capability would be negated if this strategy is adopted, it has been argued that the acquisition price should reflect rates paid.

Recommendation: Further consideration will need to be given to the basis for determining acquisition values, however this is beyond the scope of this study and would be addressed in the final Acquisition Strategy.

Council should place a moratorium on the payment of rates for those lots on which acquisition is proposed, until a final decision on the strategies is made.

Response: This issue was raised in many submissions and warrants further consideration by Council.

Recommendation: This issue be referred to Council for further consideration.

Acquisitions, if they are to occur, should occur swiftly and reflect realistic land values that have not been reduced by the impact of the Study.

Response: Acquisitions would need to be subject to funding and would be prioritised.

Recommendation: This issue would be addressed in the final Acquisition Strategy.

Russell Island's development will be curtailed without a bridge.

Response: The draft strategy recognises the need to reduce development potential on the Island to reflect the Island vision and achieve sustainability. For this reason, a bridge to Russell Island is not considered appropriate as it would ultimately lead to the suburbanisation of the Island.

There needs to be action by Council to limit the trading of land to purchasers who are not aware of the possible implications of the strategy.

Response: The strategy implications have been disseminated through all relevant sections of Council so that potential purchasers can obtain the latest information on development potential.

A decision needs to be made on what will happen to those lots only partially affected by the acquisition area.

Response: This appears to apply mainly to lots on the edge of conservation areas or large lots of which only a portion is affected by the designation. It is suggested that provided 450 square metres of land is available for building and that vegetated areas will not be disturbed, development should be permitted on lots partially within an acquisition/conservation area.

Recommendation: This would be resolved as part of the final Acquisition Strategy.

There is concern over the use the acquired land would be put to and whether or not the cost of managing this land has been included in the overall costs of the strategy.

Response: The acquired land in the conservation areas would be zoned for conservation and this will need to be clearly articulated in the Acquisition Strategy. The cost of managing this land has not been included in the costings but should be considered as part of the implementation strategy when identifying acquisition priorities.

Recommendation: Council should consider cost of management during preparation of implementation strategy.

Aboriginal cultural heritage issues cannot provide the basis for preventing development on freehold title.

Response: No areas have been precluded from development based on cultural heritage significance. Rather, protection of conservation areas for ecological reasons has the added benefit in many instances of also protecting areas assessed as having highest cultural heritage value.

The acquisition areas include lots which have existing dwellings or other buildings. Is it the intention to acquire these?

Response: It is not the intention of the strategy to acquire lots with existing dwellings or current Building Approvals.

Recommendation: Lots with existing buildings or with current building approvals should be precluded from the conservation areas and not required for acquisition. Final acquisition plans should be adjusted to preclude lots with dwellings and current BAs.

The strategy does not go far enough in terms of economic development of the Islands based on the tourism industry.

Response: Provision is made for appropriate types of tourism development. Tourism would in fact be welcomed provided it focuses on the natural attributes of the Islands and is consistent with the Island vision.

The strategy should do more to encourage amalgamation of lots to reduce levels of development on all Islands.

Response: The Strategy suggests the need for limited incentives for amalgamation to be provided by Council. These need to be articulated and strategies put in place to encourage landowners to take advantage of them.

Recommendation: Council develop a range of incentives to promote lot amalgamations (waiving of rates, valuation advice, etc.,) and promote these measures.

Strategy fails to give adequate consideration of alternative effluent disposal options. Cheaper alternatives to the introduction of reticulated sewerage are available and should be considered.

Response: Alternative technologies are available and should be encouraged in those catchments which exceed the septic tank sustainability threshold. However such systems can be expensive (composting toilets ranging from \$2,000 - \$6,000) and there is still a need to treat grey water. Given socio-economic characteristics of the population and ultimate levels of development, reticulated sewerage which collects and properly treats all effluent is preferred in this sensitive environment.

However, the Strategy does provide the opportunity for alternative treatment technologies in those catchments which exceed septic sustainability threshold until sewerage is provided.

The strategy does not include sufficient measures to conserve water usage and therefore effluent generation.

Response: While the strategy includes measures to reduce stormwater runoff (such as use of rainwater tanks and absorption areas) measures should also be incorporated to encourage reduced water consumption. This could include low pressure shower roses, dual flush toilets etc. This would also lead to reduced effluent generation and reduce overloading of absorption trenches.

Recommendation: Amend strategy to include need to encourage existing residents to adopt measures to reduce water consumption, and to require new dwellings to install water conservation fixtures.

Alternative strategies to the acquisition of conservation areas should have been given further consideration.

Response: Alternatives such as increasing minimum lot sizes and subdivision restructuring were examined but assessed as being impractical at the scale required to achieve any real impact.

Even with all the acquisitions, the development capacity of the Islands is too high to deliver sustainable development.

Response: The strategy delivers an overall reduction of 21% of the current potentially developable lots on the Islands, and establishes once and for all that they are not intended to be developed as typical suburbs. This anticipated reduction in ultimate population, together with the strategies to manage stormwater quality, vegetation protection, sewage effluent and private vehicle usage, will contribute to the sustainability of development on the Islands. Performance of the strategy in terms of environmental management would, however, be further enhanced if additional reductions in developable lots could be achieved through voluntary amalgamations.

The preferred land use strategy fails to depict adequate sites for major playing fields and community facilities such as schools.

Response: These would be identified during preparation of the DCP. The strategy recognises the desirability of retaining the secondary school site on Russell Island, however this is contrary to Department of Education Policy.

Recommendation: Amend strategy to reflect need to maintain Department of Education site in public ownership for possible future community uses.

Designation of DP categories even on lots with existing dwellings will have a negative affect on land values. It should be removed once lots have had a building constructed on them.

Response: The designation is a reflection of the true development potential of the lot. It will flag to potential purchasers any risks associated with development on the lot. On lots with existing buildings, it will prevent extensions and outbuildings from being inappropriately erected on the site.

There are a number of lots, in which owners dispute the suggested DP category.

Response: DP categories were based on available contour mapping and field checking. Some lots may be marginal and those lots of respondents disputing classification should be reviewed.

Recommendation: Lots on which the DP classification is disputed should be inspected by Council and the classification verified as part of the statutory plan preparation (implementation phase of the strategy).

How can a water-based transport system be justified without a detailed environmental study.

Response: The water-based transport system was considered by the Study Team and DoE to be preferable to a bridge connection to the Islands. The amount of ferry traffic compared to the amount of recreational boating is relatively small, although it is recognised in the strategy the need for environmental impacts to be monitored and, if necessary, management strategies put in place.

2.2 Interest Groups

This section provides a summary of the key issues raised from Interest Groups and the Study Team's response to these. Further details of the submissions and responses are provided in Attachment 2.

Macleay Island Conservation Group

Lots in DP Categories 2, 4 and 6 should be acquired if in the low conservation priority area.

Response: Lots in DP Category 2 are potentially suitable for development. There is no basis for acquiring these lots, as any dwellings would be required to be above Q100 and vegetation protection would be required.

The majority of lots in DP Category 4 would ultimately be acquired to facilitate management, although this would not be a short term priority.

Lots in DP Category 6 would be expensive to acquire and some may be potentially developable, subject to detailed survey. Opportunity for landowners to purchase these lots and amalgamate with adjoining lots should be provided. However, the strategy does recommend that any of these lots that become available should be purchased by Council for Open Space.

Because of the limited areas identified for protection on Macleay Island, the conservation priority areas should be further upgraded and development precluded from areas of low conservation priority. Also, lots with known trees providing nesting sites for the Glossy Black Cockatoo should be protected from development.

Response: The benefits of precluding development from areas of low conservation priority could, to an extent, be achieved through the proposed vegetation protection measures. However, lots with nesting trees should be identified and an assessment made of whether or not acquisition would be required in order to protect trees.

Recommendation: That lots with nesting trees be identified during preparation of the statutory plan and an assessment made of whether or not they should be acquired.

Lots in DP Category 7 should be acquired.

Response: These lots would be among the most expensive on the Islands, and would be generally suitable for development. Sufficient controls are envisaged to reduce the impact of development on the foreshores and there would be minimal cost/benefit in acquiring these lots.

Precinct 5E on Macleay Island should be upgraded to medium conservation priority and protected.

Response: A significant proportion of this parcel has been precluded from development. Given the low conservation priority status of this precinct, together with its central location and proximity to Thompsons Point, it is considered that some tourism related uses in a landscaped setting would be appropriate.

All undeveloped foreshore lots with mangroves on Macleay Island should be acquired and reclassified as high or very high conservation priority areas.

Response: The strategy provides protection for all lands below RL 2.4 m. Other mechanisms are available for managing foreshores that do not require acquisition.

The number of developable lots should be reduced by not extending sewerage to DP lots.

Response: It is not intended to sewer DP lots which are not suitable for development. Lots in DP categories on which development will be considered, would, eventually be sewered to eliminate risk of effluent surcharging.

Wildlife Preservation Society

Preclude development from areas of low conservation priority where they form buffers to conservation areas or for visual amenity.

Response: It is considered that sufficient measures have been proposed to deliver sustainable development on the Islands and that acquisition of additional low conservation priority areas is not essential. Vegetation protection measures are also included to help maintain the visual landscape.

Queensland Conservation Council

Impacts of resident and visitor populations both on and off the Islands should be addressed.

Response: On and off Island impacts were addressed particularly in relation to the transport strategy. A detailed assessment of the social/economic impact of Islands development on the mainland was beyond the scope of this study.

Development levels are still well in excess of those anticipated in the Moreton Bay Strategic Plan. There are a number of ways to further reduce lot numbers:

- **exclude tourist resorts**

- **increase Residential A lot sizes to 2000 m² where on-site effluent disposal is involved**
- **retain a higher proportion of terrestrial vegetation**
- **develop effluent disposal rules that restrict number of occupants to ecologically sustainable levels.**

Response: The Moreton Bay Strategic Plan raised the concept of sustainable population levels on the Islands. There are inherent problems associated with this approach as documented in the Strategy. The approach adopted was to identify in the Strategy those attributes of the natural environment most at risk from development, together with indicators of environmental stress, and to put in place appropriate measures to protect those attributes.

All the suggested measures to reduce development density were examined.

Strategy needs to introduce water conservation measures.

Response: This suggestion is supported particularly in view of the current on-site effluent disposal systems.

Recommendation: Include requirement for water conservation measures in Water Management Strategy.

Stormwater strategy is rudimentary and would not satisfy the requirements of Water EPP Section 36, 40-43.

Response: This is not a greenfield situation and the stormwater strategy needs to be retrofitted into an existing subdivision pattern wherever practicable. The strategy has been prepared with input from the DEH. Further refinement of the strategy (eg. to determine need and size of detention basins) would be required as part of the statutory plan preparation.

Study is inconsistent with the Moreton Bay Marine Park Plan by proposing development for Lamb Island that does not take into account the dugong habitat area east of the Island.

Response: All development on all the Islands must be consistent with the Island Vision and environmental setting. Residential and low key tourism (eco-tourism) uses only are envisaged on Lamb Island which, with the recommended environmental management measures, is not likely to significantly impact on the dugong habitat.

No reference is made to solid waste disposal.

Response: Waste disposal is addressed in the planning study. The recommendations of the Redland Waste Management Study (1994) should be carried forward into the Strategy.

Recommendation: Include relevant recommendations from the Redland Waste Management Study (1994) in the Infrastructure Strategy.

Oppose proposed resort site in central Macleay Island.

Response: Strategy recognises the sensitivity of Perulpa Bay and suggests the type of land uses in this precinct should be low key visitors accommodation, aged persons accommodation or recreational uses. The designation on the land use plan does perhaps imply a scale of use not intended.

Recommendation: Change designation on land use plan to reflect the lower key nature of uses intended.

RSC and DCILGP should withdraw rezoning approval where uncommenced land uses do not match contemporary planning and environmental requirements.

Response: This comment seems to indicate lack of understanding of the current situation on the Islands, or the cost implications associated with completely restructuring the Islands' subdivision pattern.

An addendum be released explaining the basis for determining conservation priority areas.

Response: Further clarification is required on both the basis of determining conservation priority areas and for determining acquisition areas.

Recommendation: An information sheet be distributed to all respondents providing clarification on these issues.

Cost of acquisitions should be met by remaining land owners.

Response: There are equity concerns in relation to this suggestion.

Council should develop vegetation protection and animal control laws for the Islands.

Response: Vegetation protection measures are included in the Strategy. The issue of animal controls needs to be further investigated as part of the statutory plan preparation.

2.3 Government Agencies

This section provides a summary of the key issues raised by government agencies, along with the Study Teams response. Further details of these agency submissions and both the Study Teams and Steering Committee's response to them are provided in Attachment 3.

Department of Education

Education servicing on the Islands should be minimalist in line with the preferred growth rate.

Response: Strategy recommends that school enrolments continue to be monitored and a site for an alternative secondary school on Russell Island be identified in case of future need. The Department indicated that it is not Departmental policy to retain sites that are not likely to be required in the 15 year planning horizon. The existing site on Russell Island is therefore likely to be sold unless the State Government can be persuaded to retain it for possible future community uses.

Recommendation: Council liaise with the Department of Education regarding the desirability of keeping the site in public ownership and possible mechanisms for ensuring this.

Department of Environment and Heritage

The strategy is deficient in its failure to address the need for water conservation and sewerage treatment options and timing of sewerage infrastructure. DEH also state that land disposal options of treated effluent are preferable to those involving discharging to the Marine Park.

Response: Measures to conserve water usage should be included in the strategy. These should include voluntary measures for existing residents and mandatory requirements for new dwellings, such as low pressure shower roses.

The strategy identifies which catchments should be prioritised for sewerage and measures that should be adopted to manage effluent disposal in catchments which reach the sustainable threshold. The strategy identifies the need for ongoing studies to determine and evaluate all options for the introduction of reticulated sewerage.

Recommendation: Include measures in the Water Management Strategy in relation to the conservation of water.

Any management strategy for cultural heritage should include a requirement that a permit be sought from the Department before destruction or damage to any place of Aboriginal significance under the Cultural Record Act.

Response: Whilst recognising the requirements of the Act, the approach adopted in the study requires consultation and negotiation between landowners and Quandamooka which is considered a less threatening approach to cultural heritage issues.

Water based transport routes will require maintenance dredging. A detailed strategy for dredging and disposal of dredged material will be required.

Response: QT is responsible for maintenance dredging of navigable channels. No dredging is anticipated at Council's existing or possible jetty sites as facilities will be designed to provide deep water access. This issue would be further investigated with any proposals for new marine facilities on the Islands.

The strategy needs to address the need for marine boating facilities on the Islands and the need for community jetty facilities to discourage illegal private facilities.

Response: Strategy recognises need for additional marine facilities and has notionally identified sites for further investigation around Russell, Macleay and Lamb Islands.

Department of Youth & Community Care

The strategy has not given adequate consideration to exploring potential community development opportunities arising from projects undertaken by Council's Cultural and Community Development Branch.

Response: The strategy was prepared with input from Council's Cultural and Community Development Program. However, if there is additional information or recommendations the Program could provide, these should be incorporated into the strategy.

Recommendation: Liaise with Cultural and Community Development Program to identify additional community development opportunities to incorporate in the Human Services and Community Development Strategy.

Department of Primary Industries

DPI support protection of medium conservation priority areas to ensure protection of freshwater wetlands and as a buffer to intertidal wetlands.

Response: The basis for precluding development from medium conservation areas was not only to buffer these wetlands but to reduce infrastructure costs, population levels and protect terrestrial habitat areas.

Additional areas are likely to be required outside conservation priority areas for the location of stormwater management devices.

Response: Provision has been made at a broad scale for the acquisition of additional land (32 lots in total) to accommodate stormwater treatment devices. In most catchments, there will be sufficient Council owned land or unused road reserve outside conservation areas for these devices to be located. However, a more detailed catchment by catchment assessment would be required as part of the implementation strategy.

Proposal to have cleared buffers to reduce midge control is at odds with use of vegetated buffers to protect adjacent conservation areas.

Response: The intent of the buffer was to break vegetation cover between the foreshore and inland areas. However buffers would have to be 100-200 metres wide to be effective and this is not considered practical on the Islands.

Recommendation: Requirement for buffers should be deleted from the strategy.

DNR emphasises the importance of providing buffers between development and wetlands to treat stormwater runoff.

Response: Buffers have been provided wherever practicable by retention of very high, high and medium conservation priority areas. Additional buffers are not envisaged although natural drainage lines will be protected and stormwater treatment measures will be provided in each catchment.

Development will in general be precluded below RL 2.4 metres which will provide additional buffering along the foreshore.

3. Analysis of Response Sheets

3.1 General

Response sheets distributed with Newsletter No. 5 sought the community's feedback on the proposed strategies to address the key planning and environmental management issues confronting the Islands, and how well the overall strategy achieved the agreed Island Vision. While the format of the response sheets did not readily lend itself to rigorous statistical analysis, it did serve as a 'barometer' as to how the strategies were being received. It also provided a vehicle through which respondents could provide further comment in relation to each of the strategies.

The overall response rate was lower than anticipated and certainly much lower than the initial levels of feedback at the beginning of the planning process. However, the rate was comparable to the feedback received from the earlier response sheets distributed with Newsletter No. 4 and may suggest one of the following:

- there is overall broad acceptance of the direction of the strategy by the general community;
- the majority of landowners are ambivalent about the process and do not believe it will have any impact on them;
- many newsletters are not being received.

The response sheet feedback received was overall quite positive, indicating broad support for the proposed measures to address the planning and environmental management issues on the Islands. Response sheet feedback is summarised below.

