



Gold Coast Rapid Transit



Contents

| | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| 1. | Introduction | 10-1 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of SIA | 10-1 |
| 1.2 | Context of the SIA | 10-1 |
| 2. | Methodology | 10-2 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 10-2 |
| 2.2 | Methodology | 10-2 |
| 2.3 | Study areas | 10-2 |
| 2.4 | Consultation with SIA stakeholders | 10-3 |
| 2.5 | Identification of social impacts | 10-4 |
| 2.6 | Identification of social impact significance | 10-4 |
| 2.7 | Social Impact Management Plan | 10-4 |
| 3. | Summary of Demographic Profiles | 10-5 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 10-5 |
| 3.2 | Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge | 10-5 |
| 3.3 | Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South station | 10-9 |
| 4. | Summary of community profiles | 10-14 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 10-14 |
| 4.2 | Regional Study Area (Gold Coast LGA) | 10-14 |
| 4.3 | Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge | 10-16 |
| 4.4 | Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South station | 10-17 |
| 4.5 | Summary | 10-18 |
| 5. | Summary of Consultation with SIA Stakeholders | 10-19 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 10-19 |
| 5.2 | Participant SIA Stakeholders | 10-19 |
| 5.3 | Results of Consultation | 10-20 |
| 5.4 | Mode preference | 10-23 |
| 5.5 | Suggestions for new/different route alignment | 10-25 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| 6. | Summary of Identification and Significance of Social Impacts | 10-28 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 10-28 |
| 6.2 | Limitations for the identification of social impacts | 10-29 |
| 6.3 | Property impacts | 10-30 |
| 6.4 | Federal Disability Discrimination Act | 10-31 |
| 6.5 | Significance of Social Impacts and Key to Tables | 10-31 |
| 6.6 | The Whole Corridor | 10-37 |
| 6.7 | Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge | 10-55 |
| 6.8 | Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South Station | 10-59 |

Table Index

| | | |
|-------------|--|-------|
| Table 10-1 | Suburbs in Project local study area | 10-3 |
| Table 10-2 | Stakeholder groups consulted | 10-19 |
| Table 10-3 | Summary of Potential Social Impact Identification | 10-28 |
| Table 10-4 | Anticipated Property Impacts along the GCRT Route | 10-30 |
| Table 10-5 | Assessment of likelihood and consequence of social impact | 10-32 |
| Table 10-6 | Analysis of Likelihood | 10-32 |
| Table 10-7 | Description of Certainty | 10-32 |
| Table 10-8 | Description of Frequency | 10-33 |
| Table 10-9 | Consequence of the Social Impact | 10-33 |
| Table 10-10 | Duration of the Social Impact | 10-34 |
| Table 10-11 | Extent or Spatial Scale of the Social Impact | 10-34 |
| Table 10-12 | Mitigatory Potential of the Social Impact | 10-35 |
| Table 10-13 | Acceptability of the Social Impact | 10-35 |
| Table 10-14 | Potential local and regional social impacts and their significance, Whole of Corridor Construction | 10-37 |
| Table 10-15 | Potential local and regional social impacts and their significance, Whole of Corridor Operation | 10-42 |
| Table 10-16 | Potential local social impacts and their significance, Section 2 Construction | 10-55 |
| Table 10-17 | Potential local social impacts and their significance, Section 3 Construction | 10-59 |

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of SIA

The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) undertaken as part of preparing the Concept Design and Impact Management Plan (CDIMP) had a number of purposes, agreed to by TransLink and Gold Coast City Council (GCCC) prior to the commencement of the SIA¹. This Chapter is drawn for the Volume 7 Technical Report titled *Social Impact Assessment*. Refer to this report for the complete SIA. The purposes of the SIA are as follows:

- » to identify social impacts arising from the Gold Coast Rapid Transit (GCRT) Project at a community level (with a clear identification of impacts at the local and regional study area levels) for both the construction and operational stages of the project²;
- » to provide feedback into the project's concept design:
 - Section 2 - feedback on the alignment (within the route); and
 - Section 3 - feedback on the alignment (within the route);
- » to better inform the project's community engagement and impact management activities; and
- » to develop a Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP) which identifies issues or impacts that can be mitigated or enhanced either by:
 - the TransLink project team; or
 - referral to relevant government departments and agencies or other service/funding bodies (public and/or private).

1.2 Context of the SIA

The SIA has a number of roles, including to be:

- » developed as part of the broader CDIMP process for the project;
- » integrated with the project community consultation process undertaken by TransLink;
- » incorporated into the design and features of the Rapid Transit System (RTS); and
- » compiled as a technical report, and published as an appendix and summarised in the main summary CDIMP document.

¹ At a meeting held on 29 August 2007 attended by representatives of TransLink, GCCC and GHD; the purpose of the meeting being to agree the scope and methodology for undertaking the SIA

² Modal options (LRT and BRT) will also be considered as part of the SIA.

2. Methodology

2.1 Introduction

The SIA methodology was developed on the basis of the following documents:

- » Queensland Department of Families (2002) *Social Issues in Development Assessment: A Resource Guide*;
- » Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care (2000) *Social Impact Assessment in Queensland*;
- » Gold Coast City Council *Social Impact Assessment Planning Scheme Policy* (Draft - January 2007);
- » Published SIA literature (e.g. Burdge, R. (2004) *A Community Guide to Social Impact Assessment* 3rd Edition, Social Ecology Press, Wisconsin);
- » GCCC Draft SIA Planning Scheme Policy (and scoping questions provided by GCCC); and
- » GCRT Terms of Reference (ToR).

The SIA needed to be objective so that the methodology was defensible. The objectivity of the SIA was maintained by:

- » undertaking consultations with SIA Stakeholders without the presence of TransLink staff;
- » triangulation of social impacts (Wlodarczyk, T. L and Tennyson, J. 2003, p.179-185) based on a number of data sources identified in the SIA methodology (published research findings, demographic and community liveability profiles); and
- » ranking of social impacts against a significance matrix.

2.2 Methodology

For detailed methodology and Terms of Reference refer to Volume 2 Appendix B.

2.3 Study areas

For the purpose of the SIA process, the project area was divided into local study areas and a regional study area (refer to Volume 2, Appendix C for SIA Study Area Maps).

2.3.1 Local study area

The local study areas were defined on the basis of the following:

- » the existing established project areas (Section 2 and 3); and
- » Census Collection Districts (CCDs) that were intercepted within a 500 metre buffer on either side of the alignment (considered to be the walkability catchment). This boundary was chosen because this area potentially contains the primary users of the transport corridor and is also the primary area affected by the project.

Table 10-1 provides a list of suburbs in the local study areas per Section.

Vol 2 Chp 10-2

Table 10-1 Suburbs in project local study area

| Section | Suburbs |
|-----------|--|
| Section 2 | Southport |
| Section 3 | Main Beach, Surfers Paradise, Broadbeach, Broadbeach Waters and Mermaid Waters |

It should be noted that there was some overlap of suburbs between sections.

2.3.2 Regional study area

The regional study area was defined at the Gold Coast Local Government Area (LGA) incorporates and addresses outside of the local study area. The regional study area reflects the old Gold Coast City Council municipal area as this relates to the 2006 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census data. It does not include the new municipal boundaries which were formed as part of the Local Government Reform Commission's recommendations in July 2007.

2.4 Consultation with SIA stakeholders

Targeted consultation with SIA stakeholders has been conducted in order to contribute to the development of:

- » description of the existing social environment;
- » identification of social impacts; and
- » mitigation, enhancement or management measures.

Specifically, the purpose of the SIA consultation is to achieve a more accurate response to the ToR for the SIA through:

- » verification of desk-based research to describe the existing environment and provide any relevant or existing information that will address any inaccurate information or gaps in desk-based research;
- » identification of perceived social impacts based on stakeholder experience of living and/or working in the study areas; and
- » discussion of mitigation strategies or impact management measures.

SIA consultation was a key component of the:

- » triangulation process to identify potential social impacts; and
- » developing appropriate mitigation/enhancement strategies and monitoring programs as included in the SIMP.

Volume 2 Appendix B sets out the consultation methodology used for the SIA.

2.5 Identification of social impacts

The framework for identifying potential social impacts was developed on the basis of the GCCC SIA ToR. The process for identifying social impacts was triangulation, where the potential social impacts are identified by at least three sources of data. The data sets used for this SIA were:

- » literature reviews;
- » demographic profiles;
- » existing community profiles;
- » site visits;
- » consultation with SIA stakeholders; and
- » data from the TransLink consultation database.

2.6 Identification of social impact significance

The process for identifying the significance of social impacts was based on a combination of risk assessment criteria and criteria for determining impact significance in Environmental Impact Assessments (EIS).

It involved the identification of the significance of potential social impacts (for both construction and operation), and the analysis of social impacts in terms of the following characteristics:

- » likelihood;
- » consequence;
- » status;
- » duration;
- » spatial extent;
- » mitigatory potential;
- » acceptability to the community; and
- » affected stakeholders.

Further detail in relation to the process for assessing the significance of the potential social impacts is described in section 6.5.

2.7 Social Impact Management Plan

The SIMP has been developed to guide the implementation of the social impact mitigation, enhancement strategies and monitoring programs. The SIMP will cover each significant (positive and negative) impact identified within the SIA for both construction and operation of the project. Each significant impact will provide opportunities for the TransLink Project Team and/or other responsible agencies (i.e. State Government agencies/departments) to mitigate or enhance the impact.

Recommendations for the mitigation and enhancement strategies and monitoring programs for significant social impacts were identified in consultation with SIA Stakeholders and the GHD SIA Team.

Vol 2 Chp 10-4

3. Summary of Demographic Profiles

3.1 Introduction

The following section provides a summary of demographic characteristics of the local and regional demographic characteristics for the following areas local study areas³:

- » Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge; and
- » Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South station.

Each of the local study areas and the whole corridor are compared to the Regional Study Area (Gold Coast Local Government Area).

Demographic data was sourced by desktop-based research including data from the ABS 2001 and 2006 Census, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research and Tourism Australia's National and International Visitor Survey reports.

The datasets for each of the local study areas was commissioned from the ABS for the purpose of the GCRT SIA. Further more, any percentage change greater than five percent is considered significant (Burdge, 2004, p.64).

3.2 Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge

Refer to Appendix H of the Volume 7 Technical Report titled *Social Impact Assessment* for the data on the whole of corridor local study area demographics and comparison to the regional study.

3.2.1 Population

Population changes in the local study area (Section 2) were different from those of the regional study area (Gold Coast LGA). 2006 data shows a 5.50 percent increase in population (from 17,330 persons in 2001 to 18,399 persons in 2006) in the local study area compared with a 13.55 percent increase in population (from 426,661 persons in 2001 to 493,574 persons in 2006) in the regional study area over the same period.

³ Collection districts that were in 500 metres of the GCRT corridor.

3.2.2 GCCC Population Projections⁴

From 2006 to 2026 the population of the SLAs included in the analysis for Section 2 are projected to increase by 33 percent. The most significant changes in age structure from 2006 to 2026 are projected to be in age groups: 60 – 64 years (76.1 percent); 65 – 69 years (101.8 percent); 70 – 74 years (138.7 percent); 75 – 79 years (117.6 percent); 80 – 84 years (92.5 percent) and 85 years and over (66.8 percent).

3.2.3 Age

There were no significant areas of growth or decline between age brackets for the local study area. In 2001 and 2006, the local study area people aged between:

- » 20-24 years experienced the highest positive change growth of 2.20 percent; and
- » 70-74 years experienced the highest negative growth between of –1.04 percent.

There were no significant differences between the percentages of people in each age cohort between the whole of corridor and regional study areas, however there were differences in the trends in the regional study area with the highest positive change growth of 0.87 in the 50-54 age cohort and highest negative growth of –0.50 in the 75-79 age cohort.

3.2.4 Indigenous Population

The local study area experienced a slight increase in the Indigenous population of 0.09 percent from 2001 to 2006 (150 to 176). These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.2.5 Language spoken at home

The local study area had a decrease in the proportion of people who speak only English at home (-5.13 percent from 13,730 person in 2001 to 13,607 persons in 2006). There was a 3.16 percent increase in the proportion of people speaking other languages at home (2,168 to 2,879) between 2001 and 2006. The top three languages (other than English) spoken at home (excluding other language) were Chinese (total languages), Korean and Japanese respectively. These patterns are generally reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

⁴ Statistical Local Areas are based on 2001 ASGC. Statistical Local Areas were reconfigured for the 2006 Census. QDLGP population figures may not align to Council's forecasts. This is due to changes in boundaries and that Council's forecasts are based on the 2004 ERP. Council reviews its forecast periodically and they will be updated to align with current population figures in due course.

