

SUMMARY REPORT ON COMMUNITY PIN UP SESSION

5 MAY 2010



SUMMARY REPORT ON COMMUNITY PIN UP SESSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	1.1 PURPOSE OF REPORT.....	1
2	WORKSHOP APPROACH.....	1
	2.1 RECRUITMENT METHODOLOGY.....	1
	2.2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND AGENDA.....	1
	2.3 ATTENDANCE.....	2
3	FEEDBACK.....	2
	3.1 QUESTIONS.....	2
	3.2 FEEDBACK FORMS.....	3

Document Control					
Version	Date	Author		Reviewer	
		Name	Initials	Name	Initials
1	June 2010	Steve Rossiter	SR	Adrian Sains	AS

MOUNT PETER MASTER PLANNING GROUP



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides a brief summary of the Community Pin Up Session held at Cairns Regional Council on 5 May 2010.

2 WORKSHOP APPROACH

2.1 RECRUITMENT METHODOLOGY

People were informed about the Community Pin Up Session by the following means:

- A newsletter distributed to approximately 6,750 households and businesses in the Mount Peter study area, Gordonvale and Edmonton
- Direct mail of approximately 600 newsletters to people who had provided their street addresses when registering on the contact list
- Email notification to those on the contact list with email addresses
- A paid advertisement in the Cairns Post
- A Cairns Regional Council media release
- Posting of the pin up session information on the Mount Peter web site
- Letters and emails of invitation to the Mount Peter Master Planning Taskforce, the Community and Landowner Reference Group and local community organisations.

2.2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND AGENDA

The purpose of the pin up session was to:

- Provide an update on the draft Structure Plan for Mount Peter
- Provide information on public transport and staging
- Outline the next steps in the planning process
- Provide an opportunity for residents to ask questions
- Present the draft structure plan maps and allow people to view them and ask questions of the project team and Council

The structure of the workshop included:

- An introductory presentation on the draft Structure Plan that addressed:
 - The planning process
 - The vision for Mount Peter
 - The main areas of the Mount Peter study area including:
 - North East Employment Area
 - Maitland Road South District Centre



- Coopers Road Centre
 - Implementation and review
- A presentation on public transport with an emphasis on providing a visual representation of how development and public transport might be staged in Mount Peter
- A general question and answer session
- An open session where participants were able to examine the plans in detail and ask questions of the project team.

2.3 ATTENDANCE

Approximately 70 people attended the workshop. 67 people completed the sign in sheet/attendance register while a small number preferred to not leave their details. Of those that completed the sign in sheet, the suburbs represented included:

- Gordonvale
- Edmonton
- Bentley Park
- Mount Sheridan
- Meringa
- Yorkeys Knob
- Fishery Falls
- Bayview Heights, and
- Cairns.

3 FEEDBACK

The pin up session involved a combination of information provision and receipt of feedback from participants.

3.1 QUESTIONS

On completion of the presentations, questions from the floor were asked about:

- Where will public transport go and will it be linked to employment areas?
- How binding are the plans – do you tell the developer where to put the houses?
- Will water be taken from the aquifer? How will the aquifer be preserved?
- Do infrastructure costs include the upgrade to the Bruce Highway?
- How will stormwater impacts on the east side of the Bruce Highway be managed?
- Will there be two entries to Cairns from the south planned?



3.2 FEEDBACK FORMS

Only three feedback forms were completed and returned.

Strengths of the draft Structure Plan were identified as:

- Layout, insight, thought into balanced structure
- The bus way system
- Letting Gordonvale establish first.

Concerns expressed about the draft Structure Plan are shown below.

