

Dear Assessment Manager,

I am a resident of ... and wish to object to the proposed reconfiguration which seeks to further reduce the planned public parkland and replace it with additional residential lots.

My primary concern is that ... is a growing family-oriented community where local parkland is an essential part of everyday life. Many residents have young children who rely on nearby open space for play, exercise and social interaction. The existing park is already well used by families, children, walkers and neighbours throughout the week. As more homes are completed, demand for accessible green space will only continue to increase.

While the applicant refers to a combined “1 hectare park”, this is misleading. The existing parkland has already been dedicated and should not be counted as a new benefit of this application. The proposal would reduce the previously approved park dedication on Lot 904 from approximately 7,415m² to just 3,438m², removing more than half of the currently approved parkland from the site.

The Park Needs Assessment focuses on whether the park can accommodate district-level facilities. However, this overlooks the importance of neighbourhood parks. Local parks do not need large sporting facilities or car parks to be valuable. Their greatest value lies in providing residents with safe, walkable open space close to home, particularly for young families and children.

The applicant also suggests that a future district park elsewhere in Rochedale can compensate for the loss of parkland at this site. I respectfully disagree. A park located elsewhere cannot replace the convenience and community benefits of local green space within walking distance of Arbor residents.

Once public parkland is converted into residential lots, it is effectively lost forever. Although additional housing may provide short-term benefits, preserving public open space will deliver lasting social, recreational and environmental benefits for current and future generations.

I also note that Council's Information Request reportedly stated that any further reduction in the park dedication was not supported, and that a park of only 3,438m² would be insufficient to adequately service the surrounding community. These concerns should be given significant weight.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Brisbane City Council refuse the proposed reduction in parkland, require at least the previously approved park dedication to be retained, and protect the open space originally intended to serve the Arbor community.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours faithfully,

Warm regards,