

From: noreply@ecq.qld.gov.au
To: [LG CC Submissions](#)
Subject: (56658) Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council - External Boundary Review - Trevor Gear
Date: Thursday, 23 June 2022 7:54:01 PM
Attachments: [Livingstone-Shire-Council-and-Rockhampton-Regional-Council-Boundary-Proposal.pdf](#)

Online submission for **Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council - External Boundary Review** from Trevor Gear

Submission Details

Name: Trevor Gear

Privacy preferences: Publishing your submission and your name

Submission text:

File upload: Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council Boundary Proposal.pdf (120.5 KB)

Submission ID: 56658

Time of Submission: 23 Jun 2022 7:53pm

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>

Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council - External Boundary Review

It is with interest watching the debate and reading the planning advice, I provide my feedback. The decision to move the boundaries should be the responsibility of the *Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning* and QTC on the basis of maintaining a viable and sustainable local government authority, not a vote of self-interest.

Reasoning: The residents of Glenlee, Glendale and Rockyview will not see any difference to services between RRC and LSC, including water, refuge services and road maintenance. Therefore, if one council, Rockhampton Regional Council who has the most to benefit from the boundary changes publicly provides an incentive to the premise holders a significant rates reduction each year, then obviously the premise holder would be foolish not to vote for the boundary change. Adding to this tainted process. QTC highlights the significant financial gain to RRC without any risk, therefore every rate payer for RRCs has an interest to vote Yes for the boundary change to obtain this short- and long-term financial gain.

This process is tainted with money incentives and needs to be about viability and sustainability. Maybe the debate of re-amalgamation should be had, if that is the most viable and sustainable future.

If RRC were concerned about boundaries, then RRC should move the boundary along Emu Park road to shift the median density Nerimbera residents to RRC and provide them with a refuge service. That is a disgrace in a first world country where one half of the street gets a refuge service and the other doesn't.