Disclaimer: Any representation, statement, opinion or advice, expressed or implied in this publication is made in good faith but on the basis that the Gold Coast City, its agents and employees are to the extent permissible by law, not liable (either by reason of negligence, lack of care or otherwise) to any person for any damage or loss whatsoever which has occurred or may occur in relation to that person taking or not taking (as the case may be) action in respect of any representations, statement or advice referred to above.

3.2.6 Religion

The highest proportion of the population in the local study area in 2001 and 2006 that expressed a religious affiliation are Christian (58.72 percent in 2006). However, this group also experienced the highest negative percentage change of -5.86 percent from 2001 to 2006 (11,184 to 10,804). The highest positive percentage change between 2001 and 2006 for the local study areas was no religion (4.15 percent; from 2,587 persons in 2001 to 3,513 person in 2006). These patterns are reflective of religious patterns in the regional study areas.

3.2.7 Education Level

The proportion of people in the local study area finishing secondary school at Year 10 decreased by 2.19 percent from 2001 to 2006, (3,571 to 3,390 persons). At the regional level there was a positive change in the percentage of people finishing school at Year 10, 4.02 percent from 2001 to 2006.

There was a significant increase in the proportion of people in the local study area finishing school at Year 12 from 2001 to 2006 (7.06 percent, 5,732 person in 2001 to 7,386 person in 2006), however this was substantially lower than the increase seen in the regional study area (12.12 percent from 125,250 persons in 2001 to 158,085 person in 2006) over the same period.

The local study area has also experienced increases in the proportion of people completing tertiary education⁵. The increases in the number of people finishing school at Year 12 and completing tertiary education are generally reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.2.8 Non-school field of study

The population in the local study area experienced positive percentage changes between 2001 and 2006 in all fields of non-school study. Of particular note, there was a significant increase in the proportion of people studying management and commerce (9.98 percent, from 1,087 people in 2001 to 1,559 people in 2006). These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.2.9 Family Type/Composition

The population in the local study area experienced a substantial negative percentage (-15.70 percent from 4,440 families in 2001 to 1,258 families in 2006) change of couple families. There has been a substantial positive percentage change in couple families without children (14.44 percent, from 3,383 families in 2001 to 2,078 families in 2006) and there were similar percentage changes at the regional study area level.

3.2.10 Dwelling structure

From 2001 to 2006, the local study area had:

- » a significant increase in the proportion of semi-detached, row or terrace house, townhouse type dwellings etc (6.78 percent);

⁵ Completing a course to achieve a Certificate, Advanced Diploma and Diploma, Bachelor Degree, Graduate Diploma and Certificate or Post Graduate Degree

- » an increase in the proportion of separate houses (1.60 percent); and
- » an increase in the proportion of flats, unit or apartments (3.75 percent).

This is different to trends in the regional study area, where the regional study area is:

- » having significant increases in the proportion of separate houses (18.29 percent);
- » significant decreases in the proportion of flats, units or apartments (-7.91 percent); and
- » a slight increase in the proportion of semi-detached, row or terrace houses (0.29 percent).

3.2.11 Dwelling tenure

In the local study area from 2001 to 2006, there was a:

- » 2.36 percent proportional change of people renting;
- » -4.28 percent proportional change of people who own their own homes; and
- » 8.52 significant proportional changes of people who are paying off their homes.

This is a similar trend to the regional study area, where for 2001 to 2006, there was a:

- » 1.18 percent proportional change in people renting;
- » -4.07 percent proportional change of people who own their own homes; and
- » 10.73 percent significant proportional change of people who are paying off their homes.

3.2.12 Labour force

In the local study area from 2001 to 2006:

- » the proportion of total employed people increased by 7.19 percent (7,054 to 8,335);
- » the proportion of people employed full time increased slightly by 0.19 percent (4,320 to 5,120); and
- » the proportion of people unemployed decreased by 2.07 percent (838 to 574).

However the increases in total employed is substantially less than those recorded in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.2.13 Industry of employment

Between 2001 and 2006 the local study area's highest positive percentage change was within the accommodation, cafes and restaurants/ food services (2.79 percent from 756 persons in 2001 to 1,113 person in 2006) and highest negative percentage change in the property and business service (-8.14 percent, from 846 person in 2001 to 315 person in 2006). This is not similar to the regional study area where the greatest increase was in construction (2.95 percent), however the regional study area also had its greatest decrease in property and business services (-8.17 percent).

3.2.14 Occupation

There was a positive percentage change in the local study area between 2001 and 2006 in most occupation categories (especially advanced clerical and service workers, 6.80 percent), except for

Vol 2 Chp 10-8

intermediate clerical sales and service workers (-3.48 percent from 1,217 persons in 2001 to 1,138 person in 2006) that experienced a decline in the occupation. These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.2.15 Household Income

Due to the changes in the Census income brackets, a number of income levels could not be compared between 2001 and 2006. Of the income brackets that could be compared, the highest percentage change for the local study area were household incomes between \$1,000 and \$1,199 (4.35 percent, from 490 in 2001 to 884 in 2006). Similarly, the \$800 and \$999 household income bracket saw a -1.42 percent change for both the local and regional study areas. These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.2.16 Source of income

Information not available for the local study area.

3.2.17 Estimation of poverty line

The number of couple families with children under the poverty line has more than doubled, from 250 families in 2001 to 697 families in 2006 (with a proportion change of 12.12 percent) in the local study area between 2001 and 2006. The number of couple families without children under the poverty line in the local study area has substantially decreased from 471 in 2001 to 139 families over the same period (a proportional change of 16.69 percent). This is a similar trend to the regional study area however there was not the significant changes in the regional study area (0.1 percent for couple families without children and -2.15 for couple families without children).

3.2.18 Method of travel to work

The highest proportion of persons in the local study area (80 percent in 2006) used one method of transport to travel to work. Of those people 71 percent in 2006 travelled in a car as a driver. These patterns are generally reflective of travel pattern in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3 Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South station

Refer to Appendix I of the Volume 7 Technical report titled *Social Impact Assessment* for the data on the whole of corridor local study area demographics and comparison to the regional study.

3.3.1 Population

Population changes in the local study area (Section 3) were different from those of the regional study area (Gold Coast LGA), with 2006 data showing a 27.03 percent decrease in population (from 38,607 persons in 2001 to 30,455 persons in 2006) in the local study area compared with a 13.55 percent increase in population in the regional study area over the same period.

3.3.2 GCCC Population Projections⁶

From 2006 to 2026 the population of the SLAs included in the analysis for Section 3 are projected to increase by 37.4 percent. The most significant changes in age structure from 2006 to 2026 are projected to be in age groups as follows:

- » 0 – 4 years (51.5 percent);
- » 40 – 44 years (58.6 percent);
- » 45 – 49 years (67 percent);
- » 50 – 54 years (65.1 percent);
- » 70 – 74 years (71.2 percent);
- » 75 – 79 years (88.2 percent);
- » 80 – 84 years (60.9 percent); and
- » 85 years and over (99.5 percent).

3.3.3 Age

There were no significant areas of growth or decline between age brackets for the local study area. People aged between 20-24 years experienced the highest change growth between 2001 and 2006 (2.18 percent) in the local study area, while people aged 70-74 years experienced the highest negative growth, -1.49 percent between 2001 (2,292 persons) and 2006 (1,354 persons).

There were no significant differences between the percentages of people in each age cohort between the whole of corridor and regional study areas, however there were differences in the trends in the regional study area with the highest positive change growth of 0.87 in the 50-54 age cohort and highest negative growth of -0.50 in the 75-79 age cohort.

3.3.4 Indigenous Population

The local study area has experienced a slight increase in the proportion of Indigenous population (0.01 percent from 2001 to 2006). This is similar to the changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

⁶ Statistical Local Areas are based on 2001 ASGC. Statistical Local Areas were reconfigured for the 2006 Census. QDLGP population figures may not align to Council's forecasts. This is due to changes in boundaries and that Council's forecasts are based on the 2004 ERP. Council reviews its forecast periodically and they will be updated to align with current population figures in due course.

Disclaimer: Any representation, statement, opinion or advice, expressed or implied in this publication is made in good faith but on the basis that the Gold Coast City, its agents and employees are to the extent permissible by law, not liable (either by reason of negligence, lack of care or otherwise) to any person for any damage or loss whatsoever which has occurred or may occur in relation to that person taking or not taking (as the case may be) action in respect of any representations, statement or advice referred to above.

3.3.5 Language spoken at home

The local study area has seen a decrease in the proportion of people who only speak English at home (-5.06 percent from 27,605 persons in 2001 to 20,186 persons in 2006). There was a 1.48 percent decrease in other languages between 2001 (5,155 persons) and 2006 (3,607 persons). The top three languages (other than English) spoken at home (excluding other language) were Japanese, Chinese, and Italian respectively.

3.3.6 Religion

The highest proportion of the population in the local study area in 2001 and 2006 that expressed a religious affiliation are Christian (52.89 percent in 2006). However, this group also experienced the highest negative percentage change -6.49 percent from 2001 and 2006 in the number of people having a Christian affiliation. The highest positive percentage change between 2001 and 2006 for the local study areas was no religion (2.28 percent). These patterns are reflective of religious patterns in the regional study areas.

3.3.7 Education Level

There was a 2.37 percent proportional decrease in the number of people finishing school at Year 10 from 2001 to 2006 in the local study area (6,990 to 4,794). There was a 3.01 percent increase in the number of people finishing school at Year 12 in the local study area from 2001 to 2006. However this was substantially lower than the increase seen in the regional study area (12.12 percent from 125,250 persons in 2001 to 158,085 persons in 2006) over the same period.

The local study area has also experienced increases in the number of people completing tertiary education⁷. The increases in the number of people finishing school at Year 12 and completing tertiary education are generally reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3.8 Non-school field of study

The local study area has experienced positive percentage changes between 2001 and 2006 in most fields of non-school study. Of particular note, there was a significant increase in the number of people studying management and commerce (6.81 percent). These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3.9 Family Type/Composition

There was a significant increase in the proportion of couple families (30.50 percent) from 2001 to 2006 in the local study area. There has been a significant proportional decrease in couple families without children (-29.79 percent from 7,276 persons in 2001 to 1,377 persons in 2006). These patterns are opposite to those seen in the regional study area over the same period, where the percentage change of couples without children has increased by 12.62 percent and couple families with children has decreased by 13.83 percent.

⁷ Completing a course to achieve a Certificate, Advanced Diploma and Diploma, Bachelor Degree, Graduate Diploma and Certificate or Post Graduate Degree

3.3.10 Dwelling structure

From 2001 to 2006, the local study area had:

- » a significant increase in the proportion of flats, units or apartments (11.02 percent).
- » a significant increase in the proportion of separate houses (6.27 percent); and
- » a slight increase in the proportion of semi-detached, row or terrace house, townhouse etc (0.29 percent).

This is different to trends in the regional study area, where the regional study area is:

- » having significant increases in the proportion of separate houses (18.29 percent);
- » significant decreases in the proportion of flats, units or apartments (-7.91 percent); and
- » a slight increase in the proportion of semi-detached, row or terrace houses (0.29 percent).

3.3.11 Dwelling tenure

In the local study area from 2001 to 2006, there was a:

- » 1.07 percent proportional change of people renting;
- » 3.16 percent proportional change of people who own their own homes; and
- » 11.04 significant proportional change of people who are paying off their homes.

This is a different trend to the regional study area, where for 2001 to 2006, there was a:

- » 1.18 percent proportional change in people renting;
- » -4.07 percent proportional change of people who own their own homes; and
- » 10.73 percent significant proportional change of people who are paying off their homes.

3.3.12 Labour force

In the local study area from 2001 to 2006:

- » the proportion of total employed increased by 3.10 percent (15,772 to 12,960);
- » the proportion of people employed full-time increased by 9.68 percent (9,312 to 8,220); and
- » the proportion of people unemployment decreased by 3.10 percent (1,553 to 807).