Summary of Responses

The proportion of responses to each of the questions is presented in the following discussion. It was suggested in one or two of the submissions received that those questions for which three alternative responses were provided (*very well*, *reasonably* and *not well*), that the 'reasonably' response was not truly neutral, and they are therefore biased. For this reason, and due to the relatively small sample size, the findings need to be treated with some degree of caution and do not enable statistically robust conclusions to be drawn on the level of support, or dissatisfaction, with each strategy. Nonetheless, the figures do enable the following observations to be made.

Island Vision

Feedback suggests that a majority of the respondents considered the draft Strategy would achieve the agreed vision.

Of responses to this question:

- 40.1% indicated the draft Strategy achieved the Island vision *very well*.
- 42.9% indicated draft Strategy achieved vision *reasonably*.
- 16.9% indicated draft Strategy did *not* adequately address vision.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	37%	44.5%	18.4%
<i>Macleay</i>	45.4%	39.1%	15.5%
<i>Lamb</i>	45.2%	51.6%	3.2%
<i>Karragarra</i>	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%

The main reasons for dissatisfaction were as follows:

- poor access to mainland;
- study was biased;
- insufficient information provided; and
- acquisitions inequitable.

Ecological Sustainability

Feedback suggests that a majority of respondents considered that the draft Strategy would achieve an appropriate balance between the environmental, economic and social processes needed to ensure ecological sustainability

Of the responses to this question:

- 41.2% indicated the draft Strategy achieved ecological sustainability *very well*.
- 44.1% indicated sustainability achieved *reasonably*.
- 14.1% indicated draft Strategy did *not* achieve sustainability.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	40.5%	43.6%	15.8%
<i>Macleay</i>	42.2%	47.1%	10.6%
<i>Lamb</i>	46.7%	46.7%	6.7%
<i>Karragarra</i>	33.3%	38.9%	27.8%

The main reasons for dissatisfaction were as follows:

- study bias;
- lack of protection for flora and fauna; and
- lack of information provided.

Drainage Problem Lands

The analysis indicates that the majority of respondents considered that the draft Strategy would resolve the long term drainage and flooding issues on the Islands.

Of the responses to this question:

- 47.1% indicated draft Strategy resolved drainage issues *very well*.
- 38.0% indicated drainage issues were resolved *reasonably*.
- 14.9% indicated drainage issues were *not well* resolved.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	46.8%	37.6%	15.6%
<i>Macleay</i>	47.5%	36.9%	15.6%
<i>Lamb</i>	45.2%	51.6%	3.2%
<i>Karragarra</i>	52.9%	35.3%	11.8%

Environmental Conservation

Protection of Natural Attributes

The analysis suggests that the majority of respondents considered that the draft Strategy would ensure the protection of the Island's natural attributes.

Of the responses to this question:

- 44.9% indicated the draft Strategy ensured the protection of natural attributes *very well*.
- 41.2% indicated it ensured the protection *reasonably*.
- 14.9% indicated the draft Strategy did not adequately ensure the protection of natural attributes.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	46.8%	39.8%	13.4%
<i>Macleay</i>	40.3%	43.7%	16%
<i>Lamb</i>	51.4%	42.9%	5.7%
<i>Karragarra</i>	38.9%	44.5%	16.6%

Achievement of Balance Between Development and Protection

The analysis suggests that a large number of respondents considered that the draft Strategy would only achieve a reasonable balance between levels of development and environmental protection.

Of the responses to this question:

- 35.9% indicated the draft Strategy achieved a balance between development and environmental protection *very well*.
- 45.6% indicated it achieved a *reasonable* balance.
- 18.5% indicated the draft Strategy did not adequately ensure a balance between development and environmental protection.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	36.9%	43.3%	19.8%
<i>Macleay</i>	33.3%	51.2%	15.5%
<i>Lamb</i>	40.0%	51.4%	8.6%
<i>Karragarra</i>	33.3%	27.8%	38.9

The main reasons for dissatisfaction were as follows:

- lack of protection for flora and fauna on Lamb and Macleay;
- development on Russell limited without better mainland access; and
- lack of information provided.

Development

Appropriate Range of Land Uses

The majority of respondents indicated that the range of land uses provided was appropriate to their Island. A significant number of respondents from Russell indicated that there should be greater levels of development than provided for. A slightly lower proportion from Macleay and Karragarra considered there was too much development proposed.

Of the responses to this question:

- 71.7% indicated draft Strategy provided an appropriate range of land uses.
- 28.3% indicated draft Strategy did not provide an appropriate range of uses.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Russell</i>	69.6%	30.4%
<i>Macleay</i>	74.1%	25.9%
<i>Lamb</i>	82.9%	17.1%
<i>Karragarra</i>	72.7%	27.8%

The main reasons for dissatisfaction were as follows:

- insufficient levels of development; and
- insufficient information.

Land Use Consistency with Island Lifestyle and Vision

A similar proportion of respondents considered that the range of land uses was consistent with the Island lifestyle and vision.

Of the responses to this question:

- 70.8% indicated that the range of land uses was consistent; and
- 29.2% indicated the ranged of land uses was not consistent.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Russell</i>	68.6%	31.4%
<i>Macleay</i>	73.9%	26.1%
<i>Lamb</i>	76.4%	23.6%
<i>Karragarra</i>	77.8%	22.2%

The main reasons for dissatisfaction were as follows:

- insufficient levels of development on Russell; and
- excessive levels of development on Macleay and Lamb.

Water management

The analysis indicates there is strong support for the range of measures proposed in the draft Strategy for the measures to manage the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff.

Of the responses to this question:

- 85.1% indicated support for the range of stormwater protection measures.
- 14.9% indicated they did not support the range of measures.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Russell</i>	84.5%	15.4%
<i>Macleay</i>	84.9%	15.1%
<i>Lamb</i>	96.7%	3.3%
<i>Karragarra</i>	77.8%	22.2%

Infrastructure

Standards of Roads

The analysis suggests there is mixed feelings in relation to the proposed standards of roads in the draft Strategy, although it appears the majority seemingly consider it has been reasonably addressed overall.

Of responses to this question:

- 37.4% indicated the draft Strategy addressed the issue of road standards *very well*.
- 46.8% indicated road standards were addressed *reasonably*.
- 15.8% indicated roads standards were *not* adequately addressed.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	34.9%	48.3%	17.8%
<i>Macleay</i>	42.6%	43.2%	14.2%
<i>Lamb</i>	28.1%	59.3%	12.5%
<i>Karragarra</i>	61.1%	22.2%	16.7%

The main reason for dissatisfaction related to the proposed road widths and construction standards.

Effluent Treatment and Disposal

The analysis suggests there are also mixed feelings in relation to the proposal to eventually introduce reticulated sewerage to the Islands, although again it appears that the majority of respondents consider this issue has been adequately addressed.

Of responses to this question:

- 34% indicated the draft Strategy addressed the issue of effluent treatment and disposal *very well*.
- 46.9% indicated the issue was addressed *reasonably*.
- 19.1% indicated the issue was *not* adequately addressed.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	32.8%	49.3%	17.9%
<i>Macleay</i>	36.1%	42.4%	21.5%
<i>Lamb</i>	32.3%	48.4%	19.3%
<i>Karragarra</i>	41.2%	41.2%	17.6%

Transport

Overall, the respondents indicated that the transport strategy was consistent with the Island lifestyle and vision.

Of the responses to this question:

- 64.4% indicated draft Transport Strategy *was* consistent with vision.
- 35.6% indicated draft Strategy *was not* consistent.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Russell</i>	55.6%	44.3%
<i>Macleay</i>	78.4%	21.5%
<i>Lamb</i>	75.7%	24.3%
<i>Karragarra</i>	88.9%	11.1%

Access to the mainland was the major concern of those not endorsing the transport strategy, this being mentioned by some 35% of overall respondents.

Economic Development

The majority of respondents indicated that the economic development strategy provided an appropriate range of opportunities for employment generating uses.

Of the responses to this question:

- 56.6% indicated the draft Strategy provided an appropriate range of opportunities;
- 43.4% indicated the draft Strategy did not provide an appropriate range of opportunities.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Russell</i>	51.3%	48.7%
<i>Macleay</i>	64.1%	35.8%
<i>Lamb</i>	71%	29%
<i>Karragarra</i>	70.6%	25.4%

The main reason for dissatisfaction for Russell Island respondents was related to poor accessibility to the mainland.

Cultural Heritage

The analysis suggests that there was some uncertainty over the performance of the cultural heritage strategies in terms of their ability to protect and manage the Islands' indigenous and non indigenous cultural heritage.

Of responses to this question:

- 39.2% indicated the draft Strategy addressed this issue *very well*.
- 49.4% indicated the issue was addressed *reasonably*.
- 11.2% indicated the issue was *not* adequately addressed.

The breakdown by Island was as follows:

	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Reasonably</i>	<i>Not Well</i>
<i>Russell</i>	39.3%	50%	10.7%
<i>Macleay</i>	41.4%	46%	12.6%
<i>Lamb</i>	31.3%	56.3%	12.4%
<i>Karragarra</i>	26.7%	66.7%	6.6%

Other Issues Raised

Table 1 overleaf lists the issues and the number of times they were raised following an analysis of the response sheets. Island access (improved access to the mainland and support for a bridge to Russell Island) and the need for further information were the two issues most frequently raised.

Table 1
Response Sheet Comment Categories

Comment Category	Number of Responses
Acquisition	121
Compensation	35
Employment	65
Flora/Fauna Protection	126
Housing Construction	1
Island Access	378
Less Development	127
More Development	145
More Information	256
More Parks	54
Private/Public Transport	45
Rates	44
Road Width/Construction	149
Runoff	113
Sewerage	152
Study Bias	156
Tourism/Attracting Tourists	58

Table 2 overleaf provides a similar list of issues raised in the written submissions. Requests for a moratorium on rates and questions in relation to the conservation categories were the issues most frequently raised.

Table 2
Submission Comment Categories

Comment Category	Number
Aboriginal Heritage cannot provide the basis for preventing development	2
Acquisition should occur swiftly	7
Alternative approaches to Private Transport on the Islands	3
Alternatives to the acquisition of Conservation Areas	1
Below RL 2.4 should become State Owned Land	2
Conservation Areas based on out-dated Aerial Photography	3
Conservation Areas upgraded on Macleay Island	3
Conservation Priority Disputed	29
Controls on Cats and Dogs on the Islands	2
Costs of managing acquired land not fully understood	2
Development envisaged is too high to achieve sustainable development	5
DP category disputed	23
DP designation removed once lots are built on	2
Encourage Amalgamation of Lots	6
Fails to deliver alternative Effluent Disposal Options	11
Allow farming	1
Increase Economic Development based on the Tourist industry	3
Increase Public Transport	3
Increased protection of Flora and Fauna	6
Insufficient data to acquire lots on Environmental Grounds	13
Limit purchases of land from buyers not aware of the Study's implications	1
Lots partially affected by Acquisition	10
Lots with existing dwellings to be Acquired	9
Basis for Medium Conservation	17
Moratorium on the payment of Rates	36
More Boat Ramps for local use	5
Mosquito and Midge Control	3
Insufficient measures to conserve Water Usage	10
Perulpa Island is a separate entity	1
Quick Implementation of Strategy	8
Road Width and Construction	3
Russell Island Economic Development will not occur without a Bridge	8
Schools and Community Facilities	3
Self Sufficient Development Zone	3
Separate Bay Islands Council/Member	2
Social Equity (Acquisition Price)	20
State Govt. and RSC are driving land values down, but rates are increasing	5
Still acquire if landowners would not disturb vegetation?	3
Strategy is inequitable	18
Stricter Controls on Slashing	3
Study Bias	13
Water-based transport justified without Environmental Study	2
Wishing to sell although not subject to acquisition	4

Attachment 1

Summary of Individual Submissions and Response

Respondent 2
Location or Property Description

B Kew 1/48 Miami Shore Pde, Miami Qld 4220
Lot 157, Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Objects to the resumption of Lot 157 or 17 Muraba Road to the Council. Reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prior to draft Strategy Redland Shire Council informed respondent that Lot 157 was not affected by water drainage.• Compensation will not be that of the lot's true value. The block overlooks a wide expanse of water and will be worth a lot of money in the future. On 12/7/97 the unimproved capital valuation of the lot was \$6500, on 28/7/98 it was reduced to \$2600, he finds suspicious. Rates are almost \$1000 annually and compensation would not take into account all the variables like interest paid on the money borrowed.• Respondent also owns adjacent lot. They were both bought with the dream that he and his wife would retire on one and his son on the other.	<p>Noted. Study found lot was not in a DP category area.</p> <p>Valuations were completed prior to the release of the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. If adjacent lot is not affected by drainage, owners should be advised to amalgamate to attain a substantial building site for a substantial residence.</p>

Respondent 3
Location or Property Description

K and C Hausson, 111 Empire Ave Manly West Qld. 4179
Lot 64 RP122870, Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Newsletter no. 5 p3: "Development would be precluded from all lots currently zoned Drainage Problem, apart from 23 which are subject to further assessment. Is respondents lot one of these 23?"</p>	<p>Subject lot is zoned Residential A and is not a DP lot.</p>

Respondent 4

FW & SE Oudyn, 82 Highbury Dr. Redbank Plains Qld. 4301

Location or Property Description

Lot 94 in RP130510, Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Adequate compensation for the re-acquisition of the lot. Points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valuation reduced from \$12,000 in 1991 to \$1500 at present, but rates have increased from \$588.50 in 1991 even though there has been no changes to services. • Will the independent auditor take into account the numerous years of rates that have been paid. • Council changed its structural view of the islands between purchase and present, which entitles landowners to full compensation of purchase price plus rates paid (adequate compensation). • Does the Council still expect to receive rates even though land owners of property marked conservation cannot sell it or build on it. If yes, than respondents would like a full explanation on the benefit of paying rates for the landowners. • Loss of their dream 	<p>Noted. Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>The issue of rate deferment or reimbursement has been raised with Council staff.</p>

Respondent 5

V Marsh, 73 Waikiki Rd. Bonnells Bay, NSW 2264.

Location or Property Description

Pookanah Street, Locality 8, Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Concern over the compensation for the re-acquisition of the lot. At the very least expects to be paid the equivalent of the purchase price plus the rates and levies the respondent has paid over the 25 years of ownership.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 6

S. Apperley, 26 Park Rd, Rondebosch, Cape Town, South Africa, 7700.

Location or Property Description

Lot 193 in RP133221, Russell Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot has been declared unfit for development and the respondent was not informed. The respondent has owned the lot since 1989 and has dutifully paid rates and taxes (about \$7000 total over the years) on it on a valuation of \$65000. Unsure how the lot could be valued at so much if unfit for development.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot is DP category 6.</p>

Respondent 7 B Duiker 49 Halcyon St. Lamb Island 4184
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Transport Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Islands, especially the smaller ones - golf buggies and motorised bikes to save on road maintenance, stop speeding and to save money on registration. • A special compartment for holding shopping other than the front of B.I.T.S. Boat. • A car roundabout and setdown facility at the marina to make it easier for people to load and unload shopping from the car to the boat. At present it is crowded and not very user friendly. • Better Signage of setdown area. 	<p>Noted. Transport Strategy aims to reduce traffic on roads. The Strategy however cannot prescribe the type of vehicles used.</p>

Respondent 8 G. Emery, P.O. Box 5583 Albany W.A. 6330.
Location or Property Description Lot 160P1 in RP117590

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Extremely agitated as to the lack of communication regarding the fact that his lot will be acquired for conservation. He was told that there would be no compensation for the ten years paid rates and levies. Accuses organisation of being thieves and ripping off his investment. The respondent intends to carry the dispute as far as he can with the personal rights commission.</p>	<p>Noted. Owner should be advised of basis for designations and that building approvals would be assessed on current requirements if and when strategy is adopted.</p>

Respondent 9 MK Courtenay, 65 Randall Rd, Wynnum West 4178
Location or Property Description Lot 94 on RP126539 Macleay Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Over the past 15 years of ownership the lot's value has decreased whilst the rates have increased. Purchased with initial intention to build, but can't now due to health reasons. Lot is on the edge of the land being considered for acquisition. Respondent would like Council to purchase his land as it would ideal for parkland.</p>	<p>Noted. Issue of voluntary sale of lots to be addressed as part of the Acquisition Strategy.</p>

Respondent 10

P Long and O Guiller, Newlock Superannuation Fund, PO Box 784 Toowong Qld 4066.

Location or Property Description

Lot 55 Glendale St, Russell Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot was zoned Residential A until about ten years ago when it was re-zoned Drainage Problems. Respondent is still corresponding with Council to have the lot re-zoned Res. A.</p> <p>In respect to the Newsletter No 5, p3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the respondents lot one of the 23, and if so, when will the assessment be completed. • When is the new plan likely to commence. • If Building Applications are still being considered on Drainage Problem land are they still being considered subject to normal building requirements for such land, and if so, for about how long. 	<p>Lot is in DP category 4.</p> <p>Owner should be advised of basis for designations and that building approvals would be assessed on current requirements if and when strategy is adopted.</p>

Respondent 11

R Lithgow 5/21 Felix Crs, Torquay Vic. 3228.

