

Submission issues for consideration

Why the proposed business case is flawed

- 1 The “business case” clearly promotes increasing the number of ratepayers in the mass transit corridor as a cost benefit (revenue), to justify better public transport. Clearly the business case is **biased towards more high-rise buildings** on the 400m wide transport catchment corridor, to better justify the business case.
- 2 The community is being asked to provide preference on a mode of transport, while the **true impact of the mode of transport decision is largely to do with high rise buildings. (densification)**. These two issues need to be separated.
- 3 The community is desperately in need of **better public transport NOW**, and ratepayer’s monies would be better spent on improving current buses, routes and functionality.
- 4 The business case is predicated on **growth forecast numbers that are wrong** on two counts:
 - (i) It is based on gross population increases, whereas there is no evidence of growth of public transport and
 - (ii) The population forecasts take no account of COVID, and the negative growth rate now occurring and expected to continue for 5 - 10 years. COVID has changed the way people work. The business case is all based on pre covid behavior which is no longer valid making the current business case flawed.
- 5 The existing public bus service is made up of 15 year old buses that run mostly empty. The Sunshine Coast has no culture of public transport usage which needs to be demonstrably addressed **before** any investment in mass transport has any credibility.
- 6 The Council are choosing the Public Transport mode that gets the best “Urban Transformation” not necessarily the best mode of transport for the Community. (30% weighting for selection criteria given to “land use transformation”)

Why the consultation is flawed

- 7 The Council “inform” stage of consultation that was supposed to occur in November 2020 did not achieve a broad reach across the Sunshine Coast. It failed to communicate with the majority of Sunshine Coast residents.
- 8 Therefore a large number of residents are **still** not fully informed and therefore not able to properly comment during the consultation phase.
- 9 The rezoning to medium and high density negatively impacts the amenity of existing residents in the corridor.
- 10 The planned light rail does not alleviate the need for a car as it does not connect enough major sites on the Sunshine Coast so traffic congestion will not be reduced but rather increased due to the planned population densification.
- 11 The planned densification has not been communicated to the public. Therefore many people (eg tourists) are responding without full knowledge of the proposal.
- 12 The densification planned in the 13km is an unfair impost on the residents of that corridor. 8% of the population expected to house almost 50% of new arrivals!
- 13 There is no mention on how the future advancement of proposals is to be paid. It would likely be an impost on ALL ratepayers to cover the Councils contribution. Transport levy currently \$44. How much will this be increased? Council have not explained who will pay for this and how much residents will be asked to contribute

- 14 The proposal cannot come to fruition without State Gov nor Federal funding. There is the real possibility of wasted expense without some sort of agreement in principle from this who will be footing the final bill for this. Meanwhile the community is paying the “investigation and business case” costs without the Council having any mandate to do so.
- 15 The proposed mass transit route only services 13km of the Sunshine Coast and does not connect to other existing public transport

Why the route is wrong

- 16 There is no significant congestion along the beachfront, (Maroochydore - Alex Headland - Mooloolaba) yet this is where the mass transit is planned. (This is largely because the business case modelling has been corrupted by the faulty densification logic in the business case)
- 17 Will not relieve congestion in other major areas of the Coast such as Buderim, Caloundra and the Bruce Highway, indeed may add to it as Light Rail require “right of way” at several if not all intersections. All parking along the Light Rail route will be lost therefore businesses along the route will suffer.
- 18 The planned light rail does not alleviate the need for a car as it does not connect enough major sites on the Sunshine Coast so traffic congestion will not be reduced but rather increased due to the planned population densification.
- 19 The propose route does not service the major centers such as University, airport, Buderim and Nambour hospital precincts.
- 20 Of the 43% who do work, construction and small business are the largest employers on Sunshine Coast. Need a vehicle for equipment, resources and tools. Therefore generalized public transport solutions will not work.
- 21 Public transport take up of 10% (assumption in Preliminary business case) insufficient to offset the increased cars on the road due to the densification.
- 22 The 13km corridor selected makes no allowance for any East West traffic movements.
- 23 No consideration given to Coastal hazards and coastal erosion zoning Strategy just completed (CHAS)