However the increases in total employed is substantially less than those recorded in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3.13 Industry of employment

Between 2001 and 2006 the local study area's highest positive percentage change was in the construction industry (3.49 percent) and highest negative percentage change was in the property and business services (-8.62 percent from 2,178 persons in 2001 to 675 persons in 2006). These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3.14 Occupation

The local study area has experienced positive percentage changes between 2001 and 2006 in most occupation categories (especially advanced clerical and service workers, 7.31 percent), except for intermediate clerical sales and service workers (-5.95 percent from 2,904 persons in 2001 to 1,606 persons in 2006) that experienced a decline in the occupation. These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3.15 Household income

Due to the changes in the Census income brackets, a number of income levels could not be compared between 2001 and 2006. Of the income brackets that can be compared, the highest percentage change for the local study areas is household incomes between \$1,000 and \$1,199 (4.44 percent from 974 persons in 2001 to 1,518 persons in 2006). Similarly, the \$800 and \$999 household income bracket saw a -1.16 percent change for both the local and regional study areas. These patterns are reflective of changes in the regional study areas over the same period.

3.3.16 Source of Income

Information not available for the local study area.

3.3.17 Estimation of poverty line

The number of couple families with children under the poverty line has expanded more than five times with an increase of 236 families in 2001 to 1,239 families in 2006 (a proportional change of 13.23 percent) in the local study area between 2001 and 2006. Conversely, the number of couple families without children under the poverty line in the local study area has substantially decreased by 11.89 percent (859 in 2001 to 152 families in 2006) over the same period.

3.3.18 Method of travel to work

The highest proportion of persons in local study area (79.65 percent in 2006) used one method of transport to travel to work, this representing a substantial increase (14.49 percent) between 2001 and 2006. Of those people, 66.76 percent in 2006 travelled in a car as a driver. These patterns are generally reflective of travel pattern in the regional study areas over the same period.

4. Summary of community profiles

4.1 Introduction

The following section provides a summary of the community profiles for the regional study area and local study areas for the:

- » regional study area⁸;
- » local study areas⁹:
 - Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge; and
 - Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South station.

The community profiles for each study area are based on a combination of desktop based research, site visits and consultations with SIA stakeholders.

In relation to affordable housing, the Gold Coast City Council report *Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council* (2005, Chapter 2, Section 2.2) provides the following definitions of affordability. These definitions are applied for the purposes of this report.

- » Affordable housing is defined as ‘achieving successful housing for households, including the safety, security and appropriateness of the dwelling, as well as affordable costs’; and
- » Affordability indicator is defined as ‘where households comprising the lowest 40 percent of income earners should not spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. Households paying more than this are regarded as being in ‘housing stress’. Higher income earners may choose to pay more than 30 percent of their income on mortgage payments, making ‘trade-offs’ with other areas of their domestic or discretionary expenditure in order to become home owners.’

4.2 Regional Study Area (Gold Coast LGA)

Sections below provide a summary of findings on the community profile for the regional study area, for more details refer to the Volume 7 Technical Report titled *Social Impact Assessment*.

4.2.1 Community Identity

The landscape in the regional study area is an urban/built environment, with a range of land uses:

- » residential precinct;
- » tourism precinct;
- » commercial/business precinct;
- » industrial areas;
- » specific community use (both natural¹⁰ and man-made¹¹); and

⁸ Gold Coast Local Government Area

⁹ Collection districts that were in 500 metres of the GCRT corridor.

» recreational¹².

The social amenity within these precincts varies and includes local parks, footpaths, beaches, community halls and local shopping nodes. Throughout much of the regional study area there are road and footpath networks providing for varying levels of private vehicle, public transport buses and pedestrian/cycle access.

4.2.2 Accommodation and Housing

Rentals

The median rental costs for the regional study area in the 2004/2005 Financial Year varied between \$200 and \$330 per week, depending on the number of bedrooms. The median weekly rental cost for the regional study area for 2006 was \$260 (not specific to the number of bedrooms).

Mortgage and Housing Stress

The lowest 40 percent of gross household income for the regional study area in 2006 was up to \$999 per week. Calculations show that that all of these households were suffering from mortgage stress.

In 2006, lowest 40 percent household income earners in the regional study area were suffering from housing stress. From the data, a household needs to earn above \$800-\$999 per week to avoid housing stress.

4.2.3 Social Infrastructure and Services

There is a large variety of social services and infrastructure operating in the regional study area. Community services and facilities that relate to the maintenance of community health and wellbeing include:

- » facilities related to the maintenance of physical health;
- » various recreational parks/open spaces;
- » mental health facilities community;
- » cultural centres that provide a social health service; and
- » a large range of religious institutions and religious education groups that provide for spiritual wellbeing.

4.2.4 Crime and Public Safety

The regional study area has varying levels in reported offences. Overall, the total number of reported offences against people, property and other offences has remained at consistent levels between the 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 financial years. Car theft is an important local issue to the Gold Coast community.

¹⁰ For example beaches, bush and parklands

¹¹ For example swimming pools.

¹² For example walking paths (Ocean Way)

4.3 Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge

The following section will provide a summary of findings on the community profile for the local study area for Section 2, which is contained within the suburb of Southport. For further details refer to Volume 7, Technical Report titled *Social Impact Assessment*.

4.3.1 Community Identity

A variety of land uses exist within the local study area for Section 2, for example:

- » commercial development;
- » residential housing;
- » community facilities (such as educational institutions and health services);
- » sporting and recreational parks/open spaces; and
- » key commercial business and employment hubs include the Gold Coast Hospital and Southport business area.

4.3.2 Accommodation and Housing

Rentals

In 2005 the number of separate house properties that were rented in Southport was 806, while the number of attached dwelling properties that were rented was 2,787. Median weekly rental cost for a two bedroom dwelling in Southport was \$240 in 2005.

Houses for purchase

In 2005 the number of sales for separate house properties of purchase in Southport was 284, while the number of attached dwelling properties of purchase sales was 724. The median sale prices in Southport were \$360,000 for separate houses and \$260,500 for attached dwellings and \$298,000 for vacant land.

4.3.3 Social Infrastructure and Services

Throughout the local study area for Section 2, the road and footpath networks provides space for private vehicle, public transport buses and pedestrian/cycle access. However, community consultations have highlighted mobility and access problems in various areas, such as around schools, childcare centres and the Gold Coast hospital.

The local study area also includes a range of social infrastructure facilities and services, such as community and cultural centres, various places of worship, health and related facilities and education facilities and early childhood/child care centres. Many of these are reflected in the community's strong health and wellbeing.

There are a broad range of community support services that operate in the area, many of these focusing on care for the elderly; as they are a major special needs group in the area. The various community facilities such as schools, community development facilities and organisations help create community cohesion in the area.

There are also a range of leisure and recreational facilities within the local study area. These include various sporting and activity facilities, leisure facilities and services (including parks and reserves), recreation and social facilities (including non-sporting clubs and groups); and some museums, galleries or art centres, community art programs and services, and entertainment facilities (such as cinemas and theatres).

4.3.4 Crime and Public Safety

Community consultations have highlighted various crime and public safety concerns throughout the section. Examples of these include incidences of people using illicit drugs and drinking alcohol in public spaces throughout Southport, bag snatchings and attempted abductions around the hospital precinct as well as high levels of car theft.

4.4 Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South station

The following sections of this chapter will provide an overview of the community profile for the local study area for Section 3. For more details refer to Volume 7, Technical Report titled *Social Impact Assessment*.

Suburbs transacted by the local study area for the whole corridor are:

- » Main Beach;
- » Surfers Paradise; and
- » Broadbeach.

4.4.1 Community Identity

The local study area for Section 3 is identified by dominance of tourism, hospitality and entertainment activities. High-density commercial, tourist-based and residential development in the area occurs along side sporting and recreational parks/open spaces as well as extensive beaches. Some of the key commercial business and employment hubs include Pacific Fair, Cavill Avenue, Broadbeach and the Convention Centre.

4.4.2 Accommodation and Housing

Rentals

In 2005 the number of separate house properties that were rented in Surfers Paradise was 338, while the number of attached dwelling properties that were rented was 4,160. Median weekly rental cost for a two bedroom dwelling in Surfers Paradise was \$290 in 2005.

Houses for purchase

In 2005, the number of sales for separate house properties in Surfers Paradise was 141, while the number of sales for attached dwelling properties was 1,685. The median sale price in Surfers Paradise was \$1,250,000 for separate houses and \$322,000 for attached dwellings and \$3,062,500 for vacant land.

4.4.3 Social Infrastructure and Services

Social infrastructure facilities and services in the local study area include emergency and education facilities/services. There are also a number of social infrastructure services that provide services for the elderly (for instance, meals on wheels, Broadbeach), as they are a major special needs group in this area.

The range of leisure, recreational and social facilities including:

- » parks and reserves;
- » museums, galleries or arts centres;
- » sporting and activity facilities;
- » community arts programs and services;
- » entertainment facilities (such as cinema or theatre); and
- » a library.

4.4.4 Crime and Public Safety

Community consultations have identified various crime and public safety concerns throughout the section. Examples of these include problems with intoxicated people congregating in public places and high levels of car theft in the Broadbeach and Surfers Paradise areas. In order to increase public safety, the Broadbeach Community Consultative Committee (established by the Queensland Police) is located in Broadbeach.

4.5 Summary

The different study areas for the GCRT corridor have varying community identities and social amenity. All sections feature varying degrees of commercial development and residential housing, provision of community facilities, sporting and recreational parks/open spaces. As such, the different local study areas for the relevant sections are generally representative of the range of community identities and social amenity found throughout the regional study area.

5. Summary of Consultation with SIA Stakeholders

5.1 Introduction

As part of the SIA ToR and methodology, consultation with a number of representatives from across the section of the potentially impacted stakeholders (namely community organisations, groups and services who represent the community and community services) was undertaken to contribute to the development of the SIA.

Areas of the SIA that the stakeholders were asked to provide input included:

- » description of the existing community;
- » identifying potential social impacts and;
- » brainstorming potential mitigation and enhancement strategies.

As well as responding to the above, stakeholders also provided comments on:

- » the design of the system; and
- » the mode options (light rail or bus rapid).

This section outlines comments and issues (that are not specific social impacts) derived from consultation with SIA stakeholders that relate to the project. Feedback on the identification of potential social impacts and the SIMP has already been incorporated in section 6.

This section does not focus on specific sections of the project corridor.

5.2 Participant SIA Stakeholders

Table 10-2 summarises the stakeholder groups who participated in the SIA. There were a number of other stakeholder groups invited to participate in the SIA, refer to the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment* for the stakeholders who were invited to participate in the SIA.

Table 10-2 Stakeholder groups consulted

| Stakeholder group | Date | Type of consultation |
|---|----------|----------------------|
| GCRT's Community Reference Group (Sections 1 and 2) | 05/9/07 | Focus group/workshop |
| Older Women's Network (Qld) Inc | 09/11/07 | Interview |
| Broadbeach Chamber of Commerce | 12/11/07 | Interview |
| Queensland Health, Gold Coast Hospital | 13/11/07 | Interview |
| Gold Coast North Chamber of Commerce | 13/11/07 | Interview |
| GCCC Advisory Committee | 13/11/07 | Focus group/workshop |
| Multicultural Communities Council Gold Coast | 14/11/07 | Interview |
| Disaster Coordination Unit | 15/11/07 | Focus group/workshop |

Vol 2 Chp 10-19

| Stakeholder group | Date | Type of consultation |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Friends of Macintosh Island Park & Narrowneck Inc | 15/11/07 | Interview |
| Harbour Town Shopping Centre | 16/11/07 | Interview |
| Queensland Disability Network | 17/11/07 | Focus group/workshop |
| Representatives of youth organisations | 19/11/07 | Focus group/workshop |
| Southport Croquet Club | 19/11/07 | Interview |
| Studio Village Community Services | 20/11/07 | Interview |
| Beenleigh Adult and Youth Service | 20/11/07 | Interview |
| St Vincent de Paul Society | 20/11/07 | Interview |
| My Kindy | 20/11/07 | Interview |
| Tennis Gold Coast/Queens Park Tennis Centre | 21/11/07 | Interview |
| GCCC officers | 21/11/07 | Focus group/workshop |
| Griffith University | 21/11/07 | Interview |
| Department of Education, Training and the Arts | 22/11/07 | Interview |
| Department of Housing, Community Renewal | 22/11/07 | Interview |
| Gold Coast Mobility Office | 23/11/07 | Interview |
| Centro Surfers Paradise | 23/11/07 | Interview |
| Gold Coast Tourism | 28/11/07 | Telephone interview |
| GCRT's Community Reference Group (Section 3) | 28/11/07 | Focus group/workshop |
| Trinity Kindergarten | 05/12/07 | Telephone interview |
| Surfers Paradise Chamber of Commerce | 06/12/07 | Interview |
| Total number of groups consulted | | 28 |

5.3 Results of Consultation

The results of the consultation have been summarised into the main categories (reflecting the main issues identified by the participating stakeholders):

- » transit design;
- » mode preference; and
- » suggestions for new/different route alignment.

