## Southern Moreton Bay Islands



### Integrated Local Transport Review

# Community and Stakeholder Discussion Paper Submission

18 February 2011

Prepared by Community and Social Planning Group

#### Contents

1.0	Int	roductio	n
	1.1	Purpos	e of the Submission3
	1.2	Executi	ve Summary3
2.0	Su	bmission	5
	2.1	Conten	t of Discussion Paper5
		2.1.1	Weinam Creek Social and Economic Impact Assessment5
		2.1.2	Place Project5
		2.1.3	Bayviews Digital Storytelling Project6
		2.1.4	SMBI Sports and Recreation Study 20086
		2.1.5	Redlands 2030 Community Plan7
		2.1.6	Island Library Strategy 2004-20147
		2.1.7	Strong Communities Policy7
		2.1.8	Social Infrastructure Policy
		2.1.9	Redlands Social Infrastructure Strategy8
		2.1.10	Demographics
		2.1.11	Special Transport Assistance Redlands (STAR) Community Transport
	2.2	Feedba	ck on Questionnaire11
3.0	Ne	ext Steps .	
Refe	References		
Арр	Appendix 1 – Social Disadvantage on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands		

#### 1.0 Introduction

The Community and Stakeholder Discussion Paper (the discussion paper) presents a range of useful material and data that will facilitate feedback on a number of topics in informing the Southern Moreton Bay Islands (SMBI) Integrated Local Transport Review.

In addition, the Community and Social Planning Group have coordinated a range of consultation activities and work in strategies and plans that have highlighted trends, challenges and actions for transportation on and to the Southern Moreton Bay Islands.

#### 1.1 Purpose of the Submission

The purpose of the report is to outline key issues in the discussion paper as part of the Community and Social Planning Group Submission. This submission focuses on:

- reviewing the assumptions of the ILTP and content of the discussion paper
- drawing on community feedback through *Redlands 2030: Community Plan* relating to transport and social needs
- analysing and incorporating the interviews/videos gathered during the Bayviews Digital Stories project
- summarising other Community and Social Planning documents that relate to SMBI transport and social needs
- providing an internal submission to IPG which will help to move the ILTR forward in terms of understanding community needs and canvassing options for response, either by Council or in partnership with the community/business and other levels of government (including via Regional Development Australia)

#### 1.2 Executive Summary

- The following issues need to be given consideration:
  - more detail is required in the demographic analysis that supports the Social and Economic Impact Assessment
  - disadvantage and the impact of user pays charges on low incomes with higher living costs is pivotal to the SEIA and SMBI ILTR
  - a number of additional studies have been included in the submission that were not in the discussion paper that provide policy direction for infrastructure delivery on the islands
  - $\circ$   $\;$  the depth of community consultation and feedback in:
    - Redlands 2030: Community Plan
    - Bayviews Digital Storytelling Project
    - Redlands Social Infrastructure Strategy
    - SMBI Sport and Recreation Study
    - Island Libraries Study 2004-2014
    - PLACE Project
  - additional actions and comments that have been suggested in response to the questionnaire, including:
    - prioritising linkages to key attractions and destinations
    - investigating subsidisation of transport to increase participation in sport and recreation and other core needs
    - maximising accessibility and mobility of users of pathways and cycleways
    - increasing the quality and use of inter-island transport to access facilities and services
    - coordinated ticketing and timetabling and 'Go Card' access to the islands

- Queensland Government Agent program (QGAP) to increase access to government information and services
- advocating for a P10 school at Redland Bay
- integrated service delivery, multipurpose spaces, schools as community centres
- investigate the logistics/distribution mechanisms that businesses may need at barge terminals to encourage businesses on the islands
- strategies investigating travel demand management for tourist and business operators
- developing transport strategies that will facilitate the delivery of social infrastructure approaches by:
  - incorporating the community and key stakeholders in the development of strategies and recommendations that respond to the social and economic impact assessment
  - enabling all community members to participate in community life and to access necessary services to meet their needs
  - not creating barriers for service providers to travel to the islands or for businesses to be economically viable
- The discussion paper with amendments would be a useful advocacy tool to leverage support in moving the ILTR forward

#### 2.0 Submission

This submission provides additions and further considerations on the content of the discussion paper for:

- the purposes of the SMBI ILTR
- an advocacy tool for other parties such as Regional Development Australia in gaining support to progress the SMBI ILTR
- feedback on the questionnaire

#### 2.1 Content of Discussion Paper

#### 2.1.1 Weinam Creek Social and Economic Impact Assessment

Community and stakeholder consultation is crucial in informing the social and economic impact assessment (SEIA). A further community workshop will provide an opportunity to consolidate findings from the discussion paper and to develop strategies with the community as part of the SEIA process.

Detailed demographic profiling and analysis form the foundation of an SEIA. The demographic data provided in the discussion paper provides a snapshot summary, but a number of topics such as for example disadvantage, education, internet access, car ownership, mortgage and rent have not been covered that would all provide information on residents and the likely impacts/needs for transport and any associated user pays schedule. A detailed demographic profile should form part of the SEIA and suggested content is provided in this submission. Refer to 2.1.10 and Appendix 1 of this submission.