Location or Property Description

Lot 94 on RP126539 Macleay Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The Study focuses on the minors and fails to mention the overriding concerns of the Bay Island Stakeholders.</p> <p>The Study is very “greenie” in its outlook:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater and erosion have been occurring since time began so why start worrying about it now. • Future sea-level rises are hypothetical. <p>Revenue from rates are not being put back into the islands. Over the last ten years \$57 Million in rates have been acquired by the Council from the Island landowners and only 2-3 Million have been spent on them. Stakeholders are angry.</p> <p>Rates are too high. They are the second highest after the Gold Coast and they don’t reflect the lot’s real value.</p> <p>Non-resident landowners should have voting rights, like every other Shire.</p> <p>Because of the history of dis-interest in the Islands by the mainland Council it seems appropriate that the Study should highlight the interest of the stakeholders in a separate Bay Islands Council.</p>	<p>Noted. Study is based on achieving sustainable levels of development on the islands.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Respondent 12
Location or Property Description

L Martyn Roctangle, Highland Ridge Rd, Russell Island 4184
 Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Recommendations for the Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed recommendations on land clearing controls especially considering the revenue that is gathered from the Island ratepayers through the environmental levy. • Reasons for DNR devaluing land by 50% or more. Respondent expressed a link between this and the study’s recommended resumptions. • Study recognises the original sub-divisions, but not the amount of money paid over time by landowners, for very little in return by way of improvements. • How, why, where and when ferries will operate and the cost. • Possible cable ferry at the southern end of Russell Island instead of a bridge or other alternatives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail the encouraged amalgamation of blocks, how much people are expected to pay. • Ultimate population or block numbers are too high for the spirit of the Study. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Where to go from here” - Mention the communities views that Council has not shown care, mismanaged funding and land scams are still occurring. • Quicker achievement of a funding package. • Need a larger feedback from ratepayers, 3000 of 14500 is not much. “Contact each ratepayer” • Look at the alternative of low population and low block numbers, less than scenario 1. A toll bridge would increase property values to their real worth. • The Study talks of roads, but not jetty’s, carparks and other facilities. • If funding is approved, who should administer it? • Study is too Council friendly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The islanders don’t have much voting power. 	<p>Noted. These will be included in the DCP.</p> <p>Noted. Valuations took place prior to the Study findings.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Current operations will provide the basis for future ferry services.</p> <p>Noted. This option is considered to be a prelude to a bridge to be built and has been discounted. It is not consistent with the Integrated Regional Transport Plan.</p> <p>Incentives are mentioned in Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. This level of development is considered sustainable providing appropriate environmental management measures are in place. The outcome would be enhanced if further lot amalgamations took place voluntarily.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Landowner were contacted by mail 3 times.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. These are addressed in the Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Fund would be administrated by Council.</p> <p>Noted. The Council represents the broader community and it is not surprising that the Study’s findings and Council’s views are more aligned than the views of the island landholders.</p> <p>Noted</p>

Respondent 13 VS Williscroft, 14 Citron St, Macleay Island 4184
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Maintain the area to be more suited to retirees and pensioners	Noted.

Respondent 14 HE Waring, 66 Point O'Halloran Rd, Victoria Point, Qld 4165.
Location or Property Description Lot 1 on RP860634 Macleay Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Agree generally with the findings of the Study</p> <p>Relocation of a drainage easement to what was the natural contour driven drainage down the lot before inappropriate Council works changed it.</p> <p>'Very High Conservation' on the Macleay Conservation Priority Areas Map should not extend eastwards beyond the outlet of the original creek and the old growth mangroves there. It is a contradiction of 13.3 (ii). The reason being that the mangroves across the front of the block are of recent growth after the clearing of the natural littoral forest by the previous land owner and loss of land due to increased wave action from the ferries.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The owner's land is identified as DP category 7 as a result of works by Council.</p> <p>Suggest that on-site inspection by Council Officers be held to resolve drainage issues.</p>

Respondent 15 WR Martin Lot 2 Kamar St Russell Island 4184
Location or Property Description Lot 2 on RP169491 Russell Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>No provision has been made for a farm and the cheap vegetables it offers.</p> <p>Two small areas will be farmed</p>	Noted.

Respondent 16
Location or Property Description

PF Howden, Cone St, Macleay Island 4184
 Lot 71 on RP133379, Russell Parish

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The lot in question has been determined environmentally-blighted. The respondent strongly disagrees with this for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The soil houses petrified and carbonated wood which enables wetlands to be preserved. • Fruit trees (many native) grow on the lot. • The dam is used by ducks, frogs, small fish and birds. • Its a wildlife refuge. • The respondents home is on the adjacent block and it is the most sustainable open house in Australia complete with an all-edible, near impenetrable forest. The two lots form an ecotourism facility - A Study Recommendation. • Its a Small Business - A Study Recommendation • It could be used as a research center - A Study Recommendation. <p>Its upkeep is free to Council If resumed, who would pay for all the valuable developed food trees. Respondent feels that his lot is a showcase of the Islands natural aesthetics. The landholder vows never to sell or build on the lot.</p>	<p>This lot falls within DP Category 4. The lot is part of a self sustainable lifestyle operation.</p> <p>Owner should be advised to amalgamate undeveloped lots with the house block to avoid paying double rates.</p> <p>All issues noted.</p>

Respondent 17
Location or Property Description

J Glasgow 52 Banks Ave. Pagewood NSW 2035.
Lot 359 on RP123820 Russell Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot targeted for resumption due to Conservation factors. There are no drainage problems on the block. 150m away is a home with occupants. A bird sanctuary and wetlands is located approximately 400m away on the other side of Centre Rd.</p> <p>Construction of a huge stormwater drain under Centre Rd about 2yrs ago has resulted in many water birds settling on the lot. The respondent wrote to DNR about the matter as the birds never lived on the lot before the drain was constructed.</p> <p>Requests that the block remains as Res. A so that it can be built on.</p> <p>Requests that all targeted landowners be granted an exemption from payment of land rates until the Study has finished.</p>	<p>Lot is in a High Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Owner should be advised of the process for designating acquisition lots and basis for determining acquisition costs.</p> <p>This issue of rate deferment or reimbursement has been raised with Council staff.</p>

Respondent 18
Location or Property Description

M Magill, 119 George St, Tewantin 4565
Lot 160P on RP 129109 Russell Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Plan sounds great. Needs a bridge to Stradbroke Island. Without a bridge the Island is not suitable for old sick people. The rates are a huge slice out of the respondents pension. Whoever approved the original subdivision of the land should be made to pay to resolve the problems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 19
Location or Property Description

C Mooney 16 Lavinia St. Granville 2142
Lot 21 on RP114591 and Lot 58 on RP 129112 Lamb Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Unhappy at Council's lack of intention to contact landowners affect by land resumption. If the land is so worthless than why is the respondent paying such high rates and paying for lawnmowing. In the last 5 years the 2 blocks have cost the respondent over \$30,000 including purchasing, rates and lawnmowing. They are valued at \$3,600 and \$5,000 at present.</p>	<p>Owner's lots are not identified for acquisition. Owner should be advised of the process for designating acquisition lots and basis for determining acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 20
Location or Property Description

B Alp 96 White Rd. Wonthaggi Vic. 3995
 Lot 3 on RP124430 Russell Island.

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Agrees with the concept of the Strategy Lot has been classified as “conservation” Respondent wishes to have three point clarified probably by the Shire’s Rates Dept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could a fair and realistic valuation be made of his lot since it would be valueless when deemed “conservation”. The lot has cost respondent around \$15,000 over the last 16 years by way of purchase and rates. • Over the last year the unimproved capital valuation fell from \$4,100 to \$1,200. Possible link to point 1. • Why continue to pay rates when the respondent has no control over what happens to his property. <p>The respondent wants a fair price.</p>	<p>Lot is in a High Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Owner should be advised of basis for determining conservation priorities and determining acquisition costs.</p> <p>Rate deferment for lots identified for acquisition has been raised with Council Officers.</p>

Respondent 21
Location or Property Description

M Hornibrook 23 Coast Rd Macleay Island 4184
 Lot 241 on RP118164 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Part of lot declared conservation. Surely a mistake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot is a cleared residential lot with no native flora or fauna and has been like that for some years. • It is surrounded from behind, on one side and across the street by houses. • The shaded area on the plan even covers existing houses and nominates the respondents exotic garden as environmentally important. • Respondent has a current building permit and has completed most of his house. <p>Respondent does not accept that his lot is on the proposed acquisition list.</p>	<p>Lot is partially in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Owner should be advised that lots with existing BA or approved buildings will not be acquired.</p>

Respondent 22
Location or Property Description

B & P Duiker 49 Halcyon St. Lamb Island 4184
 Lamb Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The following issues are at least 8 years old and the majority of them have already been submitted to Council.</p> <p>The proposed acquisition area on the southeast side of Lamb Island could be a Marine Education Centre with low key accommodation. Already discussed it with Jan Oliver of MESA who agrees and she would manage it.</p> <p>Conservation of Lamb Island’s paperbark trees on the northwest side.</p> <p>A brick lattice needs to be implemented into the sides of the cliff walls at Clarks Point as the area has already sunk about 10mm. If nothing can be established, then signage should be placed there as danger to the public.</p> <p>The islands especially Lamb Island need roads like those incorporated on Coochiemudlo Island, with hardy grass right to the side of the road, plus concrete bays.</p> <p>Planting more trees especially flowering gums.</p> <p>Form a senior CITS Group for the islands.</p> <p>More comfortable and frequent B.I.T.S. transport.</p> <p>Police to address vigilante groups on the islands, instead of just collecting revenue.</p> <p>Address problems associated with Tractor Point, especially the heavily eroded drains.</p> <p>The re-direction of stormwater that runs across the respondents lot.</p> <p>Strongly agrees with the DRAFT’s point that “it is not envisaged that Karragarra Island will need or desire any commercial facilities”</p>	<p>Noted. Amend report to change “Waterhole Midden” to JEFF WARDS MIDDEN and “Wards Park, Spring Midden” to IAN WARDS PARK ROAD RESERVE AND WELLERS BUSH CARE</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This is recommended in Strategy.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. For Council consideration.</p> <p>Noted. For Council consideration.</p> <p>Noted</p>

Respondent 23
Location or Property Description

N Waldion Russell Island 4184
 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>There will never be any progress on Russell Island until a bridge is constructed.</p> <p>Value of land has been cut in half but the rates still remain high.</p> <p>Respondent can’t sell it because the rates are too high for anyone to want to purchase it.</p>	<p>Noted. The “progress” envisaged by the respondent is inconsistent with the island image.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 26

B McVeigh PO Box 447 Nundah 4012

Location or Property Description

Lots 56 & 62 on RP122315 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Landholder has invested a considerable amount of money in this project only to find out that the lots are being considered for resumption.</p>	<p>Lot has an existing dwelling. Lot 56 is DP category 7 and is partially in an area of very High Conservation Priority. Lot 62 is DP category 4 and exists in a Very High Conservation Priority Area. Landowner should be advised that no lots with dwellings are intended to be acquired.</p>

Respondent 27

FG Holmes 37-47 Cavendish St. Russell Island 4184

Location or Property Description

Lots 10-24 on RP134519 & Lots 9, 25-29 on RP135118 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lots 14-21 are marked for conservation areas and are going to be considered for resumption.</p> <p>Respondent lives on Lot 9 and farms Lots 9, 28 and 29 and now they are subject to partial acquisition. He wants them left alone as he has been there for 52 years.</p> <p>Also the drainage problem lot is used for irrigation purposes so he would also like that to be left as is.</p> <p>If acquisition occurs of the other blocks, the price should take into account the value of the land, rates and levies paid.</p>	<p>Lots 15-20 are in a very high conservation area. Lots 14 and 21 are partially within the very high conservation area. Lots 10-13 and 22-24 are not within a Conservation Priority Area. Lot 27 is DP category 4.</p> <p>Lot 28 is in a Very High Conservation Priority Area. Lots' 9, 25-27 and 29 are partially within a Very High Conservation Area.</p> <p>Owners should be advised of basis for determining conservation priorities and determining acquisition costs.</p> <p>An alternative to acquisition would be to amalgamate lots and enforce vegetative management controls.</p>

Respondent 28

G Argles 30 Hartley Cres. Redbank Plains 4301

Location or Property Description

Lot 322 on RP133120 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The lot has been put forward for resumption.</p> <p>Lot cost \$18, 000, rates over the last seven years have been \$780. The present unimproved capital value is \$1600</p>	<p>Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Owners should be advised of basis for determining conservation priorities and determining acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 29 I Campbell 16 Venus Crt. Cedar Grove Heights 4285
Location or Property Description Lot 439 on RP121209 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Although this block is situated in a drainage problem area it is unique in that it is the only block in the area that was raised to the originally required datum prior to settlement. It is consequently above all tide and flood inundation.	Lot is in DP category 4. Inspect site and establish development suitability.

Respondent 30 P Winkler 33 Prince Edward St. Carlton NSW 2218
Location or Property Description Lot 25 on RP132073 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot has a drainage problem and is in a conservation area. Why should landholders pay rates on land that is useless to them. The RSC should refund all rates and have them buy the land back.	Lot is in Medium Conservation Priority Area and DP category 3. Owners should be advised of basis for determining categories and acquisition costs.

Respondent 31 MM Young PO Box 150 Russell Island 4184
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>It is a matter of concern that acquisitions are timed ahead as far ahead as 5 years or more. Concerns are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the land is located in medium, high and very high conservation value areas yet whilst it remains in private hands it is under enormous threat. • The owners are still required to pay rates yet they are being told their land will never be developed. • The release of the study will further aggravate the real estate market and may result in further devaluations. • Uncertainty for landholders results in negativity and dissatisfaction amongst stakeholders and does little for the debate on the future of the Islands. <p>Request that the Acquisition Program be given “Top Priority” and all acquisitions be made as soon as possible. Furthermore all rates be frozen or a commitment that rates paid between now and the time of purchase will be refunded.</p> <p>Such a commitment by RSC would increase positive negotiations towards the Islands future</p>	Noted. Issue of rate deferment/reimbursement until lots identified for acquisition has been raised with Council officers.

Respondent 32

T Anderson 54 Clifton Dr. Jimboomba 4280

Location or Property Description

Lot 24 on RP139475 Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Main problem is that the Study is not listening to what the landholders want. The lot being placed in the Conservation category is not correct because the lot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cleared for farming. • bulldozed into an unnatural slope for subdivision. • what native plants that are there have been planted by the respondent. • disturbed by water, electricity and road services. <p>Development and habitat destruction occurring on the mainland has a much greater impact on the Bay than any development on the islands, why are they treated differently.</p> <p>Respondent detested the implementation of the services to the island yet he paid his share for them. While rates go up, his island lifestyle disappears.</p> <p>He does not agree with the Study because it lacks scientific research, no data, no comparisons to back up recommendations made.</p> <p>At the next land valuations the respondent is going to apply for a reduction in rates at the Land Court using the Study as evidence.</p>	<p>The lot is partially in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Noted. The islands' setting, environmental attributes and need for protection is well documented.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Sufficient evidence is available to identify impact of development on terrestrial and marine environments.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Owners should be advised of basis for identifying conservation priority areas.</p>

Respondent 33

C Walker 99 Dillon Rd The Gap 4061

Location or Property Description

Lot 4 on RP108840 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot is subject to resumption because of drainage problems.</p> <p>This would be a considerable financial loss to the respondent considering rates paid, maintenance, soil tests and original purchase.</p> <p>Rates should be frozen until firm decisions are made, considering that land will not be able to be built on.</p> <p>Soil test evaluation was never forwarded to the respondent even though he paid for it and repeatedly asked for it.</p>	<p>Lot is in DP Category 1.</p> <p>Comments noted. Owner should be advised that applications prior to adoption of strategy would be reviewed on their merits.</p>

Respondent 34
Location or Property Description

K Leigh Lamb Island Realty 7 Lovell Pde. Lamb Island 4184
 Drainage effected lots on Lamb Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Questions the nature and extent of the recategorisation of drainage affected lots in the Study. Some of the effected properties are currently listed for sale with the real estate and the respondent is concerned that the landholders and future purchasers are fully not informed about the likely impact of the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Council likely to implement the ten categories of drainage affected lots? • If yes, is it intending to formally rezone the Bay Islands in line with these categories? • If yes, is it intending to formally adopt the category descriptions, development implications and actions outlined in the Study? • If yes, what actions will be taken to compensate those whose properties are affected but not acquired? 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Owners should be advised of the basis for determining DP categories, acquisition price and timing of the strategy.</p>