5.3.1 Transit design

There was a range of issues or comments raised in relation to the design of the GCRT System and these issues have been summarised below (refer to the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment* for more details).

- » **Public transport feeder links** – An issue raised frequently by stakeholder representatives was the importance of feeder routes from existing public transport to the GCRT System. Specific comments or links highlighted were connections from Nerang train station to Pacific Fair; and from the proposed Broadbeach Rapid Transit System into the Pacific Fair shopping centre. The ease of connecting from the GCRT to existing transport services was regarded as important by a number of stakeholder representatives.
- » **Elevation** – Sections of the GCRT route were identified as needing to be elevated to minimise disruption to the existing road network in that area. It would have the same effect as a monorail in that it would minimise traffic disruption or in some areas, reduce the need for road widening to accommodate the dedicated corridor. It might also reduce cost by taking up less land stakeholder representatives commented that elevating the system could be considered in:
 - Section 3: Ferny Avenue travelling up Cypress Avenue into the Gold Coast Highway and then to Q1 building. Also elevation at the Nerang – Broadbeach Road intersection.
- » **Accessibility** – Design of the GCRT needed to take into account the mobility of elderly people and the sick, particularly in regards to exiting and entering the GCRT system/station near the Gold Coast Hospital area. In addition, having the carriage level with the road was regarded as an important design element.
 - **Wheelchair accessibility** - Several stakeholder representatives noted that the transit system needed to accommodate people in wheelchairs or using walking frames. There is an issue with wheelchair accessibility on buses as not all buses have this facility. Dedicated wheelchair spaces on the transit carriages were also important as well as a carer's seat near the wheelchair space. To enable people in wheelchairs to have enough time to get on and off the carriages, it was suggested that cameras be linked to the driver so that the driver can clearly see if people in wheelchairs or other people with mobility issues have embarked/disembarked. A dedicated wheelchair area on the station platform such as at heavy rail stations - was an additional idea.
 - Another recommendation was to invite people in wheelchairs to test the useability of the transit design, rather than able-bodied people in wheelchairs.
 - Accessibility for people with prams or with other packages/baggage was also identified as needing to be considered in the design aspects of the transit system design. A specific comment was made in relation to the Pacific Fair shopping centre and the proposed Broadbeach South station where escalators are specifically designed for these purposes. The Myer Centre in Brisbane was an additional example.
 - Stakeholders highlighted the importance of all facilities (toilets, ticketing outlets) on the GCRT system needed to be accessible to people with a disability; and that these people also needed to be familiarised with the system as it would affect them (e.g. through colour coding of information).

- Location of access points for the GCRT system was another key consideration. People with a disability may be reluctant or unwilling to use the system if they have to cross a busy road to access it.
- » **Other accessibility issues** – There were other specific issues raised in relation to accessibility. One stakeholder representative raised concerns in relation to the rapid transit system design and the ability of service vehicles being able to access businesses in that street (i.e. with less road space due to the rapid transit system design).
 - Another concern in the Paradise Waters area (Section 3) was the impact of the transit route on the current slip lanes. It was recommended that the concept design consider the changes to the slip lane and road in and out of the island (Admiralty and Commodore Drives).
 - Maintaining access to the kindergarten in Carey Lane (off Queen Street) in Section 2 was an issue raised by a stakeholder representative. It was recommended that a left in/left out configuration be considered as well as a U-turn facility at the nearby traffic lights so that cars could access the lane.
- » **Safety** – Many stakeholder representatives raised the issue of safety of the GCRT system, and particularly the importance that the community ‘perceived’ the system to be safe to use. A recommendation was to incorporate the Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) and other security equipment at stations and on the rapid transit carriages. Consideration also needed to be given to safety at the exit points (where people get off the transit system) and appropriate lighting in and around the transit stations.
 - A specific reference to safety was made by one stakeholder representative in regards to the kindergarten on the corner of Queen Street and Carey Lane. The kindergarten needed to be protected from a traffic accident by the way of a barrier such as a high tension steel cable barrier that would also reduce opportunities for crime (i.e. a solid wall may provide an area of concealment).
- » **Cycle facilities** – Bicycle spaces should be considered at the transit systems and allowances made for bicycles in the transit carriage. This was also regarded as a way to minimise car use. Pedestrian and cyclist linkages/paths into the transit area were also regarded as important.
- » **Underground** – There were a number of stakeholder representatives who thought the system should be underground in certain sections. One of the sections referred to was near Scarborough Street.
- » **Park n’ Ride facilities** – According to several stakeholder representatives these facilities should be incorporated into the design of the transit system.
- » **Aesthetics** – Stakeholder representatives stated that the system and transit stations should be “attractive”, “modern” and designed to a high standard so it could be recognised as a world class system. Further more, the stakeholders stated that a sense of place can be achieved by incorporating interesting and appealing design of stations and the overall system.
 - Another stakeholder representative stated that a see-through/clear roof should be considered as it might provide a good way to showcase the Gold Coast.
- » **Emergency vehicle access** – The transit system needs to be designed to provide emergency vehicle access as required.

- One stakeholder representative queried whether there would be water supplies along the transit route and accessibility to fire hydrants for fire fighting purposes.
- » **System information** – Some stakeholder representatives highlighted the issue of information on the GCRT system for visitors to the Gold Coast, particularly those from non-English speaking backgrounds. It was regarded by one stakeholder representative that multi-lingual signage was not necessary but perhaps a touch screen display system for ticketing (on the stations and in carriages) with options for the information in different languages.
 - It was generally considered that safety messages and signs should be multi-lingual.
- » **Other design issues** – Some of the other design considerations raised by stakeholder representatives were:
 - graffiti prevention measures were needed at stations;
 - for areas with a lot of stairs/rails/car parks, reference should be made to public space and publications for young people by GCCC in relation to skateboarders;
 - footbridges were recommended on Parklands Avenue linking the Griffith University medial precinct to the future hospital site. A footbridge should also be considered at the transit station proposed near the Gold Coast Convention Centre, crossing over the highway to the restaurant precinct;
 - a recommendation from a stakeholder representative was that a ferry service could be connected to the transit system;
 - specific concerns were raised about the general design of the system as to whether - particularly in the Surfers Paradise area – it could be called ‘rapid’ with the number of stations being proposed; and
 - another stakeholder representative said that the community were expecting a well planned route and mode of transport from the start that would service the community for the next 100 years. A “band-aid” solution with subsequent stages of the system to improve it was not welcome and that the design should be done well at the start.

5.4 Mode preference

Feedback from stakeholder representatives regarding the mode options of LRT and/or BRT was noted during the SIA consultation process. No specific questions were asked by GHD to stakeholder representatives as to their preference for one option or another. The issues summarised below are based on feedback received from some of the stakeholder representatives in regards to either their preference for a particular mode and the reasons why or feedback on both mode options (for more details refer to Volume 7 Technical Report titled *Social Impact Assessment*).

5.4.1 Light Rail Transit

Comments or feedback on the LRT option varied, covering areas such as efficiency and reliability, aesthetics and energy usage. The specific issues raised in relation to light rail as the option for the GCRT project are summarised below:

- » **Power cuts** – There were questions raised by stakeholder representatives as to the impact on the GCRT System if the Gold Coast experienced a power cut. One stakeholder representative queried

whether there would be a need to construct additional power generators to supply the system if it was LRT or for the volt supply to be upgraded.

- » **Visual impact** – The visual appearance of overhead powerlines in Surfers Paradise was regarded by one stakeholder representative as “tacky” and there was the comment that some overhead powerlines had recently been removed in that area. Another stakeholder representative regarded the overhead lines as a negative visual impact. It was recognised that there would be no visual impact if the power lines were located underground.
- » **Environment and overhead lines** – One issue raised was whether overhead lines for the LRT would disturb trees and impact on flora and fauna.
- » **Cost** – Some stakeholder representatives regarded the cost of the LRT as being more expensive than the BRT. One stakeholder representative claimed that the LRT would be five times more expensive than the BRT.
- » **Efficiency** – The issue was raised as to whether the LRT would be faster than the current bus services along Section 3. If not, a lot of money would be wasted.
- » **Noise** – One stakeholder representative perceived that the LRT may generate less noise in operation than the BRT.
- » **Corridor** - One stakeholder representative perceived that the LRT may have a smaller corridor (in width) than the BRT.
- » **Perceptions** - The concept of the light rail was more modern than the BRT according to one stakeholder representative while another thought that the elderly would be more familiar and more likely to use the system if it is an LRT. Another stakeholder representative said there was a perception of the light rail as safer and more reliable as it was a more permanent structure.
- » **Tourists** – The LRT was regarded as a more familiar mode of transport for tourists as it was more widely adopted in Europe and South East Asia.
- » **Impact on Gold Coast Indy 300** – An issue was raised that if the LRT was selected the permanent tracks could affect the traction for the Indy cars.
- » **Accidents** - Concern was raised by a stakeholder representative as to whether there would be an increased risk of fatalities as a result of using the LRT rather than the BRT. How the concept design would address the issue of accidents on or near the transit system was a key factor.
- » **Environmental impact** – One stakeholder representative said the LRT was preferred from a social point of view as the BRT would emit “toxic fumes” while the LRT would not. Another perspective was that there would be an environmental impact as a result of the power generation and fuel source for the transit option regardless of whether it was LRT or BRT.

Melbourne’s tram system was used as an example or comparison by a number of stakeholder representatives.

5.4.2 Bus Rapid Transit

The BRT option did not receive as much feedback or comment as the LRT and issues related to flexibility and changes to route alignment. The specific issues raised in relation to BRT as the option for the GCRT are summarised below:

- » **Flexibility** – A number of stakeholder representatives described the BRT as being more flexible in terms of the ability to change the alignment if the system was not proving to be successful in particular areas. Another aspect of this was the perception that the BRT could be used elsewhere (outside the route alignment) while the LRT would always be in a fixed alignment.
- » **Construction impact** – A perception was that the construction of the LRT could cause more disruption due to having to erect the overhead lines so the BRT might be faster and easier to construct.
- » **Cost** – The BRT was perceived as being of less cost than the LRT.
- » **Accessibility** – An issue raised was whether the BRT would come to the stations closely in line with the platform and therefore minimise the gap with the carriage. The LRT by being on a fixed track may not have this problem. For those with mobility concerns, this could be an issue in terms of their ability to get on and off the system.
- » **Reliability** – Concern was raised that buses could break down and may not be as easily maintained as the LRT.
- » **Environmental impact** – The BRT was perceived by one stakeholder representative as emitting toxic fumes (Refer to section 5.5.1 above).

One stakeholder representative did not have a preference for BRT or LRT but the mode option should be selected based on the least number of impacts, cost and largest carrying capacity of passengers.

5.5 Suggestions for new/different route alignment

Some of the feedback received from stakeholder representatives included suggestions or recommendations for new or different route alignments. This primarily focused on what was identified as the need to connect the outer lying suburbs of the Gold Coast particularly in the north and west. Connectivity of the service with existing public transport networks was a key aspect of this issue.

It should be noted that the issues and recommendations summarised below are based on the feedback received from some of the stakeholder group representatives in regards to aspects of the Concept Design rather than as a response to specific questions asked by GHD. Therefore some stakeholder representatives did not provide any comment or feedback on different or extended route alignments or the location of stations (refer to Appendix P of the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment*).

5.5.1 Extension of route

Specific recommendations or suggestions for extensions to the proposed route alignment were:

- » A feeder route should be created along Bundall Road to then loop into the rapid transit system, providing linkages to the current Council Administration Centre and businesses/facilities along Bundall Road.
- » Other route suggestions included placing the route down Wardoo Street to the Currumburra area, which has now been incorporated as part of the route, with a station being located along Wardoo Street.

Stakeholder representatives also commented on feeder routes in general, and particularly the importance of the Nerang-Broadbeach connection.