#### 2.1.2 Place Project

The focus placed on transport and access to services in the Place Project should be expanded. A number of priority strategies were developed that have commitment from State and local government and community stakeholders:

Priority Strategy	Project and Stakeholders
Engage transport providers and planners with an	RCC - SMBI ILTR
aim of coordinating service delivery and	Translink
addressing costs, demand for parking and lack of	
coordinated ticketing	
Develop a community transport plan focusing on	RCC - SMBI ILTR
innovative and low cost transport solutions	Community groups/forum
(community bus, car pooling, share transport	
register etc)	
Initiate a road safety and accident prevention	RCC Ferry terminal and carpark masterplans
plan for ferry terminals	
Coordination of school buses and supervision of	RCC Community Safety Officer, MP
young people	
Ensure appropriate access for people with	RCC
disabilities at key locations:	
number of disability parking areas adjacent	
to ferry terminals	
secure a suitable disability accessible taxi	
investigate and implement disabled access	
to ferry community facilities	
Enhance the range of community information	RCC and BICS - Welcome Kit

available for island residents	QLD Health - Health and Wellbeing Needs
	Assessment
Enhance and better coordinate government and	RCC, State govt, community organisations –
community based outreach to the islands	SMBI Family Support Network
Enhance the capacity of island residents to	RCC and Sport and Recreation Qld joint planning
access relevant sporting and recreation activities	process for the Bay islands

#### 2.1.3 Bayviews Digital Storytelling Project

The role of transport to community identity and spirit is clearly evident in these films. The films discuss the pros and cons and unique circumstances of transport options to and on the islands with particular reference to the:

- ferries and barges, shared vehicles, bicycles, golf carts, motorbikes and modified vehicles
- inter-island transport modes and their role in community building and access to friends, services
- need for public transport and the potential of having innovative transport models on the islands
- challenges in routine issues such as maintenance of vehicles and transporting goods/groceries
- value of Russell Island retaining its original jetty trolley to ease the burden of carrying goods
- importance of constructed pathways and all-weather roads for connecting destinations
- logistics involved for kids to get to school

#### 2.1.4 SMBI Sports and Recreation Study 2008

The Study contains a number of strategies that have relevance to transport. The active transport options need to have further dedicated work as part of any transport plan. Cycleways and walkways will need to link destinations such as schools and ferry, shopping centres, parks and sports parks. Car parking and vehicular traffic planning should be concurrent with cycleways and walkways. Planning and design should factor in active transport solutions as a priority.

Three strategies are of particular note:

Strategy 1 – planning for Sport and recreation land and Embellishments to address existing shortfalls and future population growth

• Develop two additional district sports parks on Russell IIsand and Macleay Island which will service the whole of the SMBI

Strategy 5 – The Walking and Cycling Environment

- Provide walking and cycling facilities in island communities to improve access, recreation and physical activity choices for all age groups.
- Implement walking and cycling infrastructure in a coordinated sequence.

#### Strategy 6 – Public Transport

• Address travel barriers to sport and recreation participation, experienced by island communities.

#### Living sustainably on the islands Goal 7

#### Strong future for islands

Island communities thrive, and strategic plans and visions, developed with the community, guide successful regeneration, healing and wellbeing of North Stradbroke Island, Coochiemudlo Island and the Southern Moreton Bay Islands.

#### Goal 8

#### **Island living**

Upgrades to the islands' infrastructure, including better roads, car parks, pathways and sport and recreation facilities, improve the quality of life for island residents while maintaining their unique island character and fragile environment.

#### Goal 9

#### **Responsive transport systems**

Affordable and environmentally sensitive transport infrastructure to, from, and on the islands supports the health and wellbeing of island residents.

#### **Prioritising public infrastructure** Goal 11

#### **Connections within and around the Redlands**

In line with sustainability; new transit systems, improved roads, car parks and public transport options to keep pace with demand; and increase connectivity in and around the Redlands, and most notably with the Bay islands, Brisbane and the Gold Coast.

Redland City Council, 2010, *Redlands 2030 Community Plan: Creating Our Future*.

There is discussion on subsidies (inter-island and island mainland), bicycle hire and use of club/service organisation vehicles for special events as part of this strategy. Inter island travel to enable young people to access the new sports park facilities will be required.

#### 2.1.5 Redlands 2030 Community Plan

Redlands 2030 is the community's long-term plan for the future based on thousands of contributions of local residents, businesses and organisations.

It expresses shared visions and values that will drive civic planning in the Redlands over the next 20 years. The plan clearly states the community's vision and vision outcomes.

#### The Vision

"In 2030, the Redlands will be a well-designed, vibrant city of mainland and island communities, each with distinctive character, heritage and lifestyles. Our shared values will shape the way we care for each other and how we protect the land, seas and waters where we choose to be." (Redland City Council, 2010, Redlands 2030 Community Plan: Creating Our Future)

#### Vision Outcomes:

- Healthy Natural Environment
- Green Living
- Embracing the Bay
- Quandamooka Country
- Wise Planning and Design
- Supportive Vibrant Economy
- Strong and Connected Communities
- Inclusive and Ethical Governance

#### 2.1.6 Island Library Strategic Plan 2004-2014

The strategic plan looked at the use of and future requirements for island library services on SMBI and NSI. The Russell Island Library is the only formal library service on SMBI, with a community library on Macleay Island and a small community collection on Karragarra island. The mobile library is unable to service the library due to the size of its chassis in relation to barge landing ramps.