Why the Light Rail mode option is wrong

- 24 Light rail is an inflexible solution built on questionable assumptions relating to fire transport, technology and people movements. A light rail route once built, is inflexible, as it will be hard engineered. Light Rail is less adaptable to a change in technology.
- 25 The planned light rail does not alleviate the need for a car as it does not connect enough major sites on the Sunshine Coast so traffic congestion will not be reduced but rather increased due to the planned population densification.
- 26 Light Rail is far less scalable. You can't start small and grow (Meaning nothing happens in the interim.) and you cannot go small if it's not working or something better comes along.
- 27 Light rail places a major barrier along the beachfront area
- 28 Light Rail will take far longer to build than other options
- 29 Light rail is dated and fixed technology.
- 30 There would be more disruption during and after construction with light rail
- 31 Some business along the route would likely close due to the disruption during construction.
- 32 All parking along the Light Rail route will be lost therefore businesses along the route will suffer.
- 33 If one light rail train fails, the whole system fails. (They can't drive around each other.)

- 34 Light rail has ugly overhead wires and has ugly intrusive fencing.
- 35 Light Rail Cost will leave little to no funding for public transport solutions in other areas
- 36 Light Rail with densification around it is totally contrary to the existing Sunshine Coast culture.
- 37 Current population level of the coast does not support a light rail proposal and may not in the future. Current 56 seat public transport buses run mostly empty - what will larger carriage light rail usage figures be?
- 38 The width of the corridor will require the loss of extensive on street parking and the reduction from 4 to 2 lanes in some areas. Additionally, many existing intersections will be compromised (light rail right of way) or closed.
- 39 The proposed light rail route is only 50m from the high tide mark along Alexandra Pde and therefore subject to flooding and coastal hazards. Light Rail means Steel wheels on steel tracks Its incredible noisy when braking, like when descending Alexandra Headland.
- 40 Light Rail takes up the widest corridor of all the option. (A minimum of 8.5 meters.)
- 41 Light Rail's compromised ability on slopes and cambers could require hard engineering and or excavation across Alexandra Headland.
- 42 Light Rail is far more expensive to build than other options at an estimated \$100 million per kilometer, that's \$2.3 billion for one corridor.

What is wrong with this from Sunshine Coast community perspective;

- 43 The Sunshine Coast's character is low to medium density housing which is why people choose here over the Gold Coast. A shift to medium and high density changes the character of the area and undermines the very benefit and point of difference the Sunshine Coast currently offers.
- 44 The development of the CAMCOS corridor for fast (heavy) rail, bringing a spur line from Beerwah to Maroochydore should be the first priority. This would represent the genuine spine for mass transit on the Coast that would service a far greater population and geographic catchment, link us to Brisbane and would also ease congestion on the Bruce Hwy. Stations along this would be hubs from which a larger number of smaller GPS enabled electric/hydro busses or smaller trackless trams would then service the rest of the Coast.
- 45 There are no clear plans for upgrades to services such as hospitals, schools, sewerage systems, waste systems and telecommunication systems to support the increased densification in the urban corridor.
- 46 No consideration has been given to existing residents' amenity.
- 47 The current mass transit solution does not cater to people living and working in other areas of the Sunshine Coast.
- 48 No consideration given to why people come to the Sunshine Coast in the first place, lower density housing/not the Gold Coast
- 49 Proposal all based on work trips, yet 57% of the population don't work. (2016 census) Of the 43% who do work, construction one of the largest employers. Need a vehicle for tools. Therefore will not use current public transport.
- 50 Densification in the coastal corridor is not considering long term climate change impacts and coastal erosion.
- 51 People who reside in the corridor have bought into that area because it is low rise. Any change negatively impacts existing residents' amenity.

- 52 Resumption of land along the corridor will force long term (sometimes elderly) residents out of their family homes and possibly deny them the ability to buy back into the area they have lived in all their lives because their financial ability is limited.
- 53 The densification plans could actually worsen housing affordability as older cheaper properties are knocked down and expensive beachside apartments built.
- 54 The densification will come before the light rail. Therefore new arrivals will still require a vehicle. This coupled with the road disruption during the construction of the light rail will intensify congestion. Car usage behaviors will also already be established which will be hard to change once the light rail is finally up and running.
- 55 Public transport in the 13km coastal stretch does not alleviate the need for a vehicle by those living there. Therefore car usage will not be reduced as suggested.
- 56 Mass Transit feasibility all based on work trips to and from a developing CBD. What if this does not become the major employment area as predicted? Are we prepared to spend \$2+ billion before we know its success?