Respondent 35 (35-38)
Location or Property Description

I Olsson Ausplan Research PO Box 3133 Sunnybank South 4109
 Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>DRAFT Study appears not to have inquired into the legal and policy implications of Telstra, Energex and RSC Water provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is Telstra and Energex to be compensated for the prospective customers lost due to the proposed buyback. • Council could be in breach of its obligation to provide water to all vacant lots without water pipeline at their frontage within the Russell Island part of the Mainland system. • If there is a Res A land acquisition program, will owners be compensated for their lost water right and will owners not affected but on a street not serviced be compensated. <p>The Proposed Areas Acquisition Map has problems being clearly understood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All DP Categories are not presented as certain areas that should be acquired are not shown. • Council owned land is not up to date. • Council owned land is not shown as DP or not DP. • Land Use Map is deficient in parks and playing areas for Russell Island. Playing areas outlined are insufficient for recreation or organised sport except at the local precinct level. • Land Use Map does not identify sewerage treatment or points of discharge, site for an additional primary school on southern end, emergency helicopter landing facility or new water tower locations. 	<p>Noted. These utilities provide services on a needs basis. There is no issue of compensation.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Council should consider the servicing implications of the proposed strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Mapping detail is sufficient for strategic planning. Databases will be updated as part of the Statutory Planning Process.</p> <p>Noted. To be addressed at the Statutory Planning Stage.</p> <p>Noted. These details will be dealt with in the Statutory Planning document.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Both the mainland and Russell Island forums expressed strong support for a bridge.</p> <p>Late 1980s Premier’s Dept. Report stated that it would cost \$100 to \$200 Million to bring Russell Island’s planning and services up to scratch. Cost of resuming drainage problem land was over \$20 Million. (French Valuation)</p> <p>How is this reduced to \$46.1 Million and \$17.4 Million respectively ten years later. Respondent suggests that strategy is aimed at a very poor provision of services.</p> <p>Respondent wishes to voice these concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why have Russell Island Conservation Areas R22, R31 and R35 been listed as of “medium” significance in the DRAFT Strategy when the DRAFT Environmental Report lists them as “low”? • Why is the internet site and call centre people depicting about 1585 lots in these areas as subject to acquisition? • Would it not be hazardous and unworthy to proceed with any acquisition program that does not complement the environmental report and where the high costs of rehabilitation could prevent long-term viability? <p>Respondent would like the study team to investigate why the technical reports for Conservation Areas R22, R31, R32 and R35 (buy back areas), show no baseline data. There are no botanical species lists, no rare species found and no detailed faunal survey, except for a bird survey of 10 common birds.</p> <p>Respondent recommends the Council drops the strategy in respect to acquisition and cultural heritage, until baseline information is provided.</p> <p>There is not enough evidence to acquire lots based on conservation and cultural heritage purposes.</p> <p>Table 4.2 of the study lists the habitat conservation priorities for the areas. Respondent feels that this information contradicts the conservation priority given for the areas.</p> <p>Aerial photos for areas R22, R31 and R35 show them to be highly disturbed and far from in-tact from a cultural heritage perspective.</p> <p>Respondent asked the CEO to personally review the matter.</p> <p>Respondent recommends suspension of acquisition and indigenous cultural heritage designations until adequate baseline studies are completed.</p>	<p>There were many present at the forums that supported a bridge. The Study Team gave a commitment to do further work on the environmental implications of a water based transport system.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Areas R22, R31 and R35 were identified as a moderate forest landscape in a flora assessment and allocated a medium conservation priority as they represent a large (if not contiguous) tracts of mixed eucalypt forest with fauna habitat significance. It was noted that for the biological resources of these areas to be maintained, lot amalgamations and building approvals would be required. This leads to the rural residential option prescribed at the summit. There was no support for this option and some other benefits could be achieved such as reduced service infrastructure, reduced population and improved water quality - these areas were identified for acquisition.</p> <p>Vegetative polygons were similar to those which species lists were obtained. Representative species lists only were obtained by the ecologist.</p> <p>Noted. Baseline information won’t change the fact that protection of this area will help preserve biological attributes and deliver a more sustainable development outcome.</p> <p>Noted. These are not the sole reasons acquisition has been recommended. Basis for acquisition needs explaining to all affected landowners.</p> <p>Noted. See above.</p> <p>Noted. See above.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Only 2 vegetation polygons on Macleay Island, M17 - 40 Lots and M19 - 6 Lots had three flora and fauna species surveys carried out. Of this, only M19 was in an area of very high conservation significance. No surveys were carried out on 247 lots listed for acquisition on Macleay Island.</p> <p>Respondent believes that on this basis only M19 lots should be acquired on Macleay Island until a more scientific study is carried out.</p> <p>4.5-5.0 m wide roads are acceptable on the larger islands. 3.5 m wide roads are a joke as they are dangerous and highly polluting through verge erosion of passing vehicles.</p> <p>No truncation of roads should be considered if views like the respondents or easy access to the water or facilities are to be interfered with.</p> <p>The islands need sewerage. What is the rationale in not providing sewerage to medium conservation areas? These are the areas most likely to harbour the endemic mosquitoes that carry the Ross River virus. Hence the argument not to sewer is dangerous to the health of everyone.</p> <p>An upgraded Rocky Point Bridge through to the mainland and again crossing the Logan River to Beenleigh-Redland Bay Rd. is less than \$50 million. With the exception of 3 km of mainland road to a Main Roads' road there is no upgrade necessary of mainland roads.</p> <p>Costs of the bridge in economic delivery of infrastructure to Russell Island has not been included in the calculations.</p> <p>GHD should now provide full costings for public scrutiny.</p> <p>The issue of the O-Bahn was not resolved. It can operate without the causeways envisaged and the crossing time of the catamarans such as the "Seaway" would now be less than the 750m causeway design. Running costs would be slightly higher but the capacity would be vastly improved. The costs without the causeways would be around \$2 million plus some minor dredging.</p> <p>There is no justification to designate land for acquisition due to conservation purposes that has been designated future Res. A or a higher zoning under the Feb. 1998 Amendment to the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Heritage studies indicate the indigenous people crossed at Rocky Point to the mainland. Not to recognise this or provide access between Rocky Point and the mainland is an err against past heritage.</p> <p>Even if the projected population was reduced, there would still be a need for a High School or at least Stage 1 of such a facility by 2005. This could however be delayed by the construction of a bridge to the mainland or North Stradbroke Island.</p> <p>The present site at Centre Rd. could be used for both primary and high schools, but it is proposed for acquisition. The issue of preschool students is another issue overlooked by the strategy.</p>	<p>Noted. Representative site sampling only was carried out. The conservation value is not the sole reason for acquisition.</p> <p>Noted. Reduced pavement reduces runoff and total stormwater flow. Grass drains and stormwater management measures will filter runoff.</p> <p>Noted. Vistas to water along streets considered important should be retained where possible.</p> <p>Sewerage will not be needed where there is little development. Fail to see point of comment.</p> <p>Noted. This is the respondents opinion. The upgrading of the road to the Pacific Highway would ultimately be required under this scenario.</p> <p>Noted. A bridge is considered not to be consistent with the islands' image.</p> <p>The issue was not raised except by the respondent. See above.</p> <p>Land was identified for acquisition on several grounds, not just conservation priority.</p> <p>Noted. This makes Rocky Point culturally significant, which has been recognised in the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. School needs relate to rate of population growth and demographic profile. A high school on Russell Island cannot be justified at present in the view of other priorities.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Approximately 1750 lots are proposed for acquisition in areas that the fauna consultant advised that they cannot be reserved and should be managed to minimise clearing. In addition, over 200 more lots have been incorrectly identified due to applying data to a more generalised neighbouring vegetation polygon. Any acquisition of land for environmental purposes must be justified on overall environmental significance and not be confused with the issue of reducing infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>3035 lots are proposed for acquisition on Russell Island. No polygons containing lots for acquisition had the combined 3 surveys completed. 22 polygons containing 1227 lots for acquisition had no vegetation species list survey.</p> <p>The paucity of environmental data is making it difficult to legitimately acquire such lands, besides some landowners would see this as a confrontationalist approach by RSC to do what it has done before - next to nothing.</p> <p>RSC should immediately publicly advise the owners that such studies do not contain fully reliable data and that their land will not be purchased. RSC should also apologise and compensate the landowners for lot devaluations. A full review needs to be done on what studies are needed and ensure they are done properly.</p> <p>Polygon R43 should be split in two and the western portion remain a high conservation area because it provides low level eucalypt forest with some high bird roosts and it is contained in one large lot. Polygon R11 should be upgraded to very high conservation significance as it contains the most important pristine high level eucalypt vegetation community of vivid diversity.</p> <p>Chenoweth and Associates in an environmental inventory for Redlands p33 recommend a course of action for the Bay Islands and recommend action for future flora and fauna surveys for the Shire in general.</p> <p>A buy back on Russell Island Only will not be determined on environmental qualities, but on an agreement between Energex and RSC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 3: Energex will make overhead supply available to the remaining unreticulated blocks on Russell Island at domestic tariffs. • The stumbling block is that the right to an existing electricity supply to the year 2050 will allow development on all existing non-drainage lots on Russell Island that are part of the agreement. <p>Russell Island's destiny is therefore that it is set to be urbanised, unlike the other islands.</p>	<p>The justification is based on achieving overall environmentally sustainable development. This concept includes ecological, economic and social sustainability. All these elements are relevant in the context of the Bay Islands and their unique setting. To this extent we agree acquisition has been based on 'overall environmental significance'.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. See above comments.</p> <p>Noted. Data is considered reliable in terms of the overall objectives of achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>Further studies would not alter the fact that there needs to be a significant reduction in development areas and population in order to achieve sustainable development of the islands.</p> <p>Noted. Current designations ensure protection of vegetation in these polygons.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Council may need to review agreement.</p> <p>Noted and disagree.</p>

Respondent 39

AR & KE Barker PO Box 168 Toowong 4066

Location or Property Description

Lot 2 on RP129824 Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>For the past 14 years the respondent have improved the property by clearing the regrowth and noxious weeds, planting native vegetation, restoring the homestead and cultivating the land.</p> <p>A statement in the Study identifies native middens on the property but the respondent states that neither his family or the previous owners ever saw a midden.</p> <p>The access road to the homestead will only be upgraded a third of the way. Lot 46 is also not to be serviced.</p> <p>The respondent feels that this is direct discrimination as they are large ratepayers and they will consider other remedies if the decision is not corrected.</p> <p>Both lots are subject to acquisition and the owner does not agree that the Council has the legal or moral right to resume the lots.</p>	<p>Part of the lot is in a Very High Conservation Priority Area. A dwelling is erected on the lot and the owner has been improving the vegetation in the conservation area.</p> <p>Owners should be advised that the lots with existing dwellings will not be acquired although high conservation areas will be subject to vegetation protection requirements.</p> <p>Noted. Contact has been made with Quandamooka to discuss this midden with the landowner. Report amended to reflect "possible shell midden".</p> <p>Noted. All developable lots will have road access.</p> <p>Noted. The situation has been explained to the landowner who seeks written confirmation land will not be acquired.</p> <p>Noted</p>

Respondent 40

GR & GF Kirtland 7 Blue Gum Drv. Marsden 4132

Location or Property Description

18 Derwent St. (Lot 113) Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Half the lot has been marked for acquisition. Half a lot is no use to the respondents. If it were drainage problems then they would understand but according to the respondent it is one of the best blocks in the area.</p> <p>The landowner has no intention of selling the lot as they have always been lead to believe that they could build on it.</p> <p>Strongly object to the portion of their property being declared for acquisition.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot is partially within a Very High Conservation Priority Area and the remaining portion of the lot is in a Low Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Need to determine whether lots partially affected can be developed and advise landowner.</p>

Respondent 41

R Scott 21 Kevin Drv. Yeppoon 4703

Location or Property Description

Lots 84 & 85 on RP 132073 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The two lots are alongside each other.</p> <p>Please note respondents objection to Lot 85 being listed for acquisition.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot 84 is DP category 2 and Lot 85 is DP category 1.</p>

Respondent 42 M Day 15 Bentham St. Mt. Gravatt 4122
Location or Property Description Lot 174 on RP124451 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The lot is listed for conservation and subject to acquisition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would the acquisition price be determined for the lot? • If acquisition is not made, will the lot still be precluded from development? • Would owners of blocks like this be better off writing them off as a loss? 	<p>Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Owners should be advised of the basis for determining conservation areas and acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 43 C & R Cassar 13/503 Pineridge Rd. Coombabah 4216
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>It appears to the respondent that the Council and the Study Team will decide at their discretion which blocks will be acquired and which ones won't, which leaves the owners without a say.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Owners should be advised of the basis for determining conservation areas and acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 44 B & P Kirkman 40 Athol Tce Boonah 4310
Location or Property Description Lot 29 on RP111233 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot is in a Drainage Constrained Area.</p> <p>Respondent was advised in 1996 by the Manager of the Planning and Environment Services of RSC that as a Res. A lot, erection of a dwelling would be permitted but was not advised of any restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lot is in a drainage constrained area, how will this effect the development of the lot? • Do any restrictions or costs apply? 	<p>Noted. Lot is in DP category 6, less than 450 m² above RL 2.4 m.</p> <p>Owner should be advised applications before adoption of strategy would be considered on merit.</p>

Respondent 45

PF Howden Cone St. Macleay Island 4184

Location or Property Description

Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent feels study should focus on more rational scenarios or ignore all scenarios until a problem arises. Study mistook “communities” for “facilities” Questionnaires were totally illogical especially in regard to Y/N answers.</p> <p>Incorporate a “Street Representative” to collect detailed data for their street and then all this can be collated. Council has two flawed infrastructure proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mains Sewage: lack of residents will result in a lack of use which could cause clogging in the system. • Sealed Roads: create more run-off and drainage problems. <p>On Macleay Island large tracts of forest and swamps have not been defined as High or Very High Conservation Value. Slashing should only be allowed with a building permit. Tree Preservation Orders should be implemented. Create Public Edible Parks as a unique tourist venture. Charging only nominal rates on significantly undeveloped land and not issuing slashing notices could persuade owners to treasure their natural blocks. Zoning for self-sufficiency like Lismore, NSW. A separate member to represent the Bay Islands communities.</p>	<p>Noted Noted Noted. Received a significant response to the questionnaires which are only aimed to provide feedback as to whether or not the Strategy was on the right track Noted. This could be an action during preparation of the Statutory Plan.</p> <p>Noted. There are techniques to avoid “clogging”. Community demands all whether, low maintenance access. Road width are minimised to reduce runoff. Noted. This will be reviewed at the final survey during the Statutory Plan preparation. Noted Noted. There will be vegetation protection measures. Noted Noted Noted Noted</p>

Respondent 46

DG Bennett 27 Grahams Rd. Strathpine 4500

Location or Property Description

Lot 602 5 Hunters Rd. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Cement Works has been constructed quite close to lot. Respondent feels that this could not have been an environmentally conscious decision.</p>	<p>Noted. Cannot comment on past decisions.</p>

Respondent 47 M Mardozza 5 Augusta Ct. Albany Creek 4035
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Rates are very high, so where is all the money going?	Noted. This issue cannot be responded to by study team.

Respondent 48 P & P Hanson 42-44 Steven Street Camira 4300
Location or Property Description Russell Island Bridge

Summary of Issues	Response
The Russell Island community are in favour of a bridge to the mainland. Environmental impacts should be studied firstly. Respondent proposes a one-lane, low-impact bridge with a high span over the main channel operating on a hourly direction change basis funded by a toll system. This would result in 24 hour access.	Noted. Bridge is not consistent with the island image or the ability to achieve sustainable development.

Respondent 49 AJ Shaw Lot 43 McKay Dr Serpentine, W.A. 6125
Location or Property Description Lot 173 Treasure Island Ave. Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondent voices his objection to the high rates he has been paying. He has owned the block for 27 years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is a decision reached deciding which lots are deemed conservation, then the blocks either side of the respondents have houses on them? Will the respondent be paid a fair price taking into account all the rates and mowing charges paid for? If the block is listed for acquisition why is the respondent still paying rates and mowing charges? 	Lot is partially in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of basis for determining conservation categories, acquisition price and a policy in regards to rates.

Respondent 50 N & JA Brooks 60 Junior Tce Northgate 4013
Location or Property Description Lot 98 on RP130510 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondents have been informed that the lot will be acquired under the proposed plan, but there is an existing dwelling present.	Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner that lots with dwellings will not be acquired.

Respondent 51 J Danyhuk 9 Tonbridge Way Morley W.A. 6062
Location or Property Description Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Why is the land worth less, but the rates are more expensive?	Noted. This issue cannot be responded to by the study team.

Respondent 52 J Bainbrigge 29 Bridgeman Dr, Reedy Creek 4228
Location or Property Description Lot 47 on RP136180 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent objects to his lot categorised as conservation and is being considered for acquisition. Grounds for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause a drop in the value of the land. • Cause negative prospects of the respondent being able to sell or trade the land at a realistic value. • Cause negative options of the respondent being able to plan and construct on the land. • Make surrounding land not subject to this categorisation, more valuable. <p>Respondent has been drafting proposals and budgeting cost estimates for construction on the lot for the past 18 months in anticipation of building mid-1999.</p> <p>Recently the respondent had trade offers which have now fallen through and the land is now unsellable.</p> <p>The respondent feels that he is in a situation of no recourse but to take legal action against the RSC for inconvenience, costs to date, stress related illness which is imminent (cause and effect), all rates and charges to date paid and then obtain a realistic value for compensation on the lot based on land of similar quality on a neighbouring island like North Stradbroke or an island in a similar situation adjacent to a capital city like Sydney or Perth (similar latitude) and all other costs incurred by the respondent and his agents.</p> <p>The respondent finds it unsatisfactory that his lot be acquired when he feels that the problem land is the drainage problem land which RSC allowed to be subdivided originally.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Advise landowner of basis for determining acquisition areas and acquisition price. Owners should be advised they can lodge a building application any time until the Strategy is adopted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. RSC was not responsible for approving the original subdivision.</p>

Respondent 55 V Schumacher 26 Gem St. Russell Island 4184
Location or Property Description Russell Island Bridge

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The respondent feels that the forecast population should be calculated on 3-5 people per lot, not 2 per lot. Whether or not this is used he believes that a bridge is absolutely necessary to transport people to and from the mainland especially in peak periods. A barge system would have to run extremely frequently (31 services in a 2 hour morning and afternoon period) in peak times and this would prove costly on barge purchasing and also could become unsafe with so many barges traversing the bay. Larger barges would not be able to be used due to the shallowness of the bay. The environmental impact of so many barge trips on the bay's flora and fauna could be a problem. The bridge could also carry a sewerage pipeline to the mainland and be funded by rates revenue.</p>	<p>Noted. Population base on average occupancy rate suggested by previous Censuses.</p> <p>Noted. A bridge would be more inclined to lead to the projected population densities suggested and it is for this reason it is considered less environmentally sustainable than water transport. It is also inconsistent with the islands' image.</p>

Respondent 56 F Eastment 8 Mawarra St. Macleay Island 4184
Location or Property Description Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent wishes that areas are made available to fish between Macleay Island and Stradbroke Island. Boat ramps need to be more readily available, not closed off, like the one at the end of Oomool Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 57 AV Greet c/- Post Office Port Douglas 4871
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent would like to see residents encouraged to purchase adjacent unused land and incorporate it into the same deed as the existing block. This would reduce the number of lots, increase the value and create a more parklike setting for dwellings.</p> <p>A subsidy paid to existing residents would assist in the purchase.</p> <p>The respondent owns three lots, one of which is his house. He would be happy enough to combine all three plus a section of road under one deed. It may also be possible to buy drainage problem land that was adjacent and incorporate it under the single deed. This would reduce the total value of the holdings, but could be used as an example of combining deeds to reduce the number of total blocks available.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is mentioned in the Strategy.</p> <p>Incentives envisaged include waived lot reconfiguration fees.</p> <p>Noted. This is discussed in the Strategy.</p>

Respondent 58 J Bowman 98 Queen St. Revesby NSW 2212
Location or Property Description Russell Island Bridge

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondent has no great deal of interest in Russell Island and has been trying to sell for sometime. Respondent interested in negotiation of undeveloped lots of land for assumed average valuation as stated under "Funding" in Newsletter No. 5.	Noted.