The strategic plan recommended the promotion of the Russell Island Library as the principal library to service all island residents with a possible expansion based on population growth. The use of the mainland library at Victoria Point and Russell Island were key recommendations. The success of these recommendations in meeting island' residents' needs for library services is dependant on affordable and accessible transport between islands and to and from the mainland, linking to Victoria Point.

The Island Library Strategic Plan will be reviewed in the future. It is likely that reliable portals for fast digital connections to mainland and other on-line knowledge services will certainly be an increasing priority under all models of development. Possible mobile library options and the development of a new library service at Redland Bay for island residents will be investigated in future planning.

#### 2.1.7 Strong Communities Policy

This policy states that Council is committed to supporting a strong community which can be recognised as *a connected community with access to the full range of options required for a rich* 

*community life and an active attachment to place*. (Redland City Council, 2009, Strong Communities Policy)

#### 2.1.8 Social Infrastructure Policy

This policy states that Council seeks the provision of a high quality, well functioning network of social infrastructure to support community health and well-being and assist in meeting the needs and aspirations of the Redland community. The following principles will guide social infrastructure planning and provision:

- equitable access and distribution
- sustainable social infrastructure
- integration
- quality and innovation

#### 2.1.9 Redlands Social Infrastructure Strategy

The *Building Strong Communities: Redlands Social Infrastructure Strategy 2009* (SIS) will provide direction for services, facilities and networks over the next 20 years. The unique circumstances of the islands is recognised in this strategy. New approaches to social infrastructure particularly relevant to the islands include:

- more emphasis on prevention and early intervention
- emphasis on supporting service systems
- creation of hubs
- a shift to place-management and joined up government
- increased use of schools as community centres
- emergence of age-friendly communities, including aged and child friendly design
- move to sustainability and thinking locally
- use of partnerships and alliances to deliver infrastructure

The need for on-island facilities/space to accommodate and support outreach services will become increasingly important.

Communities will make decisions based on what services they will access locally and what services they are prepared to travel to access. Expanding the choice of affordable transport options is crucial across the whole of the Redlands and strengthening service levels, including outreach to the islands, will be a focus of this strategy.

Redlands Social Enterprise Program	Active and Healthy Communities	
Schools as Community Centres	Critical Service Advocacy Plans	
Community Hubs and Precincts Strategy	Local Social Infrastructure Strategy - Islands	
Green Living Hubs	Kennedy's Farm Community and Sporting	
	Precinct	
Housing Choice Action Plan	Macleay Island Sporting Facility	
Ageing in Place Strategy		

The strategy outlines projects for the islands that include:

#### 2.1.10 Demographics

An understanding of the demographics and emerging trends is important and policy decisions that may incur further costs on residents, workers and visitors to the SMBI should be analysed for social and economic impacts. There are high levels of disadvantage on the SMBI and these areas have been identified as having a higher need for support services.

The demographics section in the discussion paper is very limited and there are additional criteria that require consideration in the context of transport and user pays charges. A profile snapshot can provide a lot of information whilst not dominating the discussion paper. It would be useful to understand the disadvantage that is present on the islands which will need careful consideration in any transport and user pays decisions.

#### **Profile Snapshot**

The SMBI Community Profile indicates the SMBI population in 2006, when the last Census was undertaken, was 4,224 people (up by 984 since 2001). By 2026, the population is projected by the State government's Planning Information Forecasting Unit to increase by 69.2 per cent, to 7,163.

