



## **CHANGE OF USE – TWENTY EIGHT (28) ROOM MOTEL TO TWENTY EIGHT (28) ROOM ROOMING ACCOMMODATION – 24 WILLIAM ST, GLADSTONE**

- (1) The owner of Harbor City Motel has partnered with Good Life Retirement Villages, an accredited service provider under the Residential Services (Accreditation) Act 2002, to re-purpose the existing motel to provide accommodation for aged and disability pensioners. Council approved the material change of use development application.
- (2) The infrastructure charge is \$566,224. After crediting the existing motel use, the figure is \$283,112. If an application under Council's Infrastructure Charges Economic Development Incentives Scheme were successful, the figure becomes \$141,556.
- (3) This vital form of accommodation for Gladstone's disadvantaged residents will not be provided because Council makes it cost prohibitive (even with the discount).
- (4) There is a statutory reason why Council's infrastructure charge is incorrect viz-
  - (a) The AICR identifies "rooming accommodation" as "Accommodation (Long Term)".
  - (b) Council has applied the "Accommodation (Long Term) (one or two bedroom)" charge rate.
  - (c) The Council charge rate necessarily triggers the State charge for a "one or two bedroom relocatable dwelling site".
  - (d) The unit of measurement Council uses is therefore a "one or two bedroom relocatable dwelling site". This is an incorrect unit of measurement. The rooming accommodation introduces no "one or two bedroom relocatable dwelling site". It changes motel suites to rooming accommodation suites.
  - (e) A relocatable dwelling is a self-contained residence. A suite is not a self-contained residence. Council's unit of measurement is flawed.
  - (f) A more accurate unit of measurement is a "suite" which Council's AICR has provision for. A "suite" attracts half the infrastructure charge of a "one or two bedroom relocatable dwelling".
- (5) There are merit reasons why Council's infrastructure charge is excessive viz-
  - (a) A backpacker hostel has an infrastructure charge of '\$10,111 per bedroom (where the bedroom is not part of a suite)'. A six (6) bed bedroom in a backpacker hostel (the most common configuration) therefore attracts an infrastructure charge of \$1,685 per person. In the case of the present application, Council is charging \$20,222 per pensioner. This is inequitable and punitive.
  - (b) A two (2) bedroom detached dwelling with four (4) people living in the dwelling attracts an infrastructure charge of \$20,222. Council is saying that the infrastructure charge for a disabled pensioner living by herself in a single room should be the same as a family of four (4) living in a two (2) bedroom house. Again this is inequitable and punitive.
- (6) The applicant proposes aged and disabled pensioner accommodation in the CBD with on-site swimming pool and the option of all meals being provided. Council should apply a realistic infrastructure charge. We submit use of "suite" as the unit of measurement is more accurate and that the infrastructure charge should be zero.

*Creative Thinking Responsible Solutions*