Respondent 59 A & O Wyszynski 8 Dyson Ave. Sunnybank 4109
Location or Property Description (Lot 155) 13 Murraba Rd Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
The respondents object to the proposed acquisition of the lot they were hoping to retire on in the future. Respondents have paid almost \$16000 toward the block, this includes purchase price and rates. Over the last financial year the unimproved value of the lot went from \$6500 to \$2600. The respondents feel that this is linked to the future acquisition of property at a minimal cost to the Council. They believe that at the very least the Council should fully refund purchase price and rates paid for the acquisition of the lot, as well as freezing rates until a final decision is made.	Noted. Lot is designated as a Very High Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the basis for identifying land for acquisition and the acquisition value.

Respondent 60 S & S Wargin 86 The Esplanade Karragarra Island 4184
Location or Property Description Lot 28 on RP130218 Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondents object to the lot being categorised as drainage problem. The arguments are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 492.14 square metres of the 645.92 square metre lot is 2m or higher above sea-level. • The dwelling is 4m above sea-level. • The 2.4m storm surge line is theoretical and has not been recorded in the history of the Island. • All necessary permits and requirements prior to construction in 1986 were complied with. • The dwelling is of a high quality, constructed out of brick on a concrete slab. • This categorisation will dramatically reduce the value of the property. • The Study is penalising people for not adhering to restrictions that did not exist at the time of purchase or construction. The owners are losing out.	Noted. Lot is in DP category 7. This category does not preclude development or change use rights. It simply requires dwellings to be built above RL2.4 to protect property and the environment. The designations are intended to apply to all lots whether built upon or vacant. How this designation will be presented in the Town Plan will need to be addressed at the statutory planning stage.

Respondent 61 I McCalman P.O. Box 461 Milsons Point NSW 1565
Location or Property Description Lot 41 Sundown St. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondent hopes that the Strategy will be implemented as soon as the funding becomes available.	Noted.

Respondent 62 J & J Scanlan 56 Wallace St. Toowoomba Qld. 4350
Location or Property Description Lot 18 on RP31222 Lamb Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>In agreement with many of the Study’s proposed strategies. Lot 18 has been identified for a number of functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large proportion of the land is designated as medium conservation value, with consideration for acquisition. • Small proportion designated for possible stormwater treatment. • Overlaying these areas is another listing being Special Use, eg; Tourism. <p>Vegetation now found on the lot represents some 30 years regrowth. Lower third of the block was cleared 15 years ago.</p> <p>Respondents planning to develop an ecologically sensitive retreat on the lot, including a small number of cabins (4-6) for visitors which will provide an exploring base of the Moreton Bay Marine Park.</p> <p>Area designated as medium conservation matches the vegetation distribution shown from an aerial view of the lot. This may have been altered as a large area of lantana was cleared from the lower segment of the lot in 1995. The remaining wooded area is heavily infested with introduced species.</p> <p>As part of the development, respondents would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rehabilitate wooded area. • cabins would be non-intrusive. • use composting toilets and recycle grey water. • investigate a means of absorbing excess waste water through planting a portion of the unwooded area with clumping bamboo species, suitable for the edible shoot market. <p>Area designated for drainage easement already has a large shed erected on it. Respondents happy to manage the area with indigenous water-loving species. Presently there are bamboo stands here but these are subject to harvesting by trespassers. Respondents plan to erect a fence to deter this from happening in the future.</p> <p>To minimise the effect of run-off to the high priority conservation areas of adjacent seagrass beds, the RSC owned “Edgewater Place” should be listed for stormwater management as this is the termination point for run-off from Helen Pde. Also better road construction so as to not channel run-off.</p> <p>The 4ha site will allow for seclusion of the cabins and continued privacy for nearby residents.</p>	<p>Providing there is sufficient room for development outside conservation or drainage areas, large blocks such as this should not be acquired. However, the development of the lot must include protection for the conservation area in accordance with the Strategy.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Management of the natural environment and rehabilitation of the vegetation could provide some employment opportunities.</p> <p>Respondents have had one preliminary meeting with 'Redbuild' and other interested parties in recent times regarding the venture.</p>	

Respondent 63

R Patey 119 Stuartholme Rd. Bardon 4065

Location or Property Description

Lot 251 on RP31201 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot is in a precinct depicted as being partly Island Residential and partly Conservation Area.</p> <p>Requested that the subject lot be removed from the Conservation Area designation for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation consists of immature regrowth and non-indigenous species. • 1995 the lot was cutback according to a notice supplied by the RSC. • No part of the site is identified as having any visual or cultural heritage significance. • The lot is included within Catchment M21. The priority for management of this catchment is medium and the necessary actions are described as minor stormwater controls. • The lot is not identified as being drainage constrained or susceptible to storm surge. <p>The waterfront land to the east of Precinct 1A (including the subject land) is well suited to tourist commercial uses. Reasons for this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to the commercial hub and island gateway. • Enjoys spectacular views. • Direct deep water and sealed road access. • Supports no vegetation of conservation significance. • Currently zoned Comprehensive Development. <p>It is therefore requested that the Study be amended to allow for tourist accommodation and service uses within this area, so as to provide a basis for sustainable economic development, and to reflect the existing use rights and strategic planning intent already in place. This could be accommodated either by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extending the boundaries of Precinct 1A to include this area and amending the land use designations applying to the area; • including the land in a specific precinct designed to accommodate tourist related uses. • maintaining the land in the current precinct but providing written support for a range of tourist related uses in this location. <p>Respondent cannot support a strategy which neither reflects the actual characteristics of the lot or the existing use</p>	<p>Respondent refers to the land use precinct plan which was stylised and depicts open space over the lot.</p> <p>Lot is in Low Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Amend land use precinct plan to more accurately reflecting open space/residential boundaries.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
rights attributed to it.	

Respondent 64

M Quain 5/245 Cavendish Rd. Coorparoo 4151

Location or Property Description

Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Plan is representing a top-down approach which completely disregards the rights of the landholders.</p> <p>Respondents lot is serviced by a bitumen road, reticulated water, electricity and telephone. But it is subject to acquisition as it has been listed as medium conservation (even though cleared and surrounded by existing homes) because a buffer zone needs to be erected.</p> <p>Respondent argues that there may be a case of discrimination to answer if homes in the area proposed to be acquired are not also acquired.</p> <p>Plan ignores the question of equity in that many people are going to be hurt due to acquisition.</p> <p>The plan has resulted in a depressed property market. Land value of his lot fell from \$8000 to \$1700 in the last year. Why will landowners have to pay rates for up to five years if their land is going to be acquired.</p> <p>Where has the money gone that RSC collected from rates of the islands.</p> <p>The landholders who are not residents are denied representation in decisions made.</p> <p>Is the plan's aim to remove the working class so that the lots can be sold as acreage in the future to the wealthy.</p> <p>In reference to Aboriginal Sites. The case of the "Larrikan" claim in the N.T. where it was held that freehold extinguishes forever the native title claim.</p> <p>Respondent intends to fight his view of the 'philosophy' of the plan of treating people as commodities, until a more just outcome is present.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Landowner are able to lodge a building application until the strategy is adopted.</p> <p>Noted. The Strategy will mean that some landowners will have land acquired at below the purchase rates. If lots have been built upon then they are not considered for acquisition. It could be argued that lot owners took a speculative risk which did not pay off. Acquisition is usually at current market value which is the same the owners would get if privately sold. An acquisition strategy will be prepared once the strategy has been adopted.</p> <p>Valuations fell prior to the release of the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Consideration should be a moratorium on rates for those landowners whose lots are recommended for acquisition until State Govt. makes final decision on the Strategy.</p> <p>This is a matter for Council to respond to.</p> <p>Noted. Landowner were invited to comment during preparation of the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Acquired lots will not be resold but managed as conservation areas.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is not the basis for acquiring land. It just so happens there are additional benefits for cultural heritage protection by protecting buffer areas on southern Russell Island.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Advise landowner of basis for identifying conservation priority areas and establishing an acquisition price.</p>

Respondent 65

F L Curtin 31 Orion St. Macleay Island 4184

Location or Property Description

Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent has lived on Macleay Island for only 18 months.</p> <p>There is no truly agreed Vision when individuals have their own ideals.</p> <p>Perception amongst islanders that the report was written by “them” trying to delineate what “we” should have. The report is written in a language by elite professionals for professionals.</p> <p>One should be cautious in deciding what is heritage land.</p> <p>The law as to compensation has been subverted by IPA so that the rights of compensation on rezoning have been substantially degraded.</p> <p>If tourism were expanded there would be more jobs. This could be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottage industries. • Eco and Heritage Tours. • Art Gallery. • A diorama of history, eg Stockman’s Hall of Fame. • Butterfly and Bird Sanctuary now that Currumbin has been degraded due to aircraft flight paths. • Encourage dolphins to feed from the public. • A television series on the islands. <p>Preference should be to employ local people.</p> <p>Report fails to identify the external forces of the privatisation of banking and govt. services to their closing down on the islands.</p> <p>Council should support the Commonwealth Bank since their branch is still open on the islands.</p> <p>Population growth is restricted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banks discriminating when granting home loans. • Building costs exceeding market value. • Isolation. • Absence of employment opportunities. <p>Transport services are less than satisfactory with poor co-ordination between land and water services.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. IPA requires landowners to use compensation provision or lose them after a period of 2 years.</p> <p>Noted. Strategy does not preclude this.</p> <p>Noted. These services tend to be followers not catalysts.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Respondent appears to suggest that the islands should offer the same accessibility to services as available in the mainland suburbs. This view is not consistent with the island image.</p> <p>Noted. Strategy recognises this.</p>
<p>Poor inter-island ferry timetables and they don’t run at night.</p> <p>Shorter routes to the mainland are essential. Replacement or restoration of Grant’s jetty on Macleay Island.</p> <p>Infrastructure charge is unfair especially Telstra. Australia Post does not offer a full service to Macleay Island. The Council needs to react and represent the Islands by forwarding complaints.</p> <p>Responsibility for financing proposals should be considered:</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. An alternative landing on Macleay Island is under investigation.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Funding for the Strategy is being sought from all spheres of</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Govt. has a role to play in subsidising the enhancement of Moreton Bay (NMP). • State Govt. was responsible for the initial subdivision of land the root of the problem. • RSC spending the revenue they receive from the islands, on the islands. <p>Only true way to find out the wishes of ALL the ratepayers is a ballot.</p> <p>Rates are too high. Annual rates and levies can amount to between 25-80% of total value of land.</p> <p>Council does not apply its own slashing/ mowing by-law to its lots.</p> <p>Only land acquired should be those that have a serious drainage problem. People's livelihoods are more important than minimum effects to the environment.</p> <p>The 2.4m level is too high, it should be 1.8m.</p> <p>Compensation should amount to rates paid, purchase price and loss of future enjoyment.</p> <p>New buildings should be required to have a stormwater holding tank.</p> <p>Liquid chemical toilets would be a temporary measure, but eventually sewered. Consideration to an oxidation plant on Stradbroke Island.</p> <p>Study does not properly take into account the extent to what species are endangered and whether it is preserved in other areas. Or whether a species is beneficial to an endangered species or human habitation.</p> <p>Inter-island transport must be upgraded.</p> <p>Employment statistics must be considered in conjunction with the system used to assess island rates.</p> <p>The islands must be a separate administration to RSC.</p> <p>RSC urgently needs to upgrade expenditure and ferry services and designate foreshore land for public use to encourage community usage. Also zone some small selected areas medium density housing.</p>	<p>Government.</p> <p>Noted. Island landowners are not the only stakeholders who have an interest in the Bay Islands.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Strategy aims to deliver sustainable development for the present and future generations. There is a view that the islands should not be sold off for speculative gain.</p> <p>Noted. Some observers argue that RL2.4m is too low.</p> <p>Acquisition price is usually equivalent to the current market value. This will be determined in the Acquisition Strategy.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. All treatment and disposal options will be considered.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Medium density housing is not consistent with the island image.</p>

Respondent 66
Location or Property Description

P Dowling 83 Befer Rd. Victoria Point 4165
 Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent was present at the mainland meeting held at Victoria Point Hall. 87 attended, 80 wanted a bridge - Why wasn't one ever considered.</p> <p>A bridge would solve the following problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry an integrated stormwater and sewerage pipe to the islands which would prevent the risk of leaching contaminants into the Bay. • Prevent water based transport from killing wildlife. • Address the problem of high unemployment by providing a highly accessible link to the mainland. <p>Representation on decisions made is low which makes it very hard to dileneate what they need. The respondent also wished that "Poor" and "Hopeless" were added to the next survey sheet which should be sent to landowner with the next rate notice.</p> <p>2 key areas missed in the environmental issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine life continually killed or wounded by pleasure craft and water based transport. • Removal of introduced species especially cats and dogs. <p>Problem: Newsletter 4 stated the Islands have 14,363 lots, Newsletter 5 said 19,000 lots.</p> <p>Logan River discharging into the Bay is a major environmental problem, more so than discharges from boats.</p>	<p>Noted. No count was made of bridge supporters at Summit. A bridge is not consistent with the island image.</p> <p>Noted. Arguments against a bridge are included in the Strategy document. (Stormwater would not go to mainland and there is no decision on sewerage effluent disposal strategy.)</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The number of water transport vessels is only a small proportion of craft on Moreton Bay.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>There are 15363 residential lots and 19000 total lots.</p> <p>Noted. This is not a reason why strategies for environmental management of the islands should not be introduced.</p>

Respondent 67
Location or Property Description

J Midicliiff & J Hall 10 Neata St. Corinda 4075
 441 Palm Beach Rd. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondents object to the listing of their block as "DP" and strongly protest the lack of consideration and consultation.</p> <p>Respondents believe their block is high and dry.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot is in DP category 4. Lot should be inspected to validate designation.</p>

Respondent 68 J Taege & S Hamilton 862 Kingston Rd. Waterford West 4133
Location or Property Description Lot 26 on RP981903

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondents purchased lot on 28/5/98 after being informed that they would be able to construct a dwelling. They were never told that there was a chance it could be resumed or have restrictions placed on it. Respondents plans are on hold until the Study is finalised and they feel as though this is very unfair.	Owners should be advised that building applications can be lodged until the Strategy is adopted. Lot is in DP categories 2 and 4.

Respondent 69 M D Newman 17 Parer Ave. Condell Park NSW 2200
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Seeking information on best way to get to Russell Island from Sydney.	

Respondent 70 M Quain <emmanuel@gil.com.au>
Location or Property Description R31 on the area zone map

Summary of Issues	Response
Area is of low conservation. Buffer zone is the reason offered for acquisition. Respondent wonders how this can be justified without hard data. He asks is there no room for compromise.	See No. 64

Respondent 71 J Vella 32 Sheffield St. Merrylands
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondents lot is subject to reclamation as it is 'DP'. Her sister inquired to find out the purchase price, which no-one was able to give. The respondent is worried how a budget for the strategy has been set yet purchase prices were not taken into account.	Noted. Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition price.

Respondent 72 H & K Psarros 219 Jones Rd. Bellbird Park 4300
Location or Property Description Lot 36 Kilty Lane Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot subject to acquisition. Respondents totally disagree with the RSC acquiring land. Matter will be taken to the local member.	The lot is designated DP Category 7 and partially Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the basis for determining lots for acquisition.

Respondent 73 R Rossi 9 Macedon St. Bossley Park NSW 2176
Location or Property Description Drainage affected lot

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is subject to acquisition. The respondent wishes to know the acquisition price which should take into account purchase price and rates. Is the respondents lot one of the 23 to be further assessed. Respondent does not consider her lot as being 'DP'.	Lot not given. Advise landowner of the basis for acquisition costs.

Respondent 74 R Best 2336 Dawn Circle Carson City <russ@incorporators.com>
Location or Property Description Not applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
The respondent is angry that his land is subject to acquisition.	Advise landowner of the basis for determining land for acquisition and acquisition costs.

Respondent 75 G J Webb 168 Canaipa Point Dr. Russell Island 4184
Location or Property Description Not applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Petition signed by 40 persons wishing that an Inquiry is conducted into the Bay Island ratepayers subsidising the mainland infrastructure programs, while little is spent on the islands themselves.	Noted and Council advised.

Respondent 76

P Tansey 6 Rathowen Pde. Killarney Heights NSW 2087

Location or Property Description

Not applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Why does Council waste landowner's, subject to acquisitions, time on response sheets that are largely irrelevant to them? When will RSC stop using the respondent as a cash cow and then "insult" him with irrelevant surveys.	Noted.