Older population (60 and over)         33.5%         18%           Children (0 - 17)         19.2%         25.9%           Indigenous         2.7%         1.5%           Residents born overseas         23.3%         20.9%           Non-english speaking         7.4%         6.2%           background         6.2%         6.2%           Household types:         76.3%         18.8%           Family         59.6%         76.3%           Couple families with child(ren)         21%         47.2%           One parent families         18.9%         14.3%           Households and dwellings:         0wned         24.5%         38.4%           Quinocupied dwellings         28.7%         38.4%         23.1%           Unoccupied dwellings         28.7%         38.4%         24.5%         23.1%           Unoccupied dwellings         28.7%         40.1%         40.1%           Weekly individual income:         5.7%         17.7%         10.3%           Uwe (liss than \$400/week)         6.28%         40.1%         44.2%           Weekly individual income:         24.3%         24.%         24%           Low (less than \$400/week)         4.3%         24%         24%		SMBI - 2006	Redland City - 2006
Indigenous2.7%1.5%Residents born overseas23.3%20.9%Non-english speaking7.4%6.2%background6.2%Household types: Family59.6%76.3%Couple families with child(ren)21%47.2%One parson33.4%18.8%Family types: Couple families with child(ren)21%47.2%One parent families18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned24.5%38.4%Qwned24.5%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7% * indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (S1000/week)5.7%17.7% 62.8%Uow (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week)4.3% 42.2%24% 16.3%Low (less than \$500/week)4.5% 42.3%20.8% 23.9%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000)4.5% 42.2%20.8% 42.3%Low (less than \$500/week)4.5% 42.3%20.3% 43.3%Low (less than \$500/week)4.5% 42.3%20.3% 43.3%Low (less than \$500/week)4.5% 42.3%23.9%Rentals High (S450 per week or more) Low (less than \$410 per week)0.6% 42.2%2.7% 4.5%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12.6%• Manufacturing 12.3% • Construction 15.2% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Older population (60 and over)	33.5%	18%
Residents born overseas23.3%20.9%Non-english speaking background7.4%6.2%Household types: Family59.6%76.3%Lone person33.4%18.8%Family types: Couple families with child(ren)21%47.2%One parent families18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned24.5%38.4%Purchasing24.5%38.4%Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%*indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasonsWeekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$1700/week)5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$200) Low (less than \$200)4.3%24%Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$2000)58.8%23.9%Rentals High (fa50 per week or more) Low (less than \$200)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Children (0 – 17)	19.2%	25.9%
Non-english speaking background7.4%6.2%Household types: Family59.6%76.3%Lone person33.4%18.8%Family types: Couple families with child(ren)21%47.2%One parent families18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned24.5%38.4%Purchasing24.5%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$200/week)5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$200/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$200) Low (less than \$200)58.8%23.9%Rentals High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Indigenous	2.7%	1.5%
backgroundHousehold types: Family59.6%Family types: Couple families with child(ren)21%One person33.4%Family types: Couple families21%One parent families18.9%Households and dwellings: Owned21%Owned44.6%Purchasing24.5%Renting24.2%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7%High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%High (more than \$1700/week) Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$2000)4.5%Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$2000)5.8%Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 23.9%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Residents born overseas	23.3%	20.9%
Household types: Family59.6%76.3%Lone person33.4%18.8%Family types: Couple families with child(ren)21%47.2%One parent families18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned24.5%38.4%Purchasing24.5%38.4%Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%*indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more)5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$250)58.8%23.9%Rentals High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)8.2%16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12.6% • Manufacturing 12.3% • Construction 10.6%	Non-english speaking	7.4%	6.2%
Family       59.6%       76.3%         Lone person       33.4%       18.8%         Family types:       21%       47.2%         Couple families with child(ren)       21%       47.2%         One parent families       18.9%       14.3%         Households and dwellings:       32.7%       38.4%         Owned       44.6%       32.7%         Purchasing       24.5%       38.4%         Renting       24.2%       23.1%         Unoccupied dwellings       28.7%       8.1%         *indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons       8.1%         Weekly individual income:       17.7%       6.2.8%         Low (less than \$400/week)       62.8%       40.1%         Weekly household income:       4.3%       24%         Low (less than \$1700/week)       4.3%       24%         Low (less than \$500/week)       44.2%       16.3%         Monthly mortgage repayments:       4.5%       20.8%         High (more than \$2000)       4.5%       20.8%         Low (less than \$950)       58.8%       23.9%         Rentals       0.6%       2.7%         High (\$450 per week or more)       0.6%       2.7%         Lo	background		
Lone person33.4%18.8%Family types: Couple families with child(ren)21%47.2%One parent families18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned44.6%32.7%Purchasing24.5%38.4%Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7% *indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more)5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6%2.7%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Household types:		
Family types: Couple families with child(ren) One parent families21% 14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned44.6% 24.5%32.7% 38.4%Purchasing Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7% *indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7% 6.28%17.7% 40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week) Low (less than \$200) Low (less than \$200) Low (less than \$950)4.3% 58.8%24% 20.8% 23.9%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 2.7% 2.7% 2.6%2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.3.9%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Family	59.6%	76.3%
Couple families with child(ren) One parent families21% 18.9%47.2% 14.3%Households and dwellings: Owned44.6%32.7% 38.4%Purchasing Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7% *indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7% 62.8%17.7% 40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week) Low (less than \$500/week)4.3% 44.2%24% 16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 28.2%2.7% 16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)0.6% • Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Lone person	33.4%	18.8%
One parent families18.9%14.3%Households and dwellings:	Family types:		
Households and dwellings: Owned44.6%32.7%Owned44.6%32.7%Purchasing24.5%38.4%Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%8.1%*indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income:17.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income:4.3%24%High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:4.5%20.8%High (more than \$2000)4.5%23.9%Low (less than \$400 per week or more)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%industry (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Couple families with child(ren)	21%	47.2%
