

Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024

Submission No: 7
Submitted by: Michael Yeates
Publication:
Attachments:
Submitter Comments:

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cost of Living and Economics Committee](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Economic Development Queensland Act SUBMISSION EMAIL ... April 11, 2024
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2024 11:06:29 AM

Submission by EMAIL ... 11 April 2024

I strongly support and endorse the Submission from SEQCA (Southeast Queensland Community Alliance) in regard to this proposed Act.

In addition, and in particular in relation to "cost of living", it has long been known that lower cost housing development relies on lower income occupation BUT ALSO on relatively extreme cost of transport and in many cases, no public transport.

(Note ... How "Lower cost", accessible and/or "affordable" housing can be achieved with high rise developments with lifts etc, and how such uses in such buildings can be enforced, and related issues such as car parking provision, are arguably problematic.)

This effect of "affordability segregation" is primarily due to approval of large housing developments without the necessary services, jobs, and other resources being approved in previously isolated former rural areas irrespective of location. This ensures the occupants "need a car" (or ute) to travel relatively long distances to access "missing" necessities.

A major national study and report in the late 1980s identified this issue using a location near Deception Bay as a Queensland example, as one of a number of case studies nationally. If I recall correctly, the report was known as HALCS.

In the late 1980s, I was very involved initially in a BCC project and then in a joint funded project (Commonwealth, Qld Government, and BCC) to explore low-cost medium density housing as part of The Green Street Joint Venture. This resulted in a project at Corinda identified as "Queensland A1" in the category of Urban Housing - Apartment Building" promoting "better housing choices" produced by the Queensland Department of Housing Local Government and Planning. (1993)

The integration of land use and transport (planning) sought by the initial interest in "integrated planning" in that period has not occurred. The resulting outcome is huge costs in road expansion but also huge increases in travel distances due to limited housing and location choices. These costs are borne by all through fixed costs such as registration but also in fuel costs due to locations and distances between housing and work- places, services, with few if any public transport or active transport options.

This proposed Act continues the failure to effectively integrate transport and land use as implied in the various integrated planning Acts of the late 1980s and 1990s, and subsequent versions, but not achieved, other than in some illustrative* cases, partially.

I trust the crucial issues raised here are appreciated and addressed. Unfortunately, current housing and location options continue to increase economic penalties on those least able to afford the costs and with limited choices.

These costs must be reduced for those least able to afford them while (somehow?) not allowing others to take advantage of the lower costs in a "free" market.

This implies public ownership, rigorous controls, subsidies, etc, all most likely to prove problematic in the free market.

*Some illustrative examples ...

1. Forest Lake is a useful example of low-cost higher density housing co-located at the edge of the central business and service precinct to provide disabled access etc but lacking high frequency fast transport access as an alternative to the "need for a car".
2. Springfield is a useful example of early provision of good public transport by rail but initially lacking low-cost medium density housing options co-located with the central precinct.
3. Aura is a useful example of early provision of potential workplaces but in the early stages is lacking both low-cost medium density housing and good public and active transport as an alternative to the "need for a car".
4. Robina is also a useful example where initially, the central business and services were located at a considerable distance from the extended rail line but with more recent services clustered closer to the rail station. The initial housing also lacked low-cost medium density options co-located with the business and shopping centre resulting in roads dominating the planning.
5. Arguably there are various examples (eg Carseldine) with a more walkable and accessible co-location of good public transport and low-cost housing but lacking in a vital component ie a central precinct with sufficient local services, in the case of Carseldine for example, only a minor shopping centre but distant schools and other services and active travel facilities.

I look forward to the focus on "economic development" being replaced by a much- increased focus on "integrated economic development" at the very least supported by a linking Act or other legal requirement to integrate the land use, transport, economic and environmental focus of the various Acts to create a more permanent and sustainable focus on development in Queensland.

I also invite discussion and participation in further action in regard to the issues raised in my submission and/or requests for further information I may be able to provide.

Michael Yeates
B.Arch MScEnvMan MEnvEd
Retired architect with planning interests

