

From: noreply@ecq.qld.gov.au
To: [LG CC Submissions](#)
Subject: (56853) Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council - External Boundary Review - [REDACTED]
Date: Sunday, 3 July 2022 3:34:41 PM
Attachments: [Livingstone-has-already-voted.pdf](#)

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:

File upload: Livingstone has already voted.pdf (159.9 KB)

Submission ID: 56853

Time of Submission: 03 Jul 2022 3:34pm

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 has already had a vote – 57% in favour (<https://results.ecq.qld.gov.au/elections/local/LIVINGSTONE/results/district97.html>). Democracy has spoken, we did not and do not want to have our services cut and rates paid to RRC to improve Rockhampton City's position again.

The slogan "Fairer for everyone" is blatantly false, the financial report clearly shows Livingstone Shire financially disadvantaged because RRC wants a compulsory acquisition of their rate base. The true intent behind this is to weaken Livingstone Shire and force it to amalgamate with Rockhampton again, as RRC cannot manage its budget.

RCC already had Parkhurst transferred in 1984, now they want another slice, and in 10 years they'll want another and another. An argument to return the Western suburb of Parkhurst to Livingstone should be mounted as it would be fairer for everyone.

RCC has not grown organically, instead is trying to grow by acquisition at the expense of Livingstone Shire rate payers.

Population growth:

Livingstone 44% (2001-2017), 8.5% (2012-2017) vs
Rockhampton 15% (2001-2017), 0.8% (2012-2017)

<https://population.com.au/lga/34530>

<https://population.com.au/lga/36370>.

Livingstone has managed to grow without having to acquire other shires rate base.

The statement:

"With 97% of growth in LSC projected to occur along the Coast, LSC's historic and future focus is not unreasonably on those areas – not in the Northern Suburbs."

This is directly contradicted by the fact that there are 3779 people (9.7%) of the population in Livingstone's western suburbs of Glenlee, Rockyview and Glendale. From 2020 to date there were 475 new lots proposed for Livingstone excluding the three suburbs and 503 new lots proposed in the suburbs of Glenlee, Rockyview and Glendale. This cannot be seen by anyone as 3% growth [REDACTED]

The state government is putting in a Rockhampton bypass road. The timing of this boundary review is conspicuous in light of the planned Rockhampton bypass road implementation, especially as it starts just after the three western suburbs of Livingstone.

People have to voluntarily detour to get to the Capricorn Coast, more and more people are leaving RRC and moving to Livingstone. This is done by choice, not through necessity of accessing state run facilities located in Rockhampton, a fact that RRC is erroneously trying to claim as Livingstone shire residents accessing council services/facilities.

The centre of Rockhampton Regional Council is no closer than the centre of Livingstone Shire Council to these suburbs. Rockhampton Regional Council still thinks and behaves as though it is Rockhampton City Council, which was a major reason behind Livingstone de-amalgamation in the first place.

The submission offers no evidence as to what local government services the three suburbs access, or how frequently. [RRC-Written-Submission 30-May-2022 FINAL.pdf \(ecq.qld.gov.au\)](#)

Which of these services does RRC say they provide? The submission makes vague statements and where it does not, it references state or federally owned and funded services such as hospitals, universities and schools. The RRC's own budget states that it receives funding grants from the state government for several of the facilities it claims that the residents of Livingstone shire access.

<https://www.rockhamptonregion.qld.gov.au/files/assets/public/corporate-services/finance/budget/2021-2022-budget.pdf>

The last sentence in the second paragraph in the submission is flawed. *"After all, Northern Suburb residents spend 87% of their time in Rockhampton and just 13% in Livingstone."*

There are 168 hours in a week, 13% of that time is 21.8 hrs. Assuming just 8 hours per night of sleeping would see at least 33% of their time in the shire. Allowing for eating, sleeping, watching TV, housework etc. the time spent would easily exceed 50% in their own residences. [REDACTED]

Further down the in the submission:

"A logical, sequenced plan for development is critical and can only be delivered properly when there is clear leadership, effective planning and certainty for this growing community. This position virtually mirrors the intent of Section 11 of the Local Government Regulations 2012, which states that: The external boundaries of a local government area should be drawn in a way that helps in the planning and development for the benefit of the local government area; and the efficient and effective operation of its facilities, services and activities; and has regard to existing and expected population growth."

And

"With Rockhampton's urban area geographically constrained to the east (Berserker Ranges) and also to the south and west (due to flooding) its future growth corridor rests to the north and the three localities subject to the proposed boundary change"

This is specious reasoning, essentially saying that as Rockhampton expands north it will need more land to expand north. This is akin to the saying 'The bureaucracy will need to expand to meet the needs of the expanding bureaucracy.' Rockhampton's population growth is stagnant.

There are over 1200 lots for development in RRC [Decision Notices \(Statement of Reasons\) Rockhampton Regional Council](#) and ample opportunity and land to expand towards Mount Morgan, but the council overlooks the fact that the growth rate is near 0% for their region and has nothing to do with land.

The same reasoning is used again as though it is a fact

"The following editorial is taken from The Morning Bulletin on 1 December 2014 and indicates the LSC support of the proposed boundary changes. So long Livingstone, residents vote to move to Rockhampton THE results of the voluntary ballot given to the chosen Livingstone suburbs have been tallied, and all but one have chosen to return to Rockhampton. Just three percent of votes stood between Nerimbera moving back, but in the end 52.6% of people wanted the boundaries to stay the

same. Glenlee, Rockyview and Glendale expressed a desire to be included in the Rockhampton Local Government Area, with 75%, 71.5% and 61.9% of votes in favour respectively. The Local Government Boundary Review Poll was a voluntary ballot, and Livingstone Mayor Bill Ludwig said he was pleased to see such a high number of responses. There was a response from 65.7% of eligible voters across all four suburbs. The highest response rate came from Nerimbera, with 75% of eligible voters returning their ballots.”

The bliss of using statistics in a voluntary ballot and again polls by the media located in Rockhampton. Taking this data at face value, 65.7% of residence responded (75% in Nerimbra). 75%, 71.5%, 61.9% and 47.4% said yes to the change. Glenlee, Rockyview and Glendale have a population of 3779, average of less than 65.7% voted and average of 69.4% said yes which gives less than 1725 people determining that 37,400 other people should pay more in rates.

So in statistical terms 4.6% of the population determine what should (adversely) happen to the remaining 95.4% after the entire affected area has already voted to de-amalgamate from RRC.

“RRC POSITION IF THE SUBURBS ARE NOT TRANSFERRED In correspondence to the Deputy Premier on 6 May 2022, Mayor Williams noted that Council will seek compensation for services supplied by RRC to the Northern Suburbs, and that the State Government protects the area through a regulated planning mechanism, such as a Priority Development Area (PDA). Another option that could be considered is re-amalgamation of the two Councils, which would see the LGA expand to its original footprint following the forced amalgamation of 2008.”

So if RRC doesn't get what it wants, re-amalgamation by stealth, it will seek to overturn the democratic process of 2013 and force re-amalgamation. Regardless of whatever process is undertaken, RRC will continue to push for amalgamation.

The position the submission takes regarding the past boundary realignment ignores the fact that in 1984 there were almost no services or residents in Parkhurst, it was and largely still is an industrial area. The western suburbs of Livingstone are well developed and developing residential areas. Hardly a valid comparison.

In the submission by RRC they seem to think that they should have got to vote as to whether or not Livingstone shire should have been allowed to de-amalgamate. No-one got to vote for amalgamation, so holding Livingstone responsible for RRC financial position nearly a decade after de-amalgamation is absurd.

[REDACTED]