Owned44.6%32.7%Purchasing24.5%38.4%Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%8.1%*indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income:5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income:4.3%24%High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:4.5%20.8%High (more than \$2000)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7%High (\$450 per week or more)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%Industry (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	One parent families	18.9%	14.3%
Purchasing Renting24.5% 24.2%38.4% 23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7% *indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7% 62.8%17.7% 40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week) Low (less than \$500/week)4.3% 44.2%24% 16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000) Low (less than \$2000) Low (less than \$950)8.8% 23.9%20.8% 23.9%Rentals High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 28.2%2.7% 16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Households and dwellings:		
Renting24.2%23.1%Unoccupied dwellings28.7%8.1%*indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income:17.7%High (\$1000/week or more)5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income:4.3%24%High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$500)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Owned	44.6%	32.7%
Unoccupied dwellings28.7% *indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasons8.1%Weekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7% 62.8%17.7% 40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week) Low (less than \$500/week)4.3% 44.2%24% 16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000) Low (less than \$950)4.5% 58.8%20.8% 23.9%Rentals High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 28.2%2.7% 16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Purchasing	24.5%	38.4%
*indicates potential for tourist peaks in holiday seasonsWeekly individual income: High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7% 62.8%17.7% 40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week) Low (less than \$500/week)4.3% 44.2%24% 16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000) Low (less than \$950)4.5% 58.8%20.8% 23.9%Rentals High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 2.7% 2.7%2.7% 16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	Renting	24.2%	23.1%
peaks in holiday seasonsWeekly individual income:High (\$1000/week or more)5.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%Weekly household income:High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%Monthly mortgage repayments:High (more than \$2000)4.5%Low (less than \$950)58.8%RentalsHigh (\$450 per week or more)Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%Predominant employmentindustry (Top 3)Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Unoccupied dwellings	28.7%	8.1%
Weekly individual income:Image: State of the systemHigh (\$1000/week or more)5.7%17.7%Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income:4.3%24%High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$950)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%industry (Top 3)• Retail Trade 12%• Manufacturing 12.3%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative		*indicates potential for tourist	
High (\$1000/week or more) Low (less than \$400/week)5.7% 62.8%17.7% 40.1%Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week)4.3% 44.2%24% 16.3%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000) Low (less than \$950)4.5% 58.8%20.8% 23.9%Rentals0.6% 2.7% 16.8%2.7% 16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative		peaks in holiday seasons	
Low (less than \$400/week)62.8%40.1%Weekly household income:4.3%24%High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$950)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7%High (\$450 per week or more)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%industry (Top 3)• Retail Trade 12%• Construction 10.6%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Weekly individual income:		
Weekly household income: High (more than \$1700/week)4.3% 4.3%24% 16.3%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments: High (more than \$2000)4.5%20.8% 23.9%Low (less than \$950)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7% 16.8%High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Clerical and administrative	High (\$1000/week or more)	5.7%	17.7%
High (more than \$1700/week)4.3%24%Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:16.3%High (more than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$950)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7%High (\$450 per week or more)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%industry (Top 3)• Retail Trade 12%• Manufacturing 12.3%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Low (less than \$400/week)	62.8%	40.1%
Low (less than \$500/week)44.2%16.3%Monthly mortgage repayments:	Weekly household income:		
Monthly mortgage repayments:High (more than \$2000)4.5%Low (less than \$950)58.8%RentalsHigh (\$450 per week or more)0.6%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%industry (Top 3)• Retail Trade 12%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	High (more than \$1700/week)	4.3%	24%
High (more than \$2000)4.5%20.8%Low (less than \$950)58.8%23.9%Rentals0.6%2.7%High (\$450 per week or more)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment• Construction 15.2%• Retail trade 12.6%industry (Top 3)• Retail Trade 12%• Manufacturing 12.3%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Low (less than \$500/week)	44.2%	16.3%
Low (less than \$950)58.8%23.9%Rentals	Monthly mortgage repayments:		
Rentals0.6%2.7%High (\$450 per week or more)0.6%2.7%Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Retail trade 12.6% • Manufacturing 12.3% • Construction 10.6%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	High (more than \$2000)	4.5%	20.8%
High (\$450 per week or more) Low (less than \$140 per week)0.6% 28.2%2.7% 16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Retail trade 12.6% • Manufacturing 12.3% • Construction 10.6%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Low (less than \$950)	58.8%	23.9%
Low (less than \$140 per week)28.2%16.8%Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Retail trade 12.6% • Manufacturing 12.3% • Construction 10.6%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Rentals		
Predominant employment industry (Top 3)• Construction 15.2% • Retail Trade 12% • Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Retail trade 12.6% • Manufacturing 12.3% • Construction 10.6% • Construction 10.6%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	High (\$450 per week or more)	0.6%	2.7%
industry (Top 3)• Retail Trade 12%• Manufacturing 12.3%• Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%• Construction 10.6%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	Low (less than \$140 per week)	28.2%	16.8%
<ul> <li>Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%</li> <li>Occupations (Top 3)</li> <li>Technician and trades</li> <li>Clerical and administrative</li> </ul>	Predominant employment	Construction 15.2%	Retail trade 12.6%
Assistance 10.3%Occupations (Top 3)• Technician and trades• Clerical and administrative	industry (Top 3)	Retail Trade 12%	Manufacturing 12.3%
Occupations (Top 3)  • Technician and trades  • Clerical and administrative		Health Care and Social	Construction 10.6%
		Assistance 10.3%	
workers 18.4% workers 17.2%	Occupations (Top 3)	Technician and trades	Clerical and administrative
		workers 18.4%	workers 17.2%

