

From: noreply@ecq.qld.gov.au
To: [LG CC Submissions](#)
Subject: (56692) Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council - External Boundary Review - [REDACTED]
Date: Monday, 27 June 2022 11:58:04 PM

Online submission for **Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council**
- **External Boundary Review** from [REDACTED]

Submission Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Privacy preferences: Publishing your submission without your name

Submission text: Proposed Boundary Change – Livingstone & Rockhampton Boundary Review (Glendale, Glenlee and Rockyview) The Queensland Government’s policy for significant Local Government boundary changes requires affected Local Governments to support the change and the affected communities also support the proposed change. So how is it that the matter of a boundary review (for the suburbs of Glendale, Glenlee & Rockyview) is being pursued when the Livingstone Shire Council (LSC) has very clearly advised the Minister of its opposition to the change of boundary? Extra financial burden was forced upon the Livingstone Shire with amalgamation with (RRC) followed by de-amalgamation. Now ratepayers are being burdened with extra costs (forced upon them by RRC) with LSC having to fight to retain a valued part of their Shire against a land grab by RRC. It is also noted that Government policy provides that a referendum of all residents in the affected Local Governments will occur before any recommendations of the Change Commission are implemented – further un-needed costs. Should RRC’s land grab be successful, then Livingstone residents will be burdened with higher rates and slower growth in extra services that will be required to keep up with ongoing development of the Shire. In summary, a huge impost on Livingstone residents whilst RRC residents enjoy a small decrease in rates. Where is the fairness in this? The independent report on financial impacts of the proposed boundary change prepared by the Queensland Treasury Corporation also supports the negative impact on Livingstone Shire residents ie potentially a \$161 increase in average rates and charges per property in 2024-25 increasing to a forecasted \$250 by 2030-31 compared to a decrease of \$36 in 2024-25 and \$14 by 2030-31 for RRC residents. Again, where is the fairness in this? Livingstone has nurtured and invested funds into the Glendale, Glenlee and Rockyview area in conjunction with developers to achieve the lifestyle “Park Residential” developments. Are the residents within the affected suburbs aware that RRC does not support their “lifestyle” properties? RRC does not support “Park Residential” style developments having submitted against the Livingstone Town Plan (2018). Now RRC wants to claim this prime real estate to reap the benefits at the expense of Livingstone ratepayers. Why does RRC not also claim the adjoining area of Etna Creek? Could it be because the income from this area is not as substantial and only the prime real estate is wanted. RRC also claim they have no areas for future development, yet there are Parkhurst, Gracemere, Bouldercombe and Mt Morgan that may be further developed. It is also documented that further expansion will not be required until approximately 2041 due to the slow growth of the RRC area. Will it be, that as Livingstone further develops land adjoining RRC boundaries, that RRC will also put claim to these future developments as they are near Rockhampton or is it their ultimate aim to put financial pressure on Livingstone to force a re-amalgamation of LSC and RRC? How can RRC’s argument, that residents of these areas live their lives in Rockhampton,

support a transfer of these suburbs. Residents from both shires regularly commute back and forth across both shires whether it be for work, services, and/or recreation. How many RRC residents enjoy the coastal facilities provided by LSC? If this reasoning is considered a legitimate argument for boundary realignment, then a precedent of this kind would allow any local authority within Queensland to land grab their bordering shire's developments. Would this argument mean that Brisbane City would have an argument to take chunks of adjoining shires because a large volume of their residents commute daily to Brisbane for work and recreation? The argument is ridiculous. The economy of both local authorities would derive benefit from residents commuting back and forth between shires, and I am sure that all local authorities would be encouraging people from outside their shires to commute to their areas. Please consider the repercussions that a boundary realignment would have on Livingstone Shire residents and services before making a final decision on this matter. I ask for fairness and equality for all.

File upload: No file uploaded ()

Submission ID: 56692

Time of Submission: 27 Jun 2022 11:57pm

Submission IP Address: [REDACTED]

Referral URL: <https://www.ecq.qld.gov.au/electoral-boundaries/local-government-boundary-reviews/external-boundary-and-electoral-arrangement-reviews/livingstone-shire-council-and-rockhampton-regional-council-external-boundary-review>