5.5.2 Station locations

The location of proposed stations was of particular concern in Section 2 in Southport while the number of stations in Section 3 raised some concerns in terms of the impact on the reliability and speed of the service. Key issues provided in the stakeholder feedback are summarised below:

- » Relocating the station on Queen Street outside the Southport State Primary School to the east was proposed to minimise impact on the current school parking capacity. The school pick up/drop off point was regarded as critical for the school children with a disability. The relocation of the station was also recommended by the childcare centre opposite the school. This suggestion has been considered and the station has been relocated from outside the school on Queen Street, and is now proposed to be situated to the west on Wardoo Street.
- » Relocating the station outside the Southport Croquet Club further towards the nearby parkland area was proposed to reduce the impact on two of the playing courts.
- » The Broadwater and Scarborough Street South stations could be moved slightly to the north-west.
- » It was recommended that additional stations be included in the Scarborough Street area to make it easier to access the large number of community services in that precinct but that at some of these smaller stations, the transit system would only stop on-demand.

5.5.3 Re-route options

The recommendations from stakeholder representatives regarding the re-routing of the proposed alignment ranged from smaller-scale changes to significant realignment of whole sections.

- » Near the Gold Coast Hospital precinct, a recommendation was to examine the roads near the site and whether emergency vehicle access could be provided through Little High Street (potentially converting to a two way street).
- » One suggestion was that the alignment in Section 3 would be retained but a loop added so that the GCRT system also went along Ferny Avenue.
- » Changing the transit route to the eastern side of the Gold Coast Bridge and through the Gold Coast Indy 300 area would minimise resumptions, and retain the grass verge (on the western side). It was felt that the Indy track should be considered along with the other resumptions and possibly relocated elsewhere with a stakeholder representative saying the public transport system should take precedence over events.

- » A significant re-route was suggested for the GCRT undertake a wider sub-regional role by its route going down Bundall Road and connect to Beenleigh, Robina, and Coolangatta. It was regarded that this would meet resident needs and keep Surfers Paradise and the Bundall area separate.
- » The Stage 2 route from Broadbeach to Coolangatta should be aligned to the east / west rather than north / south and go along Nerang-Broadbeach Road through to the Nerang train station.

5.5.4 Other issues

- » The Tennis Club raised the issue of the impact on their administrative building and car spaces as a result of the rapid transit route alignment in Section 2 and wanted to investigate options for use of nearby space.
- » A stakeholder representative said there needed to be a second bridge onto Chevron Island for car access from Budds Beach i.e. Palm Avenue to Dalpura Street.

6. Summary of Identification and Significance of Social Impacts

6.1 Introduction

This section of the SIA sets out the potential social impacts for each section of the project:

- » Whole Corridor – potential regional social impacts;
- » Section 2 – potential local social specific impacts; and
- » Section 3 – potential local social specific impacts.

Social impacts have been grouped under according to the key areas to be addressed in the Terms of Reference:

- » SI 1 - Demographics and social change;
- » SI 2 - Accommodation and housing;
- » SI 3 - Mobility and access;
- » SI 4 - Social infrastructure;
- » SI 5 - Needs of special groups;
- » SI 6 - Consistency or coherency of the project into its surrounds;
- » SI 7 - Community identity, cohesion and severance;
- » SI 8 - Health and wellbeing;
- » SI 9 - Leisure and recreational opportunities;
- » SI 10 - Crime and public safety;
- » SI 11 - Social amenity
- » SI 12 - Employment and local economic effects
- » SI 13 - Personal and property rights
- » SI 14 - Other social impacts.

As many of the potential social impacts do not relate to one key area alone, the other related key areas have also been noted.

Potential social impacts have been numbered for identification purposes

Table 10-3 Summary of Potential Social Impact Identification

| Section | Number |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| Whole Corridor - Construction | 1 – 26 |
| Whole Corridor – Operation | 27 – 76 |

| Section | Number |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| Section 2 – Construction | 91 – 111 |
| Section 2 – Operation | n/a |
| Section 3 - Construction | 112 - 118 |
| Section 3 - Operation | n/a |

Where a section of the GCRT has 'n/a' it means that the potential social impacts have already been identified in the whole of corridor.

Potential social impacts have been identified based on the following data sources:

- » Site visits;
- » Literature review (based on a light rail and heavy rail case studies, refer to the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment*);
- » Review and analysis of demographic data (refer to Appendix A to the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment*);
- » Review and analysis of relevant community profiles (refer to the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment*);
- » Consultations with SIA stakeholders (refer to the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment*); and
- » Review of TransLink Community Consultation database.

6.2 Limitations for the identification of social impacts

The following components of the project were not known at the time of writing the draft SIA:

- » Social impacts were developed and SIMP developed based on:
 - The GCRT corridor with a 500 metres walk up area;
 - There would be either a LRT or BRT operating.
- » Details of construction, including:
 - Method of construction (whether starting at one end and working to the other or working in sections);
 - The size of the construction and operational workforces;
 - The duration of construction;
 - Traffic diversions, road closures etc
- » The final locations of the stations;
- » Details of the station design and landscaping;
- » Whether the system will be a LRT or BRT and the exact operating strategy for the given mode;
- » Some data for the community profile data (at the local study area) was not publicly available;



- » Connectivity with other networks were under development (road, public transport and pedestrian / cycle facilities), although the plan to develop the Integrated Transport System has been noted;
- » The exact number of directly impacted properties along Section 2 and Section 3;

The following limitation impacted on the quality of data collected for the SIA:

- » Project knowledge of the SIA Stakeholders varied, impairing the ability to identify social impacts by some stakeholders;
- » At the time of writing the SIA, some other technical reports were not completed and therefore outcomes from other technical reports have not been incorporated into the SIA analysis;
- » Timeframes and budget.

6.3 Property impacts

As per the requirements of the TOR, the number of properties to be acquired for the project have been identified per section.

6.3.1 Number and type of properties

The property numbers in Table 10-4 indicate the likely number of 'full takes' – where the occupants will need to relocate to a new residence, and businesses that will need to be relocated or paid compensation for the value of their business if relocation is not viable.

Table 10-4 Anticipated Property Impacts along the GCRT Route

| Section | Number of Full Takes |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Section 2 | |
| Houses | 5 |
| Apartment buildings | 2 |
| Units in apartment buildings | 68 |
| Commercial properties | 12 |
| Government Properties | 4 |
| Section 3 | |
| Houses | 0 |
| Apartment buildings | 4 |
| Units in apartment buildings | 57 |
| Commercial properties | 17 |
| Government Properties | 4 |

Additionally, 38 properties in Section 2 and 50 in Section 3 maybe partially impacted. For example a partial take may include a requirement on an areas of common land our outdoor facilities¹³.

With reference to EC13 from the SIA ToR the 'new front liners' (properties that are directly impacted as a result of the project) were not available at the time of writing the SIA.

6.4 Federal Disability Discrimination Act

The GCRT is being designed and will be constructed as per the relevant disability legislation, regulations and guidelines. According to the Function Design Guideline for the GCRT (Part D) the regulation under the *Federal Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (1992) (DDA) is the basis for the station design.

All aspects of the system design including vehicles, stations and access to stations are based on compliance with DDA and DSAPT requirements. Low floor entry and close docking will enable direct access to vehicles without need for ramps.

Appropriate design has been included in the:

- » Platform sizing (platform length, platform lighting, boarding points, waiting space, slip resistance, trip hazards; drainage, gradients and cross falls, colour and luminance contrast, evenness, surfaces, platform edges and surface markings);
- » Station typology as per hierarchy;
- » Components of stations (information – signs, displays and network, furniture, access (surfaces and treatments¹⁴), security, optional enhancements and landscaping.

The conveyances (either LRT or BRT) will also meet the relevant disability legislation, regulations and guidelines.

6.5 Significance of Social Impacts and Key to Tables

TransLink, GCCC and GHD developed a project specific social impact significance identification process for the GCRT. This process is outlined in the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment*. It is recommended that readers refer to Appendix Q of the Volume 7 Technical Report, titled *Social Impact Assessment* prior to reading the potential social impacts to gain an understanding of how decisions of significance were undertaken. The following provides a summary of the contents from Appendix Q.

Assessment of likelihood and consequence of social impact

An assessment of likelihood and consequence of a social impact will be determined by:

- » An assessment of likelihood which takes into consideration certainty and frequency; and
- » An assessment of consequence.

¹³ The information contained in Table 10-4 and the proceeding paragraph was provided by Translink on Thursday 17 April 2008.

¹⁴ This can be further split into walkways, ramps and landings, stairs, wheel chair access, handrails, tactile ground surface indicators,

Table 10-5 Assessment of likelihood and consequence of social impact

| Likelihood of social impact | Consequence of social impact | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Insignificant | Minor | Moderate | Major | Extreme |
| Certain | Medium | Medium | High | Excessive | Excessive |
| Very likely | Medium | Medium | High | High | Excessive |
| Likely | Medium | Medium | Medium | High | High |
| Possible | Low | Medium | Medium | High | High |
| Unlikely | Low | Low | Low | Medium | High |
| Rare | Negligible | Low | Low | Medium | Medium |

Likelihood of social impact

Table 10-6 Analysis of Likelihood

| Frequency | Certainty | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 5% | 25% | 40% | 60% | 75% | 100% |
| Continuous | Likely | Likely | Likely | Very likely | Certain | Certain |
| Frequent | Possible | Likely | Likely | Likely | Very likely | Certain |
| Regular | Possible | Possible | Possible | Likely | Very likely | Very likely |
| Irregular | Unlikely | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Likely | Very likely |
| Uncommon | Unlikely | Unlikely | Possible | Possible | Likely | Likely |
| Unexpected | Rare | Unlikely | Possible | Possible | Possible | Likely |

Certainty

Table 10-7 Description of Certainty

| Certainty | Description |
|-----------|---|
| 100% | The identified social impact will occur (100%) |
| 75% | The identified social impact is very likely to occur (75% certainty) |
| 60% | The identified social impact is likely to occur (60% certain) |
| 40% | It is possible for the social impact to occur (40% certainty) |
| 25% | The identified social impact is unlikely to occur (25% certain that the social impact will occur) |
| 5% | It will be rare for the social impact to occur (5% certain that the social impact will occur) |

Frequency

Table 10-8 Description of Frequency

| Frequency | Description |
|------------|--|
| Continuous | The identified social impact occurs permanently, continuously or at a frequency that is at least once a fortnight through to once every 6 months for the stage of the project (e.g. construction or operation) |
| Frequent | The identified social impact could occur at least once every 6 months or once every 24 months for the stage of the project (e.g. construction or operation) |
| Regular | The identified social impact could occur at some time between every 2 and 5 years for the stage of the project (e.g. construction or operation) |
| Irregular | The identified social impact might occur at some time between every 5 to 10 years during the stage of the project (e.g. construction or operation) |
| Uncommon | The identified social impact might occur at least once in the life of the project, until 2041 (either construction or operation) |
| Unexpected | The identified social impact is not expected to occur during the life of the project (either construction or operation) |

Consequence of social impact

Table 10-9 Consequence of the Social Impact

| Rating | Proposed description |
|----------|--|
| Extreme | <p>Multiple public (i.e. non construction or operational workforces) fatalities perceived or deemed to be caused by the project; and/or</p> <p>Increase in project reputation or damage to the project's reputation at the national level; and/or</p> <p>Media coverage at the international level; and/or</p> <p>Impact results in over 10% change or a extensive deterioration or enhancement in the social impact indicator (this can be both a positive or negative change) within 500m of the GCRT corridor (local study area)</p> |
| Major | <p>Single fatality ; or permanent major disability of a member of the public (i.e. non construction or operational workforces) perceived or deemed to be caused by the project; and/or</p> <p>Increase in project reputation or damage to the project's reputation at the national level; and/or</p> <p>Media coverage at the national level; and/or</p> <p>Impact results in a 5-10% change or a substantial deterioration or enhancement in the social impact indicator (this can be both a positive or negative change) within 500m of the GCRT corridor (local study area)</p> |
| Moderate | <p>Recoverable accident of multiple or single members of the public (i.e. non construction or operational workforces) fatalities perceived or deemed to be caused by the project; and/or</p> <p>Increase in project reputation or damage to the project's reputation at the state level; and/or</p> <p>Media coverage at the state level; and/or</p> <p>Impact results in a 2 – 5% change or a considerable deterioration or enhancement in the social</p> |