	<ul><li>Labourers 16%</li><li>Professionals 12.3%</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Technicians and Trade workers 16.8%</li> <li>Professionals 14.6%</li> </ul>
Highest level of schooling:		
Left school at Yr 10 or below	51.7%	43.2%
Went on to complete Yr 12	28.5%	40.6%
Education post secondary		
school		
Employment status:		
Employed	85.7%	95.8%
unemployed	14.3%	4.2%
Work from home	7.6%	4.6%
Dwellings without internet	44.3%	29.4%
connection		
No car ownership	13.1%	6%

Reference: Profile.id, Redland City Council Community Profile – 2006 and 2001 Enumerated Census Information, 2009

- The islands present a challenge when determining resident populations due to high unoccupied dwelling rates. This is related to the number of holiday accommodation and second homes given the islands' proximity to Brisbane.
- Older age profile with 67% of residents aged over 40, compared with the City's average of 38%. Growing proportion of aged population to continue to 2031.
- Island communities are significantly disadvantaged in comparison to the mainland and rank high in disadvantage for rental stress, profound or severe disability, income support and unemployment\*. (Uniting Care, 2010)
- Lower income levels and higher living costs.
- Housing costs (both for rental and home purchase) are lower than that for Redland City, Brisbane and Queensland. However, when considered with the lower than average household incomes, housing stress could be an issue.
- Households on the islands largely comprise people living alone or couple families without children.
- Lower representation of children, youth and young adults, although a transition appears to be occurring with population growth and more family households.
- The islands have more indicators of disadvantage than other parts of Redland City.
- Incomes across the islands are relatively low, leading to potential housing stress.

\*Based on Redlands balance data, which includes the Southern Moreton Bay Islands and North Stradbroke Island

#### **Cultural Diversity**

Like most of Redland City the population is relatively homogenous in cultural and linguistic terms, with over 90% speaking English as their major language. Proportions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are higher on Macleay (3%) and Russell (2.5%) Islands than in the rest of Redland City (1.5%).

#### Disadvantage

In 2001 and 2006, the Southern Moreton Bay Islands were rated as experiencing a higher level of disadvantage than for both the Redland City and Queensland. The Australian Bureau of Statistics Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) uses an index of disadvantage that compiles unemployment, income, education and others and assigns a score. A comparison across Queensland showed that three out of the four SMBI islands (Lamb, Russell and Macleay) would rank in the lowest 10% of Queensland and Australia.

A detailed summary on social disadvantage has been prepared by the Community and Social Planning Group and is provided in Appendix 1.

#### **Housing Stress**

The Redlands Community Profile (2008) states that the impact of increasing rental and home loan costs on Redland City households is measured in the context of household income. Where a household is paying more than 30% of its income in housing costs (whether rental or home loan costs), that household is considered to be experiencing 'housing stress'.

In the southern part of the City and on the islands, over 1 in 5 households were in housing stress. Although housing loan repayments and rentals may seem low on the islands, taking into account a high proportion of low incomes and high living costs, the islands are very vulnerable to housing stress.

Home loan costs and rentals are detailed in Appendix 1.

#### 2.1.11 Special Transport Assistance Redlands (STAR) Community Transport

STAR community transport have just recently extended their services to the SMBI. The following item was recently in the Bayside Bulletin (Tuesday 8/2/11):

"STAR Community Transport began services on Macleay and Russell Islands on 10 January 2011, working with the local taxi operators. The objective is to move HACC eligible residents (who have been assessed and accepted by STAR Community Transport) around the islands, to the jetty, shopping, family and medical destinations as required. All bookings must be phoned through to STAR Community Transport on 3821 6699, with at least two working days notice. Fares are \$5 each way with carers travelling at half price."

#### 2.2 Feedback on Questionnaire

Q3.1.7	<ul> <li>Imagine the Southern Moreton Bay Islands in 10 years time:</li> </ul>
	What do they look like? What are people doing? How are they travelling?
	By 2026, the population is projected by the State government's Planning
	Information Forecasting Unit to increase by 69.2 per cent, to 7,163.
	Responses from participants in the Redlands 2030 visioning for the islands
	included:
	<ul> <li>A population that is not detrimental to the environment</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>High class eco-tourism destination</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Sustainable and affordable housing and transport options</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Self-sufficient from the mainland whilst providing a lifestyle which</li> </ul>
	embraces the needs of the community
	<ul> <li>Ageing in place</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Maintaining a slower lifestyle yet with a range of employment and</li> </ul>
	business opportunities
	<ul> <li>Maximising the potential of the Bay (tourism, business, lifestyle,</li> </ul>
	environmental values)
	<ul> <li>Access to facilities, entertainment and recreation</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Affordable and effective community transport on the islands</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Rail to Redland Bay or bridge to Russell Island</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Use of foreshore areas for parks/community space rather than parking</li> </ul>

04.1	
Q4.1	<ul> <li>How has the population changed over the last 10 years?</li> </ul>
	The largest changes in age structure in this area between 2001 and 2006 were in
	the age groups:
	<ul> <li>60 to 69 (+216 persons)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>70 to 84 (+109 persons)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>5 to 11 (+105 persons)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>35 to 49 (+96 persons)</li> </ul>
	0 55 to 45 (150 persons)
	The largest proportion of the population will be in the 60+ category although there is likely to be an increase in families in the next census.
	Who has moved here? How long do they stay?
	Anecdotally, there have been reports that families with young children (two
	parents and single parents) have increased. Many leave within 5 years due to the
	high living costs and need to access a wider range of services (e.g. health,
	education, sport, employment etc).
	<ul> <li>What encourages people to move and live on the islands?</li> <li>Affordability and lifestyle have been the most common drivers in encouraging</li> </ul>
	people to move and live on the islands.
	What effect has this had on the islands?
	<ul> <li>There is a diverse range of skills and strong community groups</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Pressure/social issues that arise from costs that have not been factored in</li> </ul>
	to a move to the islands such as:
	<ul> <li>Ferry and barge travel</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The need for an island/mainland car</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Higher cost food/groceries and fuel</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Limited services, particularly for health and education</li> </ul>
Q4.2.1	<ul> <li>In your view what are some of the reasons an older population are attracted to the islands?</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Retirement in an island setting that is still close to Brisbane</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Low cost of land and housing</li> </ul>
Q4.2.4	<ul> <li>Why do you think those on lower incomes are attracted to the SMBI?</li> </ul>
Q4.2.4	
	<ul> <li>Low cost of land, housing and rent</li> </ul>
	• Existing family members
	<ul> <li>Lifestyle and island setting</li> </ul>
Q4.2.6	<ul> <li>In your view, what attracts people to live on the SMBI?</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Low cost of land, housing and rent</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Existing family members</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Lifestyle and island setting</li> </ul>
	o Retirement
	o Environment
	What are people's expectations for island living and island life?
	<ul> <li>Mixed – tranquillity, slow pace of life, mainland urban services and</li> </ul>
	facilities
	<ul> <li>Strong community life</li> </ul>
	o Affordability