Respondent 77

T & B Evans Lot 15 Mt. Tarampa Rd. Mt. Tarampa 4311 <SMTP.bev@hypermax.net.au> (according to B Fuller, this is the work of Dr David Vance UQ ph: 3365 5491)

Location or Property Description

Not applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Many people are trying to pay off mortgages and the Council wants to acquire the land at a very low cost.</p> <p>Composting toilets and the recycling of grey water should be investigated further.</p> <p>There should be conservation listings for mangroves.</p> <p>Dr David Vance's Assessment of the Strategy: Regarding Newsletter No: 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of recognition of the advantages of composting toilets. Lack of consideration of the intermediate option of construction of a pedestrian, cycle and moped bridge to the mainland. Not having provided the appropriate figures for comparison/ reference in the "Land use and Development pattern". Not having noted in the Cultural Heritage section that Strategy Response measures included compulsory acquisitions. Falsely having stated that 'undevelopable' lots will be acquired at an assumed average valuation, when in fact they would be acquired at a 'market value'. <p>Misleadingly stating "recommended for possible acquisition", when in fact the recommendations incorporated a large number of 'absolutely' recommended for acquisition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All further information documents should be made available on the internet. 	<p>Noted. Acquisition price will be that the landowners would receive on the open market.</p> <p>Noted. Sewerage is the preferred long term effluent management strategy. On site systems aren't always effective for part-time operation. Mangroves are in very high conservation areas.</p> <p>Noted. See above.</p> <p>Noted. Not feasible or consistent with the island image.</p> <p>Noted. Were available on display or by request.</p> <p>Noted. No sites are being acquired on the sole basis of cultural heritage protection. This happens to be an added benefit.</p> <p>Noted. The development costs quoted in the Newsletter adopted an assumed average value. The Strategy (sect. 7.3) clearly refers to market value.</p> <p>Landowner should be advised of the ability to lodge a BA and the basis for identifying acquisition areas.</p> <p>Acquisition of conservation areas would be subject to adoption of Strategy and a final survey.</p> <p>Noted. This is up to RSC.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Regarding the Response Sheet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The middle category should be made a neutral response, otherwise the results will be biased. 2 main areas that are fundamentally different and require data collection for each; 1. Is the respondent in agreement with a particular aspect; 2. Will the plan lead to the realisation of the particular aspect. <p>Regarding the UCV of property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UCV has plunged in the last few months. Respondent asks the question if this is linked to the proposed acquisitions. <p>Respondent also questions the apparent unavailability of information regarding acquisitions to the public.</p> <p>Respondents strongly object to the acquisition of their land as their life savings are invested in the lot.</p>	<p>Noted. Responses were not intended to provide statistically robust analysis, just general guidance as to whether the strategies were on the right track.</p> <p>Noted. Response sheet provided opportunity for comments if respondent so wished.</p> <p>Valuations occurred prior to and independently to the DRAFT Strategy preparation. Valuations simply reflect recent sales.</p> <p>Noted. Final decision on acquisitions will depend on support from the State Govt.</p> <p>Noted. Lots for acquisition on the edge of the conservation areas would be subject to a survey.</p>

Respondent 78

S Whitehead 1/2 Daylesford Rd. Springfield, Tasmania 7009.

Location or Property Description

42 Coondooroopa Dr. on RP31213 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>No prior warning that the lot is subject to proposed acquisition.</p> <p>Land valuation has reduced from \$31,000 to \$24,000 in the last year.</p> <p>Compensation should be prompt and take into account the purchase sum, rates and services paid, interest paid on loans and an amount for injurious affection within reasonable grounds of the situation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 79

L Holt Queensland Conservation Foundation, PO Box 12046 Elizabeth St. Brisbane 4002

Location or Property Description

Not applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The area's regional landscape value should be assessed by RSC and the State.</p> <p>Impacts external to the islands must be addressed when considering future likely development. Impacts of resident and visitor population on and off the islands should be addressed.</p> <p>Development on the islands is well in excess of the level than should occur. There are a number of ways to further reduce the number of lots:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion of conventional tourist resorts. • Increase Res. A lot size through incentives and performance requirements. • Increase Res. A lot size to 2000 sq. m, where on-site effluent disposal is involved. • Retaining a higher proportion of existing terrestrial and tidal influenced vegetation. • Develop on-site effluent disposal rules that restrict numbers of occupants per lot or per catchment to an ecologically sustainable level. • Pricing the supply of infrastructure and of services to residents/lot owners on a full cost recovery basis. <p>The cost of providing sewerage infrastructure is so high that advanced on-site effluent disposal technology would be very cost competitive. DNR staff (eg. Peter Beavis) should be consulted on such issues.</p> <p>Performance of existing septic systems should be assessed by RSC to see whether health and environmental requirements are met.</p> <p>Encourage residents to install rainwater tanks or pricing water so that conservation measures will be carried out by residents.</p> <p>Strict on-site effluent disposal requirements for grey water.</p> <p>Objection to the DRAFT Strategy ignoring Section 33 of the 1997 Water EPP.</p> <p>Suitable water quality standards be adopted in the policy for treated wastewater disposal from on-site systems.</p> <p>The stormwater strategy is very rudimentary and could not satisfy the requirements in the Water EPP section's 36, 40-43.</p> <p>The Strategy is not consistent with the Strategic Plan in 3 respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas marked for island residential use and habitat protection are marked different. • Far more residential use is envisaged by the strategy. • Strategy proposes residential, resort, day-tripper and commercial land uses and infrastructure provision that substantially exceed those envisaged by the Plan. <p>Study is inconsistent with the Moreton Bay Marine Park Plan proposing development for Lamb Island that does not take into account the dugong and critical habitat area immediately east of the island.</p>	<p>Noted. Has been answered as part of this strategy.</p> <p>Noted. These have been addressed in relation to transport issues.</p> <p>All these measures were considered. Rather than identify sustainable population levels (which has inherent problems), the approach taken was to identify key environmental attributes and stresses on these, and then introduce measures to address these. The resultant level of development would be sustainable if all measures are adopted.</p> <p>Sewerage is considered as the most appropriate long term effluent management strategy.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This is mentioned in the Strategy, but additional water conservation measures should also be included.</p> <p>Australian standards are adopted.</p> <p>Agree. Strategy should include measures for water conservation.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Strategy retrofits measures into existing subdivision pattern. It is not a greenfield site. The measures have been reviewed by DEH.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Strategy reduces current residential areas.</p> <p>Support services required to increase social and economic sustainability.</p> <p>Noted. Strategy reduces current development potential, and envisages only low key ecotourism and residential uses.</p>
<p>There is no reference to solid waste disposal in the Study.</p>	<p>Recommendations from Redland Shire Waste Management Study (1994)</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Oppose to the resort proposed for central eastern Macleay Island because of its scale and terrestrial and marine environmental constraints.</p> <p>RSC and DCILGP should review the environmental and planning acceptability of the land use in terms of vegetation, visual amenity, effluent disposal and other constraints and take action to withdraw rezoning approval where the uncommenced land uses do not match contemporary planning and environmental requirements.</p> <p>Support the intention not to build a bridge to Russell Island. However concerned about the intentions to expand the barge and ferry services.</p> <p>All new and expanded landing and mooring infrastructure should be determined by impacts on terrestrial and marine vegetation, the habitat and moving of marine creatures, acid sulphate soils, construction and dredging impacts and visual impacts.</p> <p>QCC proposes that sites for landing in figure's 10A and 10B be regarded as provisional only subject to EIA and development assessment.</p> <p>An explanatory addendum be released providing background information on the terrestrial and marine vegetation communities of the islands and the basis for them being allocated conservation priority.</p> <p>About 30%, not 10% of low priority conservation land should be retained.</p> <p>It is unclear whether and how land subject to an acquisition will be protected and acquired.</p> <p>Cost of acquisitions should be met in part by the remaining landowners.</p> <p>High conservation land be given protected area status.</p> <p>RSC develop special vegetation protection and animal control laws for the islands and apply mechanisms like VCAs.</p>	<p>are included in the Planning Study. These should be carried forward into the Strategy.</p> <p>A low key tourist facility, not a resort, was envisaged. Suggest the designation on Figure 10A be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>Noted. It has been reviewed.</p> <p>Noted. Improved access to the islands will diminish the need for development of supporting activities.</p> <p>Noted. All such infrastructure is subject to an EIS.</p> <p>Noted. This has been recommended in the Strategy, Figures 10A and 10B should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Noted. A letter should be distributed to all respondents outlining the basis for determining conservation priority areas in the Planning Study.</p> <p>Noted. Clearing controls are proposed to protect vegetation in low conservation priority areas.</p> <p>Noted. Land will be zoned open space or environmental protection.</p> <p>Noted. There are equity problems with this suggestion.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted. Animal controls need further consideration at DCP stage.</p>

Respondent 80

B & P Sutton 20-26 Spoonbill Dr. Elimbah 4516

Location or Property Description

Lots 264 & 265 on RP31212 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lots are identified as “Conservation to be considered for acquisition”.</p> <p>The lots are 2 cleared residential lots, amalgamated as suggested by Council, containing no native flora or fauna of significance and has been like that for many years.</p> <p>Lots are surrounded from behind and to one side by new dwellings and one is undergoing construction directly across the street.</p> <p>The shaded areas shown on the map even cover existing new dwellings.</p> <p>Chose land to retire on and have already spent in excess of \$80,000 on it.</p> <p>As no notification was received from Council the respondents would like the shaded area to be removed from their lots.</p>	<p>Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining land for acquisition and acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 81

V Vella 44 Stradbroke Dr. Russell Island 4184

Location or Property Description

Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondent states that if a bridge is not constructed by 2001, “we taken the island over”.	Noted. Bridge is inconsistent with the island image.

Respondent 82

R Rideout 112 Tannum Beach Van Park Tannum Sands 4680

Location or Property Description

Lot 42 Southend Rd. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot is on the list to be acquired by Council due to being identified as medium conservation.</p> <p>Dream of retiring to the island.</p> <p>There are houses behind the lot and at the end of the street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining land for acquisition and acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 83 L Ford PO Box 367 Maroochydore 4558
Location or Property Description Lot 63 on RP133991 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot will be acquired if the strategy is implemented.</p> <p>Respondent paid \$11,000 for the lot in 1982 and the present value is \$5,500.</p> <p>The respondent objects paying annual rates of 786.93 per year until the lot is acquired (about 5 years). This nearly amounts to its present value.</p> <p>The plan may hold some value for the minority of landholders not effected, but the majority are going to have to foot the bill for the RSC's incompetence in the first place.</p> <p>Compensation offered is totally inadequate and should at least amount to rates paid, plus interest plus an adequate compensation value for the lot.</p>	<p>Lot is partially in a High Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Noted. Agree that it is unreasonable for landowners of lots potentially identified for acquisition to continue to pay rates before the Strategy is resolved. This issue has been raised with Council Officers.</p>

Respondent 84 G Ford PO Box 367 Maroochydore 4558
Location or Property Description Lot 169 on RP130091 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot will be acquired if the strategy is implemented.</p> <p>Respondent paid \$11,000 for the lot in 1982 and the present value is \$5,500.</p> <p>The respondent objects paying annual rates of 786.93 per year until the lot is acquired (about 5 years). This nearly amounts to its present value.</p> <p>The plan may hold some value for the minority of landholders not effected, but the majority are going to have to foot the bill for the RSC's incompetence in the first place.</p> <p>Compensation offered is totally inadequate and should at least amount to rates paid, plus interest plus an adequate compensation value for the lot.</p>	<p>Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Noted. Agree that it is unreasonable for landowners of lots potentially identified for acquisition to continue to pay rates before the Strategy is resolved. This issue has been raised with Council Officers.</p>

Respondent 85 L Kravchenko 41 Rocklea St. Archerfield 4108
Location or Property Description Lot 42 and Lot 70 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lots are to be acquired.</p> <p>Lots purchased in 1969 and the respondent would appreciate if compensation would include the rates paid in good faith all these years.</p>	<p>RP or Street name, not given.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining acquisition price.</p>

Respondent 86 A Hardy 4 Penny Place Ourimbah NSW 2258

Location or Property Description Lot 295 on RP129105 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot earmarked for conservation. The respondent has owned it since 1973, paying rates and in recent times a slashing fee of \$100 a year to remove rubbish and excessive growth.	Land is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the basis for determining land for acquisition and acquisition price.

Respondent 87 B Delly 17 Lobe St. Bald Hills 4036
Location or Property Description Lot 19 on RP110407 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondent strongly objects to the lot being marked for acquisition for conservation purposes. Respondent has owned the lot since 1981 and intended to retire there. The lot is in a well developed residential area and there appears to be no logical reason why it should have been set aside in this fashion.	Land is partially in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the ability to lodge a BA and the basis for determining land for acquisition and acquisition price.

Respondent 88 R Hart PO Box 1684 Darwin NT 0801
Location or Property Description Lot 338

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is going to be acquired by council for conservation purposes. Respondent has the following queries: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the council going to pay for the lot?• Is he getting 'ripped off'?• How has this come about that the council wants the block back?• What use will the block be put to?	No RP or Street name given. Advise landowner of the basis for determining land for acquisition and acquisition price.

Respondent 89 N Armstrong c/o Post Office Deniliquin NSW 2710
Location or Property Description Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Bought lot with the dream of retiring there. Object to the go ahead of the plan on the grounds that it would severely restrict the respondents use of the land and the compensation paid is possibly less than what they originally purchased the lot for.	Noted.

Respondent 90 H & D Duncan-Kemp 29 Aubigny Rd Oakey 4401
Location or Property Description Lot 93 on RP126466 Lamb Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is NOT subject to acquisition but would make an ideal park or playground. Due to circumstances the respondents cannot continue to move there and find it difficult to make the rate payments. Acquired at a mutually agreed price.	Noted. Should be acquired if the landowner agrees. Advise landowner of the basis for determining acquisition/purchase price.

Respondent 91 A Adamopoulos 55 Olive St. Prospect SA 5082
Location or Property Description Lot 185 on RP127748 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
The lot is listed for acquisition. Respondent is interested in selling the property.	Noted.

Respondent 92 S Appleton PO Box 13994 - Magenta - 98803 Noumea cedex New Caledonia
Location or Property Description Lot 6 on RP130515 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Is the lot zoned Res. A and/ or zoned in an area concerned with DP. Fax: (687) 253752.	Lot is designated as DP category 2.

Respondent 93
Location or Property Description

V Jewell 8/ 1 Poinsetta Av. Runaway Bay 4216
16 Stuart St. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot has been recommended for acquisition. Respondent do not wish to continue to pay rates on the lot as they are on a pension. However would be happy to negotiate with the RSC to sell it.	Noted. Advise landowner of the basis for acquisition.

Respondent 94
Location or Property Description

L Jones & W Ring 27 Rickard Rd. Warrimoo NSW 2774
Lot 59/10 Gunsynd St. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the current zoning of the lot?• Under current zoning and proposed zonings can a residence still be built on the lot in the next 12 months?• Will the proposed re-zoning affect the building of a residence on the lot after 12 months?• Will the proposed re-zoning affect the building of a residence on the lot at anytime?• Why has the rateable value of the land been reduced recently when current trends in the transfer of vacant land has shown a marginal appreciation since the purchase some 10 years ago?• Please advise of the final date for objection to any proposed re-zoning or alteration to the current usage of the lot?	Lot is partially in a High Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of basis for determining lots for acquisition and that BAs would be considered until Strategy implemented.

Respondent 95
Location or Property Description

B Roebuck 30 Mark Rd. Russell Island 4184
Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Whatever plan is adopted, someone will be upset. This plan is for the preservation of the beautiful island lifestyle for future generations. Respondent wishes the plan every success.	Noted.