(Mount Peter Master Planning Group - responses are shown in brackets and italics)

- Density – where will bigger family blocks fit into 15 dwellings per hectare, they need to be 10% less dense
(The plan allows for more conventional development to occur in the early stages to meet the current market demands. Trends are towards smaller lots with evidence from around Queensland that this demand is growing.)
- One major centre is needed, rather than two. Maitland Road should be on northern side to not compete with Gordonvale
(The centres strategy has been developed to ensure that the Gordonvale centre and that proposed in Edmonton are complemented rather than disadvantaged by centres at Coopers Road and Maitland Road. Ultimately there needs to be a District Centre near Maitland Road to service the area where the majority of residents will be located. The intent is that the Maitland Road centre serves the catchment population and does not front the Bruce Highway intersection - which would create immediate and long term competition with Gordonvale. The proposed population would also require a second centre to service the second largest residential area near Coopers Road.)
- The major centre development at Draper Road that the population wants cannot go ahead very well with competition from Maitland Road
(The Draper Road area may have a local centre within the neighbourhood that may be limited to a corner shop; it is not a “major centre”. The proposal for a highway based retail outlet near Draper Road, which lies outside of the Mount Peter master planning area (MPA), has been taken into account in estimating retail needs within the MPA.)
- Water supply
(Strategic planning for bulk water supply has been undertaken by Cairns Water & Waste. This planning has taken account of demands arising from Mount Peter. Assessment is ongoing with respect to the detailed staging of works related to the Barron River Water Scheme and the Mulgrave River Aquifer.)
- Water run off
(Flooding assessment undertaken to date confirms that stormwater can be managed to ensure that there is no detrimental downstream impact. Further detailed work will be required by each development applicant to confirm that this is the case for all staged development situations. Anecdotal feedback from different parties is inconsistent with respect to the impacts of flooding on existing land uses. The planning team must work with the analytical assessment that has been developed from base data.)



- Strategic military perspective we are the closest to North Korea and without two roads, both south and west, we can be trapped easily

(The Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) is working on both the proposed Bruce Highway upgrade and the busway. The two proposals are complimentary and are planned to mitigate the need for an alternative third corridor from the south.)

- Self containment is defeated as the major employment node is not in the logical location of approximately midway between Edmonton and Gordonvale. This will inevitably lead to significant Mount Peter traffic flows to the north, and even worse, crossing Bruce Highway

(The major employment node in the north east services the southern corridor as a whole and will be accessed by new road connections and frequent bus services linked into the proposed busway. The Bruce Highway proposals will have the capacity to provide good access from the south.)

- Mount Peter residents will not pay for Bruce Highway and possibly much of the bus routes – where will the money come from?

(Mount Peter residents will contribute to State road infrastructure through what is known as a “Local Function” charge levied on developers that is calculated on the basis of usage. Beyond that, the State is preparing a regional Queensland infrastructure programme similar to the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Programme – SEQIPP, which will outline funding commitments for major capital works. Subject to further advice from the State government, it is not anticipated that Developers (and future residents) will have to pick up the full capital costs of State owned infrastructure)

- Sequencing is unsustainable. If starting in the middle, only short routes from residential to employment would be needed, all of which could be sustained as development progresses with later upgrades when their capacity is exceeded. This includes the STP and water supply, so they do not motivate an edges in approach

(Sequencing takes account of where access and trunk services can readily be provided i.e. from the north and south extending from existing development fronts, in doing so limiting the capital required for pioneering development works.)

- \$700 million infrastructure costs over 20,000 dwellings is \$35,000 per dwelling. Add another \$700 million for the Bruce Highway (because it is not required unless Mount Peter is constructed). So when the developers realise that the charge is \$70,000 per lot they will densify other areas of Cairns for \$35,000 per lot won't they?

(There is currently no documentation to substantiate the claim that Mount Peter infrastructure charges are likely to "exceed those for comparable developments which will severely impact on the delivery of affordable housing". Our advice from the State government is that the Bruce Highway upgrade is needed because of current and future traffic saturation levels resulting from the whole southern corridor population and not just as a result of Mount Peter. The quantum of contribution that Mount Peter residents/developers will provide for State infrastructure has already been defined as “Local Function “ charge as per response above. Also the issue of the scale of the charges in a strictly 'user pays' approach is an issue across Queensland, and the State government is currently reviewing how this can be addressed to the benefit of all involved in the industry.)