	Do you think expectations for island life are changing? If as how are they
	• Do you think expectations for island life are changing? If so, how are they changing?
	<ul> <li>Coordinated approach to integrated service delivery, multi-purpose</li> </ul>
	spaces, access to programs, services and facilities
	<ul> <li>Recognition of local skills, abilities and opportunities</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Rising demand for services given the increase in the number of people in</li> </ul>
	the islands
	<ul> <li>No longer affordable – high living costs</li> </ul>
Q5.4	How have you adapted to the changing costs of travel?
	Main points from a recent article in the Bayside Bulletin (8/2/11) raised the
	concern of residents on recent and proposed fare increases:
	• Members of the Southern Moreton Bay Island Forum want the council and Ms
	Nolan to investigate the reasons behind Bay Island Transit Services' (BITS) two
	ferry ticket price rises this year
	• BITS put the price of an adult return ticket up \$1.20 to \$15.80 last month
	• The ferry operator proposes to put ticket prices up a further 80c in April,
	bumping a return adult fare to \$16.60, a 25.40 per cent fare increase since
	2008.
	<ul> <li>That will be two price rises this year</li> </ul>
	• Want the ferry service to be part of the State Government's Translink public
	transport system so there is regulation of pricing and residents are told the
	reasons behind any increases
	<ul> <li>In its letter to the Transport Minister, the SMBI Forum also asked for ferry</li> </ul>
	fares to be subsidised in line with other State Government public transport
	services and for Translink's Go Card system to be extended to the ferry service.
	<ul> <li>But incorporating Bay Island Transport with Translink may not reduce prices of ferry tickets to the islands</li> </ul>
Q6.1	<ul> <li>Fare box data provided by BITS shows that people use the water taxi most</li> </ul>
Q0.1	between Wednesday and Friday. Where to and what activities are people
	travelling to on these days?
	<ul> <li>Social events, appointments, work, family commitments</li> </ul>
	• Fare box data provided by BITS also shows that people travel most in the morning.
	Why do people travel more at this time?
	<ul> <li>Need to return to island and home before dark</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>School and work times almost start at the same time so the bulk of</li> </ul>
	passengers travel in the morning
	What else does this data tell us?
	<ul> <li>Limited concessions for off-peak travel, weekends, seniors</li> </ul>
Q6.3	What should an on-island bus service look like?
	<ul> <li>Frequent services to meet busy ferries, particularly at peak times early pm</li> </ul>
	and late afternoon.
	<ul> <li>Need to accommodate needs of residents to carry mobility aids such as</li> </ul>
	wheelchairs or walking frames, prams, luggage or need to transport
	groceries or other items.
1	How should it operate; who should run it; when should it run?
	<ul> <li>Community operated service</li> </ul>

	<ul> <li>Investigate a sustainable model to address frequency and coordination</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Investigate a sustainable model to address frequency and coordination with ferry service.</li> </ul>
Q6.7	What would make the islands more walkable?
	<ul> <li>Linking walking networks with destinations, points of interest, heritage</li> </ul>
	trails and being suitable for a wide range of users (walkers, cyclists,
	mobility scooters etc)
	<ul> <li>Reasonable facilities at parks and rest points</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Lighting and shade provision</li> </ul>
Q7.1	Strategy 1: Land Use and transport integration
-	What would reduce your dependency on mainland services?
	Having a greater range of services (government, private and community) available
	on the islands that can be accessed from a government agency centre with portal
	access to centrelink, medicare etc. Education is also limited to primary level and a
	P10 is required at least at Redland Bay.
	r 10 is required at least at Nediand bay.
	How could these services be provided for the SMBI?
	Integrated service delivery is a priority for the SMBI. This will involve collaborative
	planning and service delivery with government, private sector and community
	organisations to best utilise resources and to be responsive to needs. There are a
	number of multi-purpose spaces that can be used to deliver a range of activities,
	programs and services and further work is currently being undertaken as part of
	the implementation of the Redlands Social Infrastructure Strategy.
	the implementation of the regional social initiast detaile strategy.
	• Do you have any suggestions for this strategy?
	<ul> <li>Improved broadband access, computer provision and training at</li> </ul>
	community facilities aiming to increase internet connection rates and
	usage.
	<ul> <li>Establishing a Queensland Government Agent Program (QGAP) to increase</li> </ul>
	the access to government information and services, similar to that on NSI.
	At QGAP offices you can conduct business with government departments
	and agencies or obtain information about government services from the
	one convenient location. The offices are single points of contact offering
	the same level of service and accessibility that is afforded to
	Queenslanders living in more densely populated areas.
	• Whilst having appropriate land use designations and being supportive of a
	range of business uses in the Redlands Planning Scheme, it is also
	important to investigate the logistics/distribution mechanisms that
	businesses may need at barge terminals to encourage businesses on the
	islands.
Q7.2	Strategy 2: Public transport
	Do you have any suggestions for this strategy?
	The consideration of subsidised travel recognises that a large proportion of island
	residents have lower incomes.
	Action 5 – Safety of users of the public transport network should be considered with:
	<ul> <li>transport operators</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>supervision of school children</li> </ul>
	o signage
	o CEPTED