Respondent 96
Location or Property Description

S Marshall 9 Schmidt Rd. Eagleby 4207
 Lot 132 on RP132856 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent does not want her land taken away, she doesn't want to sell. If the respondent does not have any say, she wants all the money she has spent on the lot which is about \$12,000, or she will swap for a Res. A. lot on Russell Island.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot is designated as DP category 4 and exists in a Very High Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the basis for determining acquisition areas and the acquisition price.</p>

Respondent 97
Location or Property Description

T McJarrow 347 Redland Bay Rd. Capalaba Qld
 Lot 27 on RP130218 Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Brought to the respondents attention that the Council may not be approving Building Permits on land classified DP. Before purchasing the lot the respondent new it was DP, but was assured they could build albeit after raising a proportion of the land for this purpose. The respondent also made extensive enquiries into dryness, drainage and a soil sample before purchasing. The respondent formally objects to this decision and also queries why the following questions have not been answered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Council going to buy back such land? • If affirmative, what procedure will be used for the valuations? • In what time frame is the above, likely to be achieved? • At what stage do the owners discontinue to pay rates? • When are the owners likely to be personally informed about such matters? 	<p>Noted. This is correct. Lot is in DP category 3. Land identified for acquisition. Advise landowner of the basis for determining acquisition costs.</p>

Respondent 98
Location or Property Description

M Levin 16 Mango Cres. Macleay Island 4184
 Lot 1 on RP85673 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>3 Proposals:</p> <p>1. re Acquisition of the waterhole area on the above lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose that the waterhole area on the lot be left in the respondents hands as Council has proven to be totally unreliable in matters of ecological importance on the islands. • Amalgamated with Lot 58. The respondents live on the site and have a shed and driveway on Lot 1. • A major reason for the purchase of Lot 1 was to create a native flora and fauna sanctuary. So far the respondent has cleared the area of noxious weeds and planted over 1000 native plants, put in 800m of irrigation to maintain flora using the waterhole as the irrigation source. The respondents have also added boardwalks and bridges to facilitate moving around and fenced the area to comply with Council’s request. • Since the beautification started taking place, native fauna has returned to the area, but the respondents believe their work is not finished. • If the area is reclaimed and the fence removed much of their planted trees will be stolen, as was the case before the fence. • The respondents believe they are 5 years ahead in achieving the aims of the Moreton Bay Strategic Plan. <p>2. re. Acquisition of Lot 4 Pecan St. Macleay Island.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same landholder owns Lot 5 and should be given the chance to amalgamate. This would achieve the same purpose at no cost to the Council. • Lots 30 and 31 or 31 and 32 be acquired as well as Lots 1, 2, 3 Pecan St., the western end of Pecan St. be closed and the entire area be made into an artificial wetland deep enough to support fish life during the dry season. • The respondents would be happy to look after the area of Lots 1, 2 and 3, purchase it even, or take up a peppercorn lease (the condition being that it is properly fenced). <p>3. Drainage of Mango Cres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street would be better drained if any drainage was to run directly along the adjoining boundaries between Lots 55 and 57, 49 and 56. This would get water into the pipe under High Central Rd. and put more water into the wetlands to the west, instead of into the respondents wetland area. 	<p>Noted. Lot should be amalgamated with Lot 58 and then the area would not be subject to acquisition. Suggest Council should inspect this site.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Recommend a site visit to clarify drainage issues.</p>

Respondent 99 (No Name) 524 Musgrave Rd. Coopers Plains 4108
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondents worked hard all their life to buy the block and is not going to give it up, and they believe neither will any other voting landholders.</p> <p>Will fight the acquisitions all the way.</p> <p>Already a large protest group organised and an enormous petition under way.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Advise landowner that they can still lodge a BA prior to the Strategy being formally adopted.</p>

Respondent 100 M & R Bourke PO Box 148 Point Lookout 4183
Location or Property Description Lot 328 on RP128019 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Object to the flora/ fauna category for the above lot.</p> <p>Bought lot 20 years ago with a view of retiring. Building on the lot would not have an adverse affect on the flora and fauna.</p>	<p>The majority of the lot exists within a Very High Conservation Priority Area. The remaining portion is in a Low Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining conservation priority areas.</p>

Respondent 101 W Ryan 97 Coish Av. Benalla Vic. 3672
Location or Property Description Lot not given, Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent paid \$16,750 for the lot in 1990. At the first rates notice, the land was valued at \$6, 300 and the rates were \$496. In 1997 the land was valued at \$5000 and the rates were \$856. In 1998 the land was valued at \$1500 and the rates are \$754.93.</p> <p>Still respondents belief that rates are calculated according to land value.</p> <p>This is the third letter the respondent has sent. If he doesn't get a reasonable reply he is sending a complaint to the Premier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is water available to the lot? • Is electricity available to the lot? • Are sealed roads and footpaths adjacent to the lot? • Are Unimproved Land Valuations the basis for rate calculations? • Are there any drainage facilities or problems associated with the lot? • Is the lot zoned suitable for the construction of a dwelling? 	<p>Noted. Forward to Council for response as no lot details provided.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the lot zoned Res. A? • Is the lot zoned in an area that will be acquired? • Why are land prices falling and rates rising? 	

Respondent 102 C Larrusso c/o A Larrusso 8 Buckingham St. Canley Vale NSW 2166
Location or Property Description Lot 28 on RP132640 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Respondent seeks details of any constraints to development on her mother's lot.	Lot is designated DP category 2 and is partially within a Very High Conservation Priority Area. Development would appear possible.

Respondent 103 M Peyrot C.M.S. Cafat BPF1 98848 Noumea
Location or Property Description 10 Kalara St. Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent agrees with the Strategy. Owners of a house built at the above address. Were authorised in 1997 to amalgamate, former lot 12, to the property. Respondent proposes to buy and revegetate Lots 249-251 RP31212 and be allowed to amalgamate with the already purchased lots. This is to further contribute to the completion of an effective "conservative area". Request that Council support the amalgamation, especially Lot 251 which has been earmarked for acquisition.</p>	<p>Noted. General support for the amalgamation of lots and for the protection of conservation values through vegetation management measures. Advise landowner of Council policy in relation to amalgamation.</p>

Respondent 104
Location or Property Description

R & M Sadler 3 St David St. Kenmore 4069
 Lot 119 on RP133630 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The team is to be congratulated if the proposals are put into effect. The website is also user friendly and informative.</p> <p>Steady drop in land values is almost certainly due to the lack of confidence in the future of the islands. Compensation prices should reflect land values before this uncertainty took place.</p> <p>More attention needs to be given to alternative ways of treating sewerage, in particular, Composting Toilets. These would achieve at least four critical ends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obviate the necessity to dispose of liquid effluent into the water table or the Bay. • Owners would act responsibly as to what materials they dispose of in their systems. • Reduce the demand for water. • Eliminate the necessity for water and sewerage reticulation in some areas. <p>Planning should include a thorough exploration of the value and practicality of environmental covenants on building blocks in certain designated areas.</p> <p>More attention needs to be paid to a network of cycle and pedestrian paths.</p> <p>Proposed land use development strategy should consider several more options such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanctuaries • Small fruit producing farms. <p>Important to have the support of island dwellers. If firm, realistic plans to rectify the mistakes of the past and create a distinctive island lifestyle, are proceeded with, owners will in general become more supportive.</p> <p>Full cooperation of various agencies for both funding and development control is vital.</p>	<p>Noted. Agree that the acquisition prices should reflect pre-Strategy land values, and may be determined in a separate Acquisition Strategy.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. These issue will be addressed as part of the implementation strategy.</p> <p>Noted. See above.</p> <p>Noted. The Strategy doesn't preclude these issues.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Respondent 105
Location or Property Description

T Chant 44/ 109 Mt. Cotton Rd. Capalaba 4157
 Lot 31 Nunkeri Dr. Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Protest to the proposed acquisition of the lot. It's a one acre lot purchased for retirement. The lot is high and dry without drainage problems, 200m from the water. The lot is lightly treed and backs onto a 70 acre forest. There is already one house built on a lot at the back of the respondents lot. Other 'future' residents in the street are also concerned.</p>	<p>Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the basis for identifying acquisition areas.</p>

Respondent 106
Location or Property Description

B Sadler 23 Rivett Way Brentwood WA 6153
 Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Overall population of the Island will end up quite high and great care needs to be taken. Respondent suggests a graduated level of infrastructure on Russell Island. The north having the most infrastructure and the area to the south, having the least because of their complex proximity to the conservation areas. There should be compulsory composting toilets, grey water systems and low-footprint houses in this area. Novel and sensitive dwelling options should be considered for the highly sensitive areas to minimise environmental impact. Every effort would need to be made to prevent the monstrous foreshore houses that exist elsewhere in Australia.</p>	<p>Noted. Noted. This is exactly what is envisaged, however it was concluded that these measures would be inadequate. Noted. No dwellings should be permitted in highly sensitive areas. People contribute to the impact on these areas, not just clearing vegetation and dwellings. Noted.</p>

Respondent 107
Location or Property Description

J Rule PO Box 74 Russell Island 4184
 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent wrote to the Council 6 weeks ago regarding "Neem" trees for pest control, the Council has not responded.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 108

R Carter 11 Charles Tce. Macleay Island 4184

Location or Property Description

Lots 13 to 18 on RP111498

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The Conservation Priority Map shows the above lots as Res. A. The Drainage Area Map shows them as Categories 4 and 6 - Is the Council having 2 Bob eachway?</p> <p>Is it possible to extend the green on the Conservation Map along to allotment 13?</p> <p>The respondent hopes this will be re-examined and acquired as soon as possible and be added to the Wetlands being currently set aside to be named the Paul Carter Wetlands. The respondent would be very embarrassed to take the Bishop, the Mayor and the Official Party through the wetlands, only to have someone point out that they were considered as Res. A. by the Study Team.</p> <p>Several groups will be supporting RSC's application to the Commonwealth to reclaim Lots 1 and 12 on RP117590 and Lots 13 to 19 on RP111498. Respondent has been assured that RSC can apply for the finance to reclaim under the Coastline Protection Plan.</p> <p>All lands containing mangroves should become part of the Moreton Bay Marine Park. Respondent has the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undeveloped lots with 450 sq. m above RL2.4 shall be re-surveyed at the expense of the State Govt. along the RL2.4 mark and a new title above the line issued to the landholder, the balance being vested in the crown. • Undeveloped lots less than 450 sq. m above the RL2.4 line, be surrendered to the crown. The land above vested in the RSC and the land below vested in the crown. • Developed lots should be surveyed off at the expense of the State Govt. The land below vested in the crown. Where a house crosses the line, the freeholder title be exchanged for a 20 year lease and the house be shifted to a higher lot provided by Council. • After all the land is eventually returned to the crown that is below the RL2.4 line, a rough track be constructed around the islands for tourists to use. 	<p>The Conservation Priority Map doesn't show zonings. It only indicates whether or not lots are in a conservation priority area.</p> <p>Lot 18 is partially within a Very High Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>The extent of the final conservation areas are subject to a final survey.</p> <p>Lot 13 should be included if the owner supports this view.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. The philosophy of having land below RL2.4m in public ownership is acknowledged. However, it is considered essential or even desirable to have all such areas available to the public in view of sensitivity of some inter-tidal habitat areas. Providing development is precluded from land below RL2.4, vegetation protection measures are enforced and public access to the foreshore is provided at several convenient locations; the Strategy will be sustainable.</p>

Respondent 109 J Kempnich 2883 Old Cleveland Rd. Capalaba 4157
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
The "Vision" is only a means of acquiring land at a very cheap price at the expense of the landholder.	Noted.

Respondent 110 J Hepworth MS 2213 Lowood 4311
Location or Property Description Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Council denied intentions of acquiring the respondents block for years, but now they do. Respondent is unhappy because he has paid rates since 1984 and has kept the block cleared. No indication has been given on the value of compensation the respondent will receive.	No lot description is provided. Advise landowner of the ability to lodge a Building Application until the final Strategy is adopted as well as the basis for determining acquisition prices.

Respondent 111 L Hackett 16 Cotton Tree Av. Macleay Island 4184
Location or Property Description Lot 12 on SP102404 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is subject to acquisition for DP. Attached is a map showing the 'real' contours of lot 11 RP111529, which is amalgamated into lot 12 SP102404 and is the parcel indicated for proposed acquisition. Respondent believes that this contour map is a better representation of the area than the Strategy's aerial photograph and as a result of this new information, the land is not drainage constrained and should not be subject to acquisition.	Lot 11 is DP category 1 and Lot 12 is DP category 7. Based on detailed survey, Lot 11 should be recategorised as DP Category 2 when final strategy plan prepared.

Respondent 112
Location or Property Description

S Williams 137 Pinjarra Rd. Pinjarra Hills 4069
 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Appears that very little consideration has been given to acquisitions.</p> <p>Respondent owns 2 adjacent lots on Wirralee St. Macleay Island. One is to be acquired.</p> <p>All lots on the northern side of Wirralee St. be removed from being subject to acquisition. Other areas should be carefully reassessed.</p> <p>Acquiring 1 of the respondents lots would greatly reduce the value of the other.</p> <p>Figures shown for compensation are far too low considering land valuations, rates, services provided etc.</p> <p>It is not clear which lots will be acquired especially considering that the conservation boundary passes through some lots.</p> <p>Some roads have one side marked for acquisition, won't this be a waste of services only serving one side of the road?</p>	<p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition areas and the acquisition prices.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. The lots should be amalgamated and thus would avoid the need for acquisition.</p> <p>Noted. Advise landowner of the basis for determining acquisition values.</p> <p>Noted. The final boundary areas for acquisition will be subject to a survey.</p> <p>Noted. This would not be an efficient use of services, however road standards are minimal and no sewerage would be required.</p>

Respondent 113
Location or Property Description

J Kelly 17 Adelaide St. Dun Laoghaire Co Dublin Ireland
 Lot 28 on RP124451 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondents lot is virtually worthless now due to the devaluing (dropped by over 300% in a year), a liability not an asset.</p> <p>It is an issue centred on the demolition of an asset. The respondents have instructed their solicitors accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition areas and the acquisition prices.</p>

Respondent 114 A Bailey General Manager National Bus Company PO Box 1190 Capalaba 4157
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
Company is under a commercial contract where conditions require coordinating services with other modes of transport. The water vessel operators have no regulating body to issue these conditions onto them. There is an obvious need to improve connections.	Noted. This part is acknowledged in the Strategy in regards to the need for service contracts for water transport operators.

Respondent 115 A & T Scammell 78 Rosia Rd. Park Ridge 4125
Location or Property Description Lot 77 on RP133379 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot has been identified to be acquired. Lot 76 and 77 are recognised as one property by the RSC and buildings are situated on both. Newsletter 5 stated that such lots would not be acquired.	Noted. Advise landowner lots with existing buildings will generally not be acquired.

Respondent 116 S & J Roberts 29 Caloola Av. Koonawarra NSW 2530
Location or Property Description 33 Forest Hill Rd. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is not subject to acquisition but respondent would like to sell the lot.	No lot description has been provided.

Respondent 117
Location or Property Description

P Bartlett 17 Todd Av. Ashgrove 4060
 Lot 33 Tulip St. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot has an acquisition boundary line marked through it. Respondent would prefer to keep the block or at least 1000 sq. m to plant native trees and shrubs, but if necessary is willing to let half of the lot be acquired (lot is 1200 sq. m). RSC has approved building in the top corner of the lot and a soil test has been done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the proposed acquisition leave enough land to be built on? • Can the respondent negotiate the amount of land that would be acquired? • Who would be responsible for re-surveying the lot? • What would be the compensation for the part that would be acquired? 	<p>Lot is partially within a High Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Noted. If a Building Approval has been issued (and is current), the lot will not be acquired.</p> <p>Issue of whether lots partially within an acquisition area are to be acquired will be determined as part of final Acquisition Strategy. In principle, if sufficient area exists outside acquisition area (say 450 m²) it would not be necessary to acquire the lot.</p>

Respondent 118
Location or Property Description

J Story 2 Sylvia St. Underwood 4119
 Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Proposals do not seem to address the problem of over population on Karragarra Is. Amalgamation and resale of larger blocks would seem to be a way around it. The \$5500 estimate for compensation on Karragarra Is. Is significantly below some recent sales values. The unimproved value would seem to be a better guide. Any resumption should be done quickly to minimise the amount of rates being paid by the landowners.</p>	<p>Noted. Increasing minimum lot sizes was not supported at the Island Summit although amalgamation incentives were envisaged.</p> <p>Noted. Acquisition prices are generally based on the market value.</p> <p>Noted. This will depend on support from the State Govt. Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition price.</p>

Respondent 119
Location or Property Description

T & G Parkin 735 Main Western Rd. Tamborine Mountain
 Russell and Macleay Islands

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Strategy is an asset stripping exercise on the respondents' 13 year investment in properties on Russell and Macleay Islands.</p> <p>The properties were the respondents investment funds as they are self employed.</p> <p>During the 13 years rates have doubled as well as other costs such as mowing and clearing of lots. At the same time the value of them is declining.</p> <p>It seems to the respondents that the rates collected are spent elsewhere.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 120
Location or Property Description

J Maria 106 St. Andrew's Dr. Tewantin 4565
 Lot 84 (11 Kurrajong Rd.) and Lot 85 (27 Coombah Dr.) Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Purchased lots nearly 30 yrs ago for \$1000, now it is worth only \$5000. This has been more than erased by the rates paid in that time.</p> <p>When lots were purchased there were good views and the respondent paid the RSC to slash to maintain these views. However now the views are blocked by trees and the respondent feels this is the reason for the devaluation in the lots.</p> <p>If these lots are to be used in the carrying out of the Strategy then the respondent would be happy to sell as she agrees with the Strategy's objectives.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining land for acquisition as well as an acquisition price.</p> <p>Noted</p>

Respondent 121
Location or Property Description

E Sopp 29 Jensen St. Banyo 4014
 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Due to the Strategy, many restrictions on building would be placed on respondent.</p> <p>If acquired, compensation should amount to the purchase price and a reasonable amount of rates paid over the years.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining an acquisition price.</p>

Respondent 122 R Jameson 136 Allee De La Bastide 83700 Saint-Raphael France 20
Location or Property Description Lot 26 on RP131827 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Will lot be acquired or how can the respondent sell it.	Lot is in a Low Conservation Priority Area and is not a candidate for acquisition.

NOTE: Response 123 is from an Interest Group and is included in Attachment 2.

Respondent 124 C & A Berry 3 Lakeside Cres. Croydon Hills Vic. 3136
Location or Property Description Lot 256 on RP131830 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is not subject to acquisition, but respondents are keen to sell the land or swap with one that is listed for acquisition but whose owners don't want to sell.	Noted. Any lots listed for acquisition will not be capable of being developed.

Respondent 125 B Lukin PO Box 132 Southport 4215
Location or Property Description Lot 147 on RP130218 Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is subject to acquisition for conservation reasons. Respondent wishes to be provided with any information which will inform them of what is happening/ going to happen/ what can and can't be done about it.	Lot is in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the grounds for acquisition and the basis for determining the acquisition prices.

NOTE: Response 126 is from an Interest Group and is included in Attachment 2.

Respondent 127 A Palmer 4 Adelaide St. Esk 4312
Location or Property Description Lot 83 on RP127449 Lamb Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Lot is subject to acquisition due to conservation priorities.	Lot is partially in a Very High Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the grounds for acquisition and the basis for determining the acquisition prices.
Respondent feels that this is grossly unfair considering the lot is serviced by a sealed road and only has a few trees on it.	Noted.
Rates and levies are too high.	Noted.
If the strategy goes ahead the respondent will use all legal means and the media to stop it. He will sue if he has to.	Noted

Respondent 128 P & G Newman 21 Buena Vista Av. Thorlands 4164
Location or Property Description Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Strategy sounds very good.	Noted.
Problem is how negative will the effect be on the landowners who lose their lots, as the respondent will? What will be the compensation? Will it take into account rates and levies paid?	Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition prices.
Respondents feel they have lost around \$9,000 to \$10,000 already through rates paid and devaluation of the lot.	

Respondent 129 J Dubson Australian Marine Conservation Society PO Box 3139 Yeronga 4104
Location or Property Description Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
The AMCS notes the importance of the Strategy.	Noted.

Respondent 130 W Horbowski (no address)
Location or Property Description Lot 89 Tenanne St. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Part of the lot is set to be resumed. The lowest part of the lot is at least 2 m above the high water mark, therefore the respondent wishes to know why the lot is being resumed.	Lot is partially in a High Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of general policy in regard to lots partially in acquisition/conservation areas.

Respondent 131
Location or Property Description

B Fuller 441 17 Mile Rocks Rd. 17 Mile Rocks 4073
 Lot 104 on RP126539 Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Respondent has asked the Premier and Hon. Terry Mackenroth MP to cancel the Study or start another Consultation period where all landholders are included.</p> <p>Lot is subject to partial acquisition for conservation purposes. This partial area presently is grass and fruit trees (photographs with submission).</p> <p>Respondent has being paying rates for over 13 years and would like to know who and under what criteria was his land assessed. He would like to be present at the next survey of his land and he will bring along his own expert to assess RSC's criteria.</p> <p>The respondent will not accept the small amount of compensation he would receive because he is not giving up his land.</p> <p>Why have the land values decreased by such a large proportion and rates continued to rise?</p> <p>Respondent has and plans to make constant contact with the Premier, Hon Mackenroth and Howard Hobbs over this issue.</p> <p>Attached are copies of responses from the Premier, Hon. Mackenroth, Dr David Vance and various photographs and paper extracts.</p> <p>See Submission 77 about the use of Dr David Vance's Assessment of the Strategy.</p>	<p>Landowner have been included in consultation process.</p> <p>Lot is partially in a Very High Conservation Priority Area.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. A breakdown of the rates should be provided.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. See separate response.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the ability to lodge a BA and general policy relating in regard to lots partially in acquisition/conservation areas.</p>

Respondent 132
Location or Property Description

J Cooling 11 Davey Rd. Mt. Evelyn Vic. 3796
 Lot 17 on RP130249 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot is in a high acquisition area for drainage and conservation.</p> <p>Respondent has just paid the excessive rates on the lot and it seems pointless to keep doing this if she cannot develop on it.</p> <p>The respondent has already had one lot acquired in Patterson St. by the RSC where she made a financial loss. If RSC was to resume the lot the respondent would hope for a reasonable price as she has already lost money.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Lot is partially in a Very High Conservation Priority Area and DP category 1.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition prices as well as the policy regarding the payment of rates.</p>

Respondent 133
Location or Property Description

D Kavanagh Macleay Island Bowls Club Inc. Benowa St. Macleay Island 4184
Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>The Club welcomes the Strategy, but has the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the concrete jetty at the end of Dalpura St. to ensure better island access. At present the 24 hour water taxi has had to relocate to the public jetty at the south end of the island and the fare is now \$30 which is out of many residents price range. • Reducing private vehicle usage will be heavily dependant on the provision of a new jetty and barge facility at the north end of the island. The location of this could be on Council owned land on the Coast Rd. between the Tingira Boat Club. • Mosquitoes are not an irritant but a growing health hazard and it is unclear what is intended by the recommendation for them. They must be treated separately and with a higher priority than midges. • The Club would welcome being included in the list of those community groups to be considered for inclusion in future requests for output. 	<p>Noted. Investigations are underway regarding a new jetty at the northern end of Macleay Island.</p> <p>Noted. No barge facility is envisaged as this would only increase vehicle usage.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. There is not a list, all members of the community are welcome to have an input.</p>

Respondent 134
Location or Property Description

S Kloda 51 Oates Av. Holland Park 4121
Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Object to Study and the fact that her lot will be resumed. The respondent will not allow this to happen. If it does occur she wants to be fully compensated the purchase price and all rates paid.</p>	<p>Noted. No lot details were provided.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining the acquisition prices.</p>

Respondent 135
Location or Property Description

R Kloda 51 Oates Av. Holland Park 4121
Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Object to Study and the fact that his lot will be resumed. The respondent will not allow this to happen. If resumption does occur he wants to be fully compensated the purchase price and all rates paid.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 139

S Goleby 362 Bloomfield St. Cleveland 4163

Location or Property Description

Lot 271 on RP31212 and 250, 251, 252 and 253 on RP31212 Macleay Island; Lots 2, 3 on RP80139 and 8, 9 on RP98141 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Strongly object to Lot 271 on RP31212 Macleay Island, being DP subject to acquisition as it is an elevated lot. Any road drainage problems could be overcome by piping the stormwater through an easement or along the road on a deeper angle against the slight rise.</p> <p>Lots 250, 251, 252 and 253 on RP31212 Macleay Island, do not have genuine conservation value as they are only sparsely treed and regularly mowed and they should be removed from such a category.</p> <p>Part of Lots 2, 3 on RP80139 and 8, 9 on RP98141 Russell Island, are marked for conservation. The respondent does not agree with this for the following reasons. Lots 2 and 3 are an existing shopping centre and Lots 8 and 9 do not have a tree on them and are zoned Comprehensive Development. The area contains most of Russell Island's shopping facilities and this should be consolidated rather than fragmented. The respondent further recommends that the whole conservation precinct that these lots exist in, be removed from having any conservation value. (Maps are attached to the Submission).</p>	<p>Noted. Lot 271 is in DP category 1. A site inspection should be conducted to validate DP Category.</p> <p>Noted. Lots are in a Medium Conservation Priority Area. However Lot 250 is only partially in this Area. These areas provide habitat and landscape values and constitute significant areas of disturbed but remnant vegetation.</p> <p>No lots with existing buildings will be required. Final boundaries of acquisition areas will be subject to survey. These lots are partially in a Medium Conservation Area.</p> <p>Retention of vegetation is considered desirable in all precincts. This precinct lies at the 'Gateway' to Russell Island and vegetation protection should be incorporated into future developments.</p>

Respondent 140
Location or Property Description

J Wittick 3 Barker Court Hamlyn Heights Vic. 3215
 Possum Pde. Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Lot is set to be acquired due to high priority conservation. Spent around \$32,000 (purchase price and rates) yet the acquisition price will only be approximately \$5,500. Respondent feels this is highway robbery.</p> <p>It concerns the respondent that the RSC knew about the drainage problems, the small lots sizes and that no town planning proposals were in place and still allowed development and were willing to collect rates at such a high price.</p> <p>Land rates and levies have amounted to around \$6,000 in the last 10 years and there are around 14,000 landowners. This totals approximately \$84,000,000 - where has the revenue gone.</p> <p>The respondent feels that the RSC wishes to develop an exclusive paradise for the rich and famous in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will acquisition take place on the respondents lot and for what amount? • Under who's authority will the strategy be implemented? • If approved, will the landowners still be required to pay rates until acquisition occurs? • Will landowners receive compensation under IPA? • What improvements on islands have been done with the rates? • Does the landowners' infrastructure cost of \$140 p/a contribute to this study? • What are the qualifications of the Planning Study Team? • Are any investors on these islands? • How did the Team negotiate the amount of the acquired properties? • How many landowners were involved in the Strategy? • Why does the Team foresee the plan to take over 3-5 years? • Will levy rates be compensated in land acquisition? • When will the final proposal be drafted and submitted? 	<p>Subject lot is in a High Conservation Priority Area. Advise landowner of the basis for determining lots for acquisition and the acquisition prices.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Study team cannot comment on this issue.</p> <p>Lot is subject to acquisition. State Council and RSC. This is under review. No. This should be addressed by Council. No. Not relevant. Not relevant. Acquisition prices, assumption based on recent sales. Landowner consulted. Funding constraints. No. When approved by State Government.</p>

Respondent 141
Location or Property Description

M Cooney 11 Adonis St. Inala 4077
Lot 17 on RP135390

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Classified drainage constrained. Respondent believes this is a mistake for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lot is on a crest and levels out on top.• Respondent has not seen any water run off the lot.• No erosion is present.• There is a slight slope away from the lot to adjacent block's 16 and 18. The lot is clear of debris as it is regularly slashed and mowed unlike neighbouring lots.• Zoned Res. A.	<p>Noted. Lot is identified as DP category 1. Suggest Council inspect site to validate category.</p>

Respondent 142
Location or Property Description

R Marshall 22 Harris St. Bellbird Park 4300
Lot 11 on RP131749 Russell Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Land is subject to acquisition and the respondent objects to this.</p> <p>The lot is considered to have 'moderate visual sensitivity'. The respondent agrees with this if the reasons are because of the large trees and the lot adjoins a creek, this is why he purchased the lot.</p> <p>The lot is rated as being 'poorly flushed' and is DP1 (at the end of the street). The respondent states that he never did plan to build on the lower portion of the lot and intended to keep this portion as a green area.</p>	<p>The lot is in the medium conservation priority category, it has not been identified as a DP lot.</p> <p>Advise landowner of the basis for determining acquisition areas.</p>

Respondent 143
Location or Property Description

R & K Pearce 10 Keith St. Macleay Island 4184
 Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Study has ignored the wishes of quite a number of residents.</p> <p>Respondents believe the Council is being influenced by a large number of non-resident landowners who bought lots as an investment and want development to take place.</p> <p>At a meeting held on 29/6/97 - All islanders (over 200 present) voted unanimously that they did not want major changes to the island's lifestyle. Subsequent meetings reinforced this.</p> <p>The vast majority who live on the islands do, to escape suburbia.</p> <p>The "GO SLOWLY" option has not been seriously considered at all. If it had been and included in workshop meetings, discussed in open forum, the respondent believes that a decision could have been possibly reached.</p> <p>The introduction of reticulated water on the islands has caused a drainage problem. Council should have done more research before implementing it.</p>	<p>Noted. Council has to balance the views of all landholders with the objective of achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>Noted. Macleay Island is the most developed and the most difficult to renew development patterns. The Strategy reflects the views of those who attended the Island Summit in regards to the need for greater protection of the existing vegetation.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. All options have been considered.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Respondent 144
Location or Property Description

W & K Noriega 38 Blue Bay Cres. Perulpa Island 4184
 Perulpa Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Congratulations on the Study.</p> <p>Perulpa Island is attached to Macleay Island via a causeway so that services are accessible.</p> <p>However Perulpa Island is an identity in itself albeit small. If every block was built on, on the island Council would encounter enormous problems of runoff into the bay.</p> <p>The island must be protected from over development and protection for the flora and fauna cannot be stressed enough.</p> <p>A separate population cap needs to be fitted to Perulpa Island. The present population is small, friendly and unique.</p>	<p>Noted. Stormwater measures are included in the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Clearing controls will be required on all of the islands.</p> <p>Noted. Existing owners could contribute by purchasing neighbouring lots and amalgamating. This would be encouraged by Council.</p>

Attachment 2

Summary of Interest Group Submissions and Response

Respondent 123

Macleay Island Conservation Group

Location or Property Description

Macleay Island

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>DP Category 2, 4 and 6: if this land also occurs in any conservation area then it ought to be acquired. In regards to category 6, no fill should be permitted on foreshore land, instead, acquire blocks.</p> <p>DP Category 7: Acquisition of all foreshore land in this category.</p> <p>DP Category 9: Request that these blocks be acquired and reclassified as High or Very High Conservation Priority Areas.</p> <p>All undeveloped blocks with mangroves should be reclassified as High or Very High Conservation Priority Areas. This will provide a buffer zone between the island and the Marine Park.</p> <p>Object to the fact Macleay Island has fewer areas of conservation priority.</p> <p>When the wetland areas are withdrawn from the High and Medium Conservation Priority Areas, only 2% of terrestrial land on Macleay Island will be protected, less than the National average.</p> <p>Upgrade some Low Priority Areas to Medium and High.</p> <p>Low or Medium Priority Conservation Areas that are also part of any Drainage or Open Space Corridor be upgraded to High Priority.</p> <p>Locality 5 - Central Area Precinct E - upgrade to medium conservation and preserved as open space and conservation area.</p> <p>Provide more open space to attract more day-trippers - they need somewhere to have BBQs etc.. Each precinct should have an open space area.</p> <p>Replace the words conservation areas with Low or Medium Conservation Priority Areas to protect High Priority areas (re: Development of Nature Trails along foreshore and in conservation areas).</p>	<p>Noted. Lots in a very high, high or medium conservation priority area are proposed for acquisition regardless of their DP category.</p> <p>Noted. Some blocks are marginally below RL2.4 and could be suitable for development. It is not feasible to acquire all foreshore lots in DP category 7.</p> <p>Noted. Many of these are elevated foreshore lots which would be developable providing access can be negotiated with landowners to the rear. The cost of acquiring these foreshore lots is not likely to be justified in terms of a contribution to sustainable development. Amalgamation with adjoining lots to gain access may provide a better long term outcome.</p> <p>This is generally the case.</p> <p>Noted. This is a result of past development outcomes on the island. The Study Team's assessment was based on what was there at the time of survey and based on floristic and faunal significance of vegetation.</p> <p>Vegetation protection will be required on all lots on the islands as well as open space corridors. Upgrading low conservation priority areas to preclude development couldn't be justified.</p> <p>No development has been included on medium conservation priority areas, open space corridors or some drainage affected land anyway.</p> <p>Noted. The site is considered appropriate for some low key ecotourism or community use facility providing it is developed in a landscaped setting.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. Designated open space areas would be finalised during the preparation of the DCP. There should be abundant Council owned land for such uses.</p> <p>Noted</p>
Conservation and Landscape Strategy	

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>1. Protection of Rare and Threatened Fauna (add these):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Purchase for conservation purposes undeveloped blocks which have old trees with hollows known to be nesting sites. • Action: Declare protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act for any known habitat of a rare and threatened species. • Change: Prepare and implement management plans for fauna species of particular conservation significance (remove 'particular'). • Achievement Measure: Control development which could be detrimental to fauna species in an area of conservation priority. <p>2. Marine Flora (add these):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: All undeveloped foreshore blocks with mangroves on Macleay should be acquired and reclassified High or Very High Priority Conservation Areas. <p>3. Terrestrial and Freshwater Wetland Flora with Designated Conservation Priority (add this):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change: Rezone subject areas to either Open Space or Conservation. (change to areas to High Conservation Priority Areas). <p>4. Fauna Habitat and General Vegetation Protection (add this):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Further reduce the number of lots available for development by not permitting any DP land to be serviced by sewerage. 	<p>Noted. Suggest that lots with nesting sites be identified during preparation of DCP and assessed whether they should be precluded from development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. DoE suggested current wording is most pragmatic approach.</p> <p>Areas of very high, high and medium conservation priority are already precluded from development. Tree clearing controls will be required elsewhere.</p> <p>Development is already precluded from marginal areas. Acquisition of land below RL2.4 should be considered but not regarded as a priority. This warrants further consideration.</p> <p>High Conservation Priority Areas are not a land use zone.</p> <p>Noted. Cannot support this suggestion as developable DP lots will need sewerage more so than non-DP lots, to avoid effluent surcharging.</p>

Respondent 126
Location or Property Description

S Baltais Wildlife Preservation Society of Qld. PO Box 427 Capalaba 4157
 Not Applicable

Summary of Issues	Response
<p>Projected population is still too high.</p> <p>Conservation and Landscape Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentives to residents for voluntary conservation agreements. • Measures to minimise vegetation loss and protect rare, threatened and vulnerable species. • Exclude development in wetland areas, very high, high and medium conservation priority areas and where the visual amenity of Moreton Bay or any elements of the Moreton Bay Strategic Plan. • Purchase very high, high and medium conservation areas and include areas of low priority where they form part of a buffer to landuses that would have a negative effect on the conservation values, visual amenity or water quality. • Prohibit further subdivision except where it leads to an overall reduction in lot numbers or a major positive conservation outcome. • Ensure all cultural sites are protected. <p>Water Management Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude development from all natural drainage lines, wetlands and protect wetland vegetation. • Provide adequate funding and resources to island Bushcare Groups. • Ensure Council implements an effective and enforceable “Wetlands and Coastal Protection” and “Erosion and Sediment Control” Policies. <p>Economic Development Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage environmentally sensitive developments, ecotourism and low impact tourist developments. • Provide incentives for home-based businesses. • Prohibit development that encourages significant recreational or non-island related water based transport, and major tourist developments. • Ensure water based transport is sensitive to the environment and does not adversely impact on the coral or marine grass habitat. <p>Prohibit the development of a bridge between the mainland and bay islands.</p> <p>Effluent Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refuse on-site disposal systems (especially land smaller than 2000 sq. m.) which have a negative impact on human health and the environment. • Incentives for on-site disposal systems that utilise new technologies that don’t have a negative impact. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. All of these actions are included in the Strategy, although no additional buffers are envisaged between development and conservation areas identified for acquisition.</p> <p>Noted. Covered in the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Rather than acquire additional buffer areas, vegetation clearing controls and stormwater management measures are proposed to protect higher priority conservation areas.</p> <p>Noted. Covered in the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Covered in the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Covered in the Strategy.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Covered in the Strategy.</p> <p>To be included in statutory planning instrument.</p> <p>Noted. Cover in Strategy.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Covered in the Strategy.</p> <p>Alternative technologies are seen as an interim measure only and will not replace the need for sewerage.</p>

Summary of Issues	Response
Waste Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a waste management system that does not have a negative impact upon human health or the environment. 	Noted

Respondent 153 Friends of Karragarra Inc. PO Box 7178 Redland Bay 4165
Location or Property Description DP Lots on Karragarra Island

Summary of Issues	Response
Concerned at the discrepancy between the number of lots potentially to be effected by the DP category and the minimum associated acquisition costs. Totally object to the down grading of the lots to DP, especially if it is motivated by an economic advantage for RSC.	There are 15 DP category lots on the Island. 6 lots on Karragarra are also precluded from development. These have not been identified for acquisition as some lots in this category may be developable subject to survey.

Attachment 3

Summary of Whole of Government Submissions and Response