Vol 2 Chp 10-33



| Rating | Proposed description |
|---------------|---|
| | impact indicator (this can be both a positive or negative change) within 500m of the GCRT corridor (local study area) |
| Minor | <p>Medical treatment of multiple or single members of the public (i.e. non construction or operational workforces) fatalities perceived or deemed to be caused by the project; and/or</p> <p>Increase in project reputation or damage to the project's reputation at the South East Queensland level; and/or</p> <p>Media coverage at the South East Queensland level; and/or</p> <p>Impact results in a 1 – 2% change or a noticeable deterioration or enhancement in the social impact indicator (this can be both a positive or negative change) within 500m of the GCRT corridor (local study area)</p> |
| Insignificant | <p>On site first aid of multiple or single members of the public (i.e. non construction or operational workforces) fatalities perceived or deemed to be caused by the project; and/or</p> <p>Increase in project reputation or damage to the project's reputation at the Gold Coast level; and/or</p> <p>Media coverage at the Gold Coast level; and/or</p> <p>Impact results in less than a 1% or a barely noticeable deterioration or enhancement in the social impact indicator (this can be both a positive or negative change) within 500m of the GCRT corridor (local study area)</p> |

Duration of the social impact

Table 10-10 Duration of the Social Impact

| Rating | Proposed description |
|---------------|--|
| High | <p>Permanent or long term (10 years or more)</p> <p>Life span of the project</p> |
| Medium | <p>Reversible over time</p> <p>Medium term (5 to 10 years)</p> |
| Low | <p>Quickly reversible</p> <p>Less than project life span</p> <p>Short term (0-5 years)</p> |

Extent or spatial scale of the impact

Table 10-11 Extent or Spatial Scale of the Social Impact

| Rating | Proposed description |
|---------------|--|
| High | In all levels of study areas |
| Medium | In both the local and regional study areas |
| Low | Only in the local study area |

Mitigatory potential

Table 10-12 Mitigatory Potential of the Social Impact

| Rating | Proposed description |
|---------------|---|
| High | <p>Limited mechanism for the Project Team to mitigate the negative social impact, could involve 100% responsibility of another entity or group of entities (e.g. local, State or Commonwealth Government).</p> <p>Little or no mechanism for the Project Team to enhance positive social impact, could involve 100% responsibility of another entity or group of entities e.g. local, State or Commonwealth Government).</p> |
| Medium | <p>Potential for the Project Team to mitigative negative social impact. However, the implementation of mitigation measures may still not prevent some negative effects. It will be the responsibility of both the Project Team and other entities or group of entities (e.g. local, State or Commonwealth Government) to implement the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Potential to enhance positive impacts. However, the implementation of enhancement measures may not lead to fulfilling the potential of the positive impact. It will be the responsibility of both the Project Team and other entities or group of entities (e.g. local, State or Commonwealth Government) to implement the enhancement strategy.</p> |
| Low | <p>High potential for the Project Team to mitigate negative social impact to the level of insignificant effects, could include 100% responsibility of the Project Team to mitigate negative social impact. No involvement from another entity or group of entities e.g. local, State or Commonwealth Government) required.</p> <p>High potential for the Project Team to enhance positive social impact. No involvement from another entity or group of entities e.g. local, State or Commonwealth Government) required.</p> |

Acceptability

Table 10-13 Acceptability of the Social Impact

| Rating | Proposed description |
|---------------|---|
| Low | SIA stakeholders have indicated their lack of willing to accept the social impact and/or indicated their intent to apply political pressure to any level of government. |
| Medium | SIA stakeholders have indicated their willingness to accept the social impact if there is appropriate mitigation/enhancement strategies in place and supported by the Project Team. |
| High | SIA stakeholders have indicated their willingness to accept and promote the social impact. |

Status of the impact and Who will be impacted

A description of whether the social impact is positive, negative or neutral. The status of the impact can be both positive and negative, dependant on who will be receptor. Identification of the stakeholder groups to be impacted by the project (as per the social impact) needs to be undertaken. The stakeholder groups are not ranked but used in descriptive purposes only.

6.6 The Whole Corridor

This sub-section sets out the potential local and regional social impacts of the project if it was to be constructed and operated as per the whole corridor.

6.6.1 Construction – Whole of Corridor

The potential social impacts from the construction of the whole corridor are set out in Table 10-14. The construction impacts for the individual sections are set out in the relevant sub-sections. This sub-section identifies the potential impacts of all sections combined.

Table 10-14 Potential local and regional social impacts and their significance, Whole of Corridor Construction

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁵ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------|
| Demographics and social change | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Change in the demographics of the local study area due to property resumptions and change in the number of affordable properties | High | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and families relocating out of the local study area due to property acquisitions. | SI1 SI13 |
| Accommodation and housing | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | The potential decrease in the numbers and types of affordable housing properties and rental stock ¹⁶ across areas of the whole corridor local study area. The number of affordable housing an rental stock to be removed due to land acquisition of the project (during the construction phase) was unknown at the time of writing the draft SIA. If this information was known it | High | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and families in the local study area who currently live in accommodation that is considered affordable. | SI2 SI5 |

¹⁵ L/C = Likelihood/consequence rating

¹⁶ Affordable housing - 'achieving successful housing for households, including the safety, security and appropriateness of the dwelling, as well as affordable costs' Source: GCCC – Chapter 2, section 2.2, Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council April 2005 Affordability indicator – 'where households comprising the lowest 40% of income earners should not spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Households paying more than this are regarded as being in 'housing stress'. Higher income earners may choose to pay more than 30 per cent of their income on mortgage payments, making 'trade-offs' with other areas of their domestic or discretionary expenditure in order to become home owners.' Source: GCCC – Chapter 2, section 2.2, *Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council April 2005*

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁵ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------------|
| | would not be published in the draft SIA report due to privacy of the land acquisition negotiations currently be undertaken at the time of writing the draft SIA. It is assumed that there will be affordable housing located within the project corridor that will need to be acquired for the project. | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Increased pressure on short term accommodation by construction workforce in the local study area | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | For tourists who have stayed in the same hotel/location over a long period. | SI2 |
| | | | | | | | Positive | For hotel owners and staff. | |
| Mobility and access | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Disruption to access of emergency vehicles to and from hospital. Ambulances may be restricted by congestion caused by the construction of the System | Excessive | Low | Medium | Medium | Low | Negative | Patients, Ambulance and Hospital employees using resources in the local study area. | SI3 SI4 SI8 |
| 5 | Alteration to the access of educational facilities, such as primary, secondary and tertiary, community services and infrastructure | Excessive | Low | Low | Medium | Low | Negative | Students, staff and associated workers using facilities in the local study area. | SI3 |
| 6 | Disruption to existing road network Temporary road closures/diversions due to construction of rapid transit corridor | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Road users, residents and businesses in the local study area and emergency vehicles. | SI3 |
| 7 | Cumulative traffic congestion (on local streets), potential rat running through local streets and the safety concerns and potential for traffic grid lock | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Road users, residents and businesses in the local study area and emergency vehicles. | SI3 |
| 8 | Disruption and reduction of on-street parking | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Regular users of on-street parking in the local study area | SI3 |
| 9 | Reduced vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access to businesses and service providers | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Business owners, staff, customers and associated workers (e.g. couriers) in the local study area. | SI3 SI12 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁵ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 10 | Disruption to community organisations whose service delivery is reliant on vehicle access to customers, clients, members, patients – e.g. services provided to homeless people. | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Community service organisations based in the local study area, customers, clients, staff, member and/or patients and associated workers (e.g. taxis, couriers). | SI3 SI4 SI6 |
| Community identity, cohesion and severance | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Increase in community severance during construction – decreased mobility, accessibility and ability to transverse and avoid construction sites in a safe manner. Plus decrease the opportunities for individuals and groups to interact and participate in events. | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents and businesses currently operating in the local study area, particularly those near the construction sites. | SI7 |
| Health and wellbeing | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Decrease in safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists around construction sites compared to existing road conditions | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Pedestrians, cyclists and motorists near the constructions site(s). | SI8 |
| 13 | Decrease in the health and wellbeing of neighbours (residents and businesses) to the construction site, e.g. noise and air quality | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Low | Negative | Residents and businesses near the constructions site. | SI8 SI11 |
| Leisure and recreational opportunities | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Change in the perception of accessibility to public open spaces – health and wellbeing, sport and recreation | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and groups who currently use open space in the local study area. | SI9 |
| Social amenity | | | | | | | | | |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁵ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|--|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|------|
| 15 | General amenity of construction sites – not consistent with the existing amenity | Medium | Low | Low | High | Medium | Negative | Residents and businesses located near the construction sites. | SI11 |
| 16 | Decrease in the ability of individuals and groups to enjoy, socialise and recreate in the local study area by decreased access, environmental impacts (noise, air quality), perceptions of health and safety | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and group who currently live, socialise and recreate in the local study area. | SI11 |
| Employment and local economic effects | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Loss of income to those businesses relying on customers accessing the construction areas (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) or who need to travel through the area (e.g. taxis, private buses and limousines) | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Owners, staff, customers and associated workers (e.g. couriers) who use the goods and services supplied by the business in the local study area. | SI12 |
| 18 | Local employment opportunities for people to be employed by Project team | High | High | Medium | Low | High | Positive | Unemployed people, people looking for a career change or to relocate to the local study area for work. | SI12 |
| 19 | Disruption to tourist access to events and attractions and flow on commercial benefits | High | High | Medium | Medium | High | Negative | Tourists, business owners and staff. | SI12 |
| 20 | Increase in businesses who supply goods and services to the construction of the GCRT. | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Positive | Business owners, employees and associated workers. | SI12 |
| Personal and property rights | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Access to affordable land to buy-back into the area for community services – may cause the complete relocation of services outside the area – impact on the service provision to clients | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals, families, businesses and community service providers who will have their land acquired. | SI13 |
| 22 | Financial costs and/or loss of not being able to develop/implement planning for private residences, businesses and community organisations | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals, families, businesses and community service providers who will have their land acquired. | SI13 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁵ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|-----------------------------|---|--|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|------|
| Other social impacts | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Disruption to major infrastructure services Disruption or temporarily disconnect major infrastructure services e.g. water, sewerage, electrical and communications | High | Low | Low | Medium | Low | Negative | Individuals and group reliant on the infrastructure and infrastructure service providers. | SI14 |
| 24 | Impact of construction workforce – parking, increase in certain types of business, accommodation (short and long term). | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents and businesses in the local study area. | SI14 |
| | | | | | | | Positive | Businesses in the local study area who supply goods and services required by the construction workforce. | |
| 25 | Reduced access to service stations and the goods and services they supply, reduced business due to the potential perception that the service station is closed or too hard to access during construction and the concern of potential customers driving near and around construction. | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Service station owners and employees and customers of the service stations. | SI14 |
| 26 | Bio-physical impacts | Refer to Volume 2: Noise and Vibration Refer to Volume 2: Air Quality. Refer to Volume 2: Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology Refer to Volume 2: Geology and Topography | | | | | | | |

6.6.2 Operation – Whole of Corridor

The potential social impacts from the operation of the whole corridor are set out in Table 10-15. The operational impacts for the individual sections are set out in the relevant sub-sections. This sub-section identifies the potential impacts of all sections combined.

Table 10-15 Potential local and regional social impacts and their significance, Whole of Corridor Operation

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|--------------------------|
| Demographics and social change | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Increase in high density living could increase the number of people living in the local study area | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Residents, businesses and community services in the local study area. | SI1 |
| 28 | GCRT could encourage those without private vehicles to live near the System (elderly, young people, those from transient backgrounds) | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Positive | Existing community members living and/or working in the local study area. | SI1 SI5 |
| 29 | System may cause gentrification/ renewal of communities The System may encourage higher socio-economic groups to live near the corridor which may cause the departure of lower socio-economic groups | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Residents living within the local study area. | SI1 |
| 30 | System may further encourage the number of non-English speaking persons (primary language spoken at home) to live/migrate near the System The increase in the number of non-English speaking persons to the local area may alter the demand to some social infrastructure services and alter the community identity of an area | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Residents in the local study area and community service providers and GCCC. | SI1 SI4 SI5 SI7 |

¹⁷ L/C = Likelihood/consequence rating

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|--------------------|
| 31 | Displacement of low income earners in the local study area due to increase in housing costs and land values | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Low income residents (i.e. people on or under the poverty line) | SI1 SI2 SI13 |
| 32 | System may encourage an increase in the population The System may encourage an increase in residential density/ development that will increase the number of residents living in the area. New residents may choose to live near the System as it will provide a reliable public transport option. An increase in population may increase in the demand for services (utilities, social infrastructure and leisure and recreation) | Medium | Medium | Medium | High | Medium | Neutral | Residents in the local study area, Local and State Governments (planning) | SI1 |
| Accommodation and housing | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | Changes in affordable housing stock The System may cause the loss of affordable housing in some areas along the corridor. This may affect /cause displacement of affordable housing residents such as migrants/ refugees. However there are opportunities to redevelop affordable housings stock | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Residents in the local study area, Local and State Governments and property developers. | SI2 |
| 34 | System may provide opportunities for transit orientated developments System may provide opportunities for transit orientated developments near the stations | Medium | High | Low | High | High | Positive | Residents in the local study area, Local and State Governments and property developers. | SI2 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|----------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|------------|
| Mobility and access | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Delays to the Rapid Transit System caused by traffic delays/congestion. Where the System will share road corridors with road users (e.g. parts of Section 3), it may be affected by a traffic accident or congestion which will affect the Rapid Transit efficiency in delivering reliable and rapid services to passengers | Excessive | High | High | Medium | Medium | Negative | Road users and residents in the local study area. | SI3 |
| 36 | Safety of pedestrians System may cause risks to the safety of pedestrians to both non-users of the System (using footpaths) and users of the System (access to and from the System). Pedestrians include persons with mobility issues (elderly and persons in wheelchairs) | Excessive | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Pedestrians, cyclists and users of the road in the local study area and patrons of the GCRT. | SI3 SI5 |
| 37 | Improved linkages between precincts and suburbs The Transit System will enhance linkages between precincts such as Southport and Surfers Paradise. In addition, it will improve linkages between major shopping centres | Excessive | High | High | Low | High | Positive | All stakeholders | SI3 |
| 38 | Changes to existing public transport providers (including passengers) System may require the relocation or permanent removal of bus stops, taxi ranks which may affect users. Some users may not be able to access the System as a result of the changes. Affects to public transport providers (buses and taxis) – may cause loss of business and rerouting stops and services | Excessive | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Passengers of public transport and public transport providers (inc. drivers) | SI3 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 39 | Increased accessibility of the Gold Coast for tourists and visitors The Transit System may provide increased accessibility to tourist areas such as the beach, theme parks and to short term accommodation | Excessive | High | High | Medium | High | Positive | Tourists (local and international), tourism operators (inc. staff) and organisations. | SI3 SI1 |
| 40 | Changes in the local road network will affect emergency services where emergency vehicles do not have access to the GCRT. If there are changes to the local road network such as reduction in speed limits, traffic calming or road closures, it will affect the response times to emergency services (such as ambulance). In addition, if there is an increase in the number of vehicles parked on local streets (from users of the Transit System), this could increase traffic congestion and affect emergency vehicles | Excessive | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Emergency service providers and State Government. | SI3 SI4 SI8 |
| 41 | Increase in alternative form of public transport for residents, employees, students, tourists and low income individuals and families | High | High | Medium | Low | High | Positive | Potential passengers on the GCRT. | SI3 |
| 42 | System will move people in and out of areas for events/ entertainment System will be able to move people in and out of areas during events (e.g. Schoolies, Gold Coast Show and Indy), in the entertainment precincts (nightclub patrons). It will increase connectivity and mobility of the Gold Coast area | High | High | High | Medium | High | Positive | Residents in the local study area, tourists (local and international), tourism operators (inc. staff) and organisations. | SI3 SI1 |
| 43 | Increased access to regional heavy rail line services (inc. interstate) and Brisbane Airport (domestic and international). | High | High | High | Low | High | Positive | Passengers requiring transport to the Brisbane Airport and regional or interstate heavy rail lines. | SI3 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------|
| 44 | Reduction in traffic/ single car occupant drivers The Transit System may encourage local residents such as the elderly to use the System instead of the private car to access services and facilities | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Positive | Residents in the local study area. | SI3 |
| 45 | Decrease in the number of employed people travelling to work as driver in private vehicles High proportion of workers currently use private vehicles | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | High | Positive | Employees who currently drive to work who have access to the GCRT (local study area) | SI3 SI12 |
| 46 | Potential dislocation of northern and western residential areas to the System (including young people) There are a high proportion of Gold Coast residents living in emerging areas (northern parts of the Gold Coast) and established areas (western parts of the Gold Coast) that would benefit from using the System. However, these areas will not be serviced directly by the Rapid Transit System | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents in the northern and western sections of the regional study area. | SI3 |
| Social infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | System will provide emergency vehicle access Providing access to emergency vehicles (fire, police and ambulance) will improve response times as emergency vehicles will not be affected by traffic congestion | Excessive | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Positive | Emergency service providers, State Government and those people requiring emergency services. | SI4 |
| 48 | Changes to access health/ medical facilities including Gold Coast Hospital Changes to access to the hospital/medical facilities will affect access for service providers of the hospital such as ambulances. It will also affect patients, visitors and staff to medical facilities | Excessive | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Health service providers (inc. staff), patients and the residents in the local study area. | SI4 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 49 | <p>Permanent changes to access of community facilities/ social infrastructure</p> <p>Permanent changes cause by the implementation of the System may affect a number of social infrastructure facilities and services. For example changes in access to schools may lead to a decrease in enrolment numbers; changes in child care centres may increase risks to safety of children and parents and changes in access may affect people wanting to visit cemeteries which may affect the health and wellbeing of the community</p> | High | High | High | Medium | Medium | Negative | Community organisations, members and staff, people who rely on the community services, GCCC, State Government and local residents. | SI4 |
| 50 | <p>Increased access to secondary and tertiary education facilities</p> <p>Improve student access to secondary and tertiary education facilities as there is an increase in population completing Year 12 and tertiary education</p> | High | High | Medium | Medium | High | Positive | Students, teachers and associated workers at the primary, secondary and tertiary education facilities. | SI4 SI1 SI3 |
| 51 | <p>Potential increase in student enrolments (tertiary and secondary) because of increased access to educational facilities.</p> | Medium | High | High | Medium | Medium | Positive | Educational facilities, Local and State Government, other students. | SI4 SI1 SI3 |
| 52 | <p>Loss of social infrastructure</p> <p>Some community services may have to relocate as a result of the project (either by rising land and running costs or acquisition/ resumption of land). It may lead to a loss of social infrastructure to communities. For example, it may affect access/ loss of land in cemeteries that may affect the local history and opportunities for the community to access the facility. It may also affect the accessibility for the community to access services/ facilities. It will affect the community's health and wellbeing if there is a loss in social infrastructure/ disruption to social networks</p> | Medium | Medium | High | Low | High | Negative | Community service providers and people who access their services. | SI4 SI13 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|--------------------|
| Needs of special groups | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | <p>Potential of inappropriate design of stations and carriages for special needs groups</p> <p>Station and System design may prevent special needs groups being able to use System. Carriages may not line up with the platforms and wheelchair persons/ parents with strollers/elderly with mobility aids may not be able to get on System. In addition, accessibility onto stations may hinder wheelchair persons and parents with strollers to use the System. In addition, special needs groups need to feel that there is enough time to get on and off the System safely to avoid injury (e.g. elderly may fall over if the carriage takes off before they sit down – they may decide not to use the System if this occurs)</p> | High | Medium | Medium | Low | Medium | Negative | Residents in the local study area, tourists, special needs individuals and groups. | SI5 SI3 |
| 54 | <p>System may benefit special needs groups</p> <p>The System may assist disabled /elderly persons to socialise/ increase networks by being able to go to events with their children or go shopping (by using of the System). Some disabled and elderly persons may find it easier to use the System and therefore are able to do a number of tasks/activities in one day (the current public transport System is too difficult/ time consuming or too costly to do more than on trip per day)</p> | Medium | High | Medium | Low | High | Positive | Individuals with special needs, special needs groups. | SI5 SI11 SI8 |
| 55 | <p>Improved access for young people</p> <p>The Transit System will provide increased accessibility to recreation (such as the beach), social, entertainment, health care facilities, educational institutions (school, university and TAFE) and employment facilities. The System will increase the young people's independence with less reliance on parents driving young people to destinations</p> | Medium | High | Low | Low | High | Positive | Residents in the local study area, young people, parents, employers and educational institutions. | SI5 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|---------------------|
| 56 | Increase in access to services and facilities for those families on or under the poverty line and young people Families under stress may not be able to afford living expenses / vehicles so public transport is main transport option | Medium | High | Medium | Low | High | Positive | Individuals and families who live on or under the poverty line. | SI5 |
| Community identity, cohesion and severance | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | System may increase severance between residents and communities adjacent to the corridor The System may reduce accessibility for residents directly along the corridor. The System may affect the community being able to cross from one side of the road to the other (as a result of the System) | Medium | High | Low | Low | High | Negative | Residents and community service providers in the local study area. | SI7 |
| 58 | Stations may contribute/ enhance a community's sense of place/ identity Some of the System's stations may enhance a community's sense of place for example emerging community areas. Whilst it may contribute to a community's sense of place to an established community | Medium | High | Low | Low | High | Positive | Residents and community service providers in the local study area. | SI7 |
| Health and wellbeing | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | Potential conflict between different user groups of the System Conflict between different user groups such as workers early in the morning and nightclub patrons returning home in the morning/ intoxicated persons may occur on the System which will cause concerns of safety using the System. Young people may decide to use station car parks and stations as opportunities for skateboarding. Which may cause a clash between young people using the space and passengers | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Passengers, GCCC, Queensland Police, employers and safety organisations. | SI8 SI10 SI11 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR | |
|---|---|--|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------|-------------|
| 60 | Noise impacts on nearby residential areas | Refer to Volume 2: Noise and Vibration | | | | | | | | SI8 SI11 |
| Leisure and recreational opportunities | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | Improved open space networks The System may improve open space networks such as footpaths/ cycle tracks and may rejuvenate the use of some green spaces (as a result of increased accessibility) | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | High | Positive | Residents and workers in the local study area and GCCC. | SI9 SI11 | |
| Crime and public safety | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | Safety of vulnerable people (children, elderly, people with disabilities) getting used to the new system and how it operates | High | High | Low | Low | Low | Negative | Vulnerable passengers. | SI10 SI5 | |
| 63 | Increased opportunities for crime due to people using the system Safety of system especially for shift workers. System needs to be safe at all hours due to shift workers as users of the System | High | High | Low | Low | Low | Negative | Passengers, especially shift workers. | SI10 | |
| 64 | Increased opportunity for car theft as the System's stations will have a number of parked commuter cars A number of the proposed stations are situated in areas that experience a high car theft rate. If passengers of the System need to drive and park to use the System there will be a high concentration of cars around stations | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Passengers who leave their vehicles (including bicycles) at the station car parks. | SI10 | |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|--|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|--------------------|
| 65 | <p>Vandalism of stations and violence may affect local residents and passengers of the System</p> <p>Stations and carriages may be a target for vandalism (e.g. graffiti) and crime. This may affect (perception of safety) for local residents and passengers using the System. It may result in local residents may decide to leave the areas and passengers may decide not to use the System</p> | Medium | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Passengers, GCCC, Queensland Police, community service providers (inc. youth groups and primary/secondary schools) | SI10 SI11 |
| Social amenity | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | <p>Changes to residential amenity</p> <p>The System may increase the level of road traffic noise (as a result in changes in access/road verges in the local road network), noise generated from System, odour, emissions, privacy and visual aesthetics to residents located within close proximity to the corridor</p> | Medium | High | Low | Low | Medium | Negative | Residents in the local study area. | SI11 SI18 |
| 67 | <p>System may increase social interaction</p> <p>The Transit System may encourage social interaction between passengers which may increase a person's social network. Regular users a certain times may interact with other regular users (e.g. elderly). This may increase a persons health and well being as well as improving the social amenity of the local community</p> | Medium | High | Low | Low | High | Positive | Passengers | SI11 SI7 SI8 |
| Employment and local economic effects | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | <p>Increased employment opportunities through ease of access to work</p> | High | High | Medium | Medium | High | Positive | Those unemployed individuals who are dependant on public transport to travel to and from work and potential employers. | SI12 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|------|
| 69 | Improved access to employment The System will provide access to employment hubs such as shopping centres, management and commerce businesses (as there is an increase in this type/ field of study) and workers in the tourism/ hospitality industry. It may also encourage workers from the broader study area to use the System to travel to and from work | High | High | High | Low | Low | Positive | Workers who live within the local study area, and workers who have access to the GCRT through linked public transport. | SI12 |
| 70 | Employment opportunities for people to be employed by TransLink, as drivers and support staff | High | High | Medium | Low | High | Positive | Unemployed individuals in the local study area or those employed people looking to change jobs or have a career change. | SI12 |
| 71 | System will affect local businesses/ economy System may provide economic benefits to local businesses - the System may provide increased access to nearby businesses and encourage new businesses to be established near the corridor which could lead to economic growth of local economy Loss of income to local businesses - The System may change access to local businesses and loss of on-street parking which may result in customers not being able to access the business which will result in a loss of income to the local business | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | High | Neutral | Businesses within the local study area. | SI12 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------|
| Personal and property rights | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | <p>System will affect property prices directly along and near the corridor</p> <p>An increase in property prices may occur near the corridor and may affect special needs groups, lower socio-economic groups as developers may purchase property (not being able to afford to stay in the community). These groups may have to relocate or become homeless. However, it may improve a home owner's assets near the corridor. However, property prices may decrease to properties (primarily residential) directly along the corridor</p> | Medium | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Neutral | Residents in the local study area, Local and State Government. | SI13 SI2 |
| Other social impacts | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | <p>Reduction of financial strain on transportation costs</p> <p>The Transit System may reduce financial strain for disabled persons who currently use taxis and is a costly mode of transport. The System may provide a number of disabled persons access to facilities and services such as access to medical facilities</p> | High | High | Medium | Medium | High | Positive | People with special needs and community service organisations. | SI14 SI3 |
| 74 | System may be a terrorist target | High | High | High | Medium | Medium | Negative | Passengers, residents, businesses and service providers in the local study area, Local and State Governments, emergency service providers. | SI14 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁷ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------|--|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|--|-------------|
| 75 | <p>Reduction of pedestrian and vehicle conflicts as a result of the reduction of private vehicles on roads</p> <p>A reduction in pedestrian and vehicle conflicts may occur if residents, visitors and tourists use the System. Some visitors/tourists that drive cars around the local study area can be distracted whilst driving (as they are looking for their accommodation, attractions) which affects the safety of other motorists and pedestrians</p> | Medium | High | High | Medium | Medium | Positive | Passengers, Pedestrians, cyclists, tourists, GCCC and State Government. | SI14 SI3 |
| 76 | <p>System will provide capacity for mass evacuation in a crisis</p> <p>System may be able to provide crisis evacuation for a large number of people during a disaster e.g. flooding, cyclone, terrorism attack. The System could revert to moving in one direction to move people out of areas</p> | Medium | High | High | Medium | High | Positive | Residents, businesses and community service organisations in the local study area, GCCC, State Government and emergency service providers. | SI14 |

6.7 Section 2: University Hospital station up to and including Sundale Bridge

This sub-section sets out the potential social impacts of the project if it was to be constructed and operated as per Section 2. This section should be read in conjunction with Section 6.6 as there are impacts that could occur in both Section 2 and the Whole of Corridor.

6.7.1 Construction – Section 2

The potential social impacts from the construction of Section 2 are set out in Table 10-16.

Table 10-16 Potential local social impacts and their significance, Section 2 Construction

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁸ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|--------------------|
| Demographics and social change | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | Change in the demographics of the local study area for Section 2 due to property resumptions. | High | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and families relocating out of the local study area due to property acquisitions. | SI1 SI2 SI13 |
| Accommodation and housing | | | | | | | | | |
| 92 | The potential decrease in the numbers and types of affordable housing properties and rental stock ¹⁹ in Section 2. The number of affordable housing an rental stock to be removed due to land acquisition of the project (during the construction phase) was unknown at the time of writing the draft SIA. | High | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and families who have to relocate out of local study area due to the decrease in the number and type of affordable properties. | SI2 |

¹⁸ L/C = Likelihood/consequence rating

¹⁹ Affordable housing - 'achieving successful housing for households, including the safety, security and appropriateness of the dwelling, as well as affordable costs' Source: GCCC – Chapter 2, section 2.2, Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council April 2005 Affordability indicator – 'where households comprising the lowest 40% of income earners should not spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Households paying more than this are regarded as being in 'housing stress'. Higher income earners may choose to pay more than 30 per cent of their income on mortgage payments, making 'trade-offs' with other areas of their domestic or discretionary expenditure in order to become home owners.' Source: GCCC – Chapter 2, section 2.2, Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council April 2005

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁸ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|--------------------|
| Mobility and access | | | | | | | | | |
| 93 | Disruption and reduction of on-street car parking on Queen street, Nerang street and Scarborough Street. | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Regular users of on-street parking. | SI3 SI6 |
| 94 | Increased traffic congestion due to construction activity in Queen Street area | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Road users, residents and businesses in the local study area, public transport and emergency services. | SI3 SI6 SI11 |
| Social infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| 95 | Disruption to access of emergency vehicles to and from hospital. Ambulances may be restricted by congestion caused by the construction of the System | Excessive | Low | Medium | Medium | Low | Negative | Individuals and groups requiring emergency services, emergency service staff. | SI4 SI8 |
| 96 | Disruption of access to the hospital 24 hours/day Access for patients, staff and associated workers needs to be maintained | Excessive | Low | Medium | Medium | Low | Negative | Individuals and groups requiring emergency services, emergency service staff. | SI4 SI8 |
| 97 | Disruption of access to Southport State School Loss of car parking outside school would have detrimental impact as school has highest number of physically disabled students who get picked up and dropped off by taxis etc | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Students, parents, staff at Southport State School. | SI4 SI5 |
| 98 | Disruption of access to social infrastructure on Queen Street including schools, child care facilities, cemetery, community services both vehicle and pedestrian access | High | Low | Low | Medium | Low | Negative | Individuals and group who access the community services and facilities on Queen St and the people who work providing the services. | SI4 SI5 SI6 |
| 99 | Impact on ability to service community (impact to operation of community service) as located on | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Low | Negative | Clients requiring community services based | SI4 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁸ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Queen Street | | | | | | | out of Queen St. | SI6 |
| 100 | Disruption to access to social infrastructure in Scarborough Street precinct Especially community centres, Centrelink, library, RSL, Department of Immigration, Multicultural Family Organisation, TAFE (including the migrant centre) and churches | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | People accessing and people providing services. | SI4 SI5 |
| Consistency or coherency of the project into its surrounds | | | | | | | | | |
| 101 | Loss of on street parking in Nerang Street, particularly outside medical precinct | High | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Staff and patients who currently use the on-street parking | SI6 SI3 |
| Community identity, cohesion and severance | | | | | | | | | |
| 102 | Loss of croquet courts Proposed station location would impact on courts of Croquet Club and threaten their ability to play/run the club. The could also lead to a change in the community identity as club has been at Southport for over 50 years and has contributed to local heritage and history | High | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Members and supporters of the croquet club. | SI7 SI8 SI9 SI11 SI13 |
| 103 | Increase in community severance during construction in the local study area – decreased mobility and accessibility and ability to transverse and avoid construction sites in a safe manner. Plus decrease the opportunities for individuals and groups to interact and participate in events. | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents, businesses and community service providers in the local study area. | SI7 SI6 |
| Social amenity | | | | | | | | | |
| 104 | Impact on residential amenity in Barratta Street – visual impacts, loss of green space | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents and businesses in the local study area | SI11 SI8 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁸ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|--|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|------------------------------------|
| 105 | Decrease in the ability of individuals and groups to enjoy, socialise and recreate in the local study area by decreased access, environmental impacts (noise, air quality), perceptions of health and safety | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents and businesses in the local study area. | SI11 SI8 |
| Employment and local economic effects | | | | | | | | | |
| 106 | Disrupted access to industrial precinct | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Businesses, employees, associated workers and customers. | SI12 SI11 |
| 107 | Changes to Croquet Club's event/social calendar, popular for social events (e.g. parties) and will decrease in financial revenue | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Croquet Club members and supporters. | SI12 SI7 SI8 SI11 SI13 |
| Personal and property rights | | | | | | | | | |
| 108 | Loss of car parking and administration building for Tennis Club Proposed route will mean Tennis Club loses administrative building and some car parking. This would have significant impact on its operations | High | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Members and supporters of the tennis club. | SI13 SI7 SI8 SI11 |
| 109 | Resumption of SES building (located within Owen Park) recreational groups, requirement to relocate services and associated infrastructure | High | High | Medium | Medium | Low | Negative | Members and supporters of the SES and the people they supply services too. | SI13 SI4 |
| 110 | Resumption of community facilities Permanent displacement of community facilities. If community facilities to be resumed, market value in Southport may mean that too expensive for groups to buy in the area | High | High | Medium | Medium | Low | Negative | Members and clients of the community service organisations. | SI13 SI4 SI6 |

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ¹⁸ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|--|------|
| 111 | Access to affordable land to buy-back into the area for community services May cause the complete relocation of services – impact on the service provision to clients | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals and group who have had land required for the GCRT. | SI13 |

6.7.2 Operation – Section 2

There are no specific potential social impacts for the operation of the GCRT in Section 2 to those identified for the whole of corridor in Section 6.6.

6.8 Section 3: Sundale Bridge to Broadbeach South Station

This sub-section sets out the potential social impacts of the project if it was to be constructed and operated as per Section 3. This section should be read in conjunction with Section 6.6 as there are impacts that could occur in both Section 3 and the Whole of Corridor.

6.8.1 Construction – Section 3

The potential social impacts from the construction of Section 3 are set out in Table 10-17.

Table 10-17 Potential local social impacts and their significance, Section 3 Construction

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ²⁰ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|--------------------|
| Demographics and social change | | | | | | | | | |
| 112 | Change in the demographics of the local study area for Section 3 due to property resumptions and change in the number of affordable properties | High | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Residents, businesses and community service providers in the local study area, GCCC and State Government. | SI1 SI2 SI13 |

²⁰ L/C = Likelihood/consequence rating

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ²⁰ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|---|--|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---|-------------|
| Accommodation and housing | | | | | | | | | |
| 113 | The potential decrease in the numbers and types of affordable housing properties and rental stock ²¹ in Section 3. The number of affordable housing a rental stock to be removed due to land acquisition of the project (during the construction phase) was unknown at the time of writing the draft SIA. | High | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Individuals families who will have to relocate out of the locals study area due to property acquisitions. | SI2 |
| Mobility and access | | | | | | | | | |
| 114 | Reduced vehicle and pedestrian access to businesses and service providers | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Customers, employees, clients and community service providers and businesses. | SI3 |
| 115 | Increased traffic congestion due to construction activity Cumulative impact traffic congestion on roads already experiencing congestion, e.g. Ferny Avenue, Bundall Road and Thomas Drive | High | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium | Negative | Road users, residents, businesses and community service providers in the local study area and emergency services. | SI3 |
| Leisure and recreational opportunities | | | | | | | | | |
| 116 | Changes required during the planning and operation (including safety and access) for major events, e.g. Indy, Schoolies Week, Blues on the Broadbeach | High | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Organisers and participants in events in the local study area. | SI9 SI11 |
| Social amenity | | | | | | | | | |
| 117 | Changes to the Centre Improvement Programme for Main Place, Broadbeach | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Staff working on and supporting the programme | SI11 |

²¹ Affordable housing - 'achieving successful housing for households, including the safety, security and appropriateness of the dwelling, as well as affordable costs' Source: GCCC – Chapter 2, section 2.2, Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council April 2005 Affordability indicator – 'where households comprising the lowest 40% of income earners should not spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. Households paying more than this are regarded as being in 'housing stress'. Higher income earners may choose to pay more than 30 per cent of their income on mortgage payments, making 'trade-offs' with other areas of their domestic or discretionary expenditure in order to become home owners.' Source: GCCC – Chapter 2, section 2.2, Housing for All of Us: A Strategy for Gold Coast City Council April 2005

| SI # | Summary of potential social impact | L/C rating ²⁰ | Duration | Spatial Extent | Mitigatory | Acceptability | Status | Directly Impacted Stakeholder | TOR |
|--|---|--------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Employment and local economic effects | | | | | | | | | |
| 118 | Disruption to businesses during construction (including small and large businesses) e.g. Convention Centre access | High | Medium | Low | Medium | Medium | Negative | Pedestrians, cyclists and road users. | SI12 SI11 |

6.8.2 Operation – Section 3

There are no specific potential social impacts for the operation of the GCRT in Section 3 to those identified for the whole of corridor in Section 6.6.