	Action 7 – Coordinated ticketing and timetabling was identified as a priority in the PLACE project. Residents wanted to use the one ticket that would get them from the islands to Brisbane CBD with effective change over of transport e.g. limited waiting time between ferry, bus and train.
Q7.3	Strategy 3: Walking and cycling
Q7.5	<ul> <li>Do you have any suggestions for this strategy?</li> </ul>
	Action 3 - prioritise links from ferry terminals to community facilities, sporting facilities, schools, centres and other key attractions and destinations.
	Action 5 – Need to look at the environmental impacts – maybe refer to recreational trails rather than trails through conservation areas. Suggest checking with Environmental Management Group.
	New action – Target design and construction specifications to maximise accessibility and mobility of users. The demographic on the islands has a high proportion of aged residents and any walking and pedestrian networks need to consider and specific design requirements e.g. rest spots, shade, drinking facilities, gradients.
	New action – Investigate innovative models and programs that encourage cycling. Some examples are courses in cycling confidence, bike maintenance activities in "Men's Sheds" programs, bike hire facilities with optional shopping bikes.
Q7.4	Strategy 4: Road network
	• Do you have any suggestions for this strategy?
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Νο
Q7.5	Strategy 5: Travel Demand Management
Q7.5	
	<ul> <li>Do you have any suggestions for this strategy?</li> </ul>
	Car park pricing is going to have considerable impacts on a population that has a large proportion of low income residents. It is strongly supported that no car park pricing schedule be implemented until the recommendations from the Weinam Creek Car Park Social and Economic Impact Assessment have been completed.
	<ul> <li>Additional actions:</li> <li>The establishment of targets or a performance framework for trip reduction between the islands and mainland would be a useful action.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Government and service provider targeted demand management strategies to facilitate car pooling, secure storage and shared facilities. This could be included in action 1.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Strategies investigating travel demand management for tourist and business operators.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Improved inter-island transport to access facilities and services located on different islands</li> </ul>
Q7.6	Strategy 6: Transport and the environment
	<ul> <li>Do you have any suggestions for this strategy?</li> </ul>
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	The focus in this strategy is on minimising environmental damage from water-based transport. This could be broadened to recognise the range of transport initiatives

being considered and the importance of protecting and enhancing environmental values for eco/nature based tourism, recreational trails, walking and cycling networks.
There could be some conflicts between this strategy and strategy 2 which is looking at increasing the frequency of public transport. If this includes water-based transport, further investigation into the potential environmental impacts would be required.

#### 3.0 Next Steps

The Southern Moreton Bay Islands' community has a strong sense of identity and community spirit. Supporting local organisations and the community to build their capacity to respond to needs and build on opportunities will be increasingly important with the future population on Southern Moreton Bay Islands.

Service and infrastructure delivery must address the needs of the SMBI community. The community should be involved in decisions based on what services they will access locally and what services they are prepared to travel to access. The integrated local transport plan should cater for access to services, facilities and networks, both inter and intra-island and to the mainland, in a way that won't negatively impact on a diverse population that has a high proportion of low income and aged residents with high living costs.

#### References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics, Census of Population and Housing, 2006
- Centre of Full Employment and Equity, Red alert suburbs: An employment vulnerability index for Australia's major urban regions, 2009
- Community and Social Planning Group, Social Disadvantage on the Southern Moreton bay Islands, 2010
- Profile.id, Redland City Council Community Profile 2006 and 2001 Enumerated Census Information, 2009
- Queensland Government, Revised Projected Resident Population Redland City by SLA, Planning Information and Forecasting Unit, 2009
- Redland City Council, Building Strong Communities: Redlands Social Infrastructure Strategy, 2009
- Redland City Council, Indigenous Community Policy, 2008
- Redland City Council, Island Library Strategy 2004 2014
- Redland City Council, Redlands 2030 Community Plan: Creating Our Future, 2010
- Redland City Council, Redlands Community Profile, 2008
- Redland City Council, Social Infrastructure Policy, 2009
- Redland City Council, SMBI Sport and Recreation Study, 2008
- Redland City Council, State of the Environment Report, 2008
- Redland City Council, Strong Communities Policy, 2009
- Uniting Care, A scan of disadvantage in Queensland, 2010

#### Acknowledgements:

- Bayviews Digital Storytelling Project
- Redlands 2030 Community Plan: visioning and consultation submissions

#### Appendix 1 – Social Disadvantage on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands