

Kimberly Backman

From: Connie Elton <connie.maree.elton@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 22 May 2026 3:07 PM
To: RES - Mailbox - Planning
Subject: MCU26/0008 - Objection to Proposed Non-Resident Workforce Accommodation

Dear Planning Department,

RE: Proposal / Objection to Proposed Non-Resident Workforce Accommodation – Mount Kelly Community

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of non-resident workforce accommodation within the Mount Kelly community (Lot 6 on RP733798). Mount Kelly is a rural–residential area characterised by lifestyle properties, strong community values, and a growing number of young families who choose this location for its safety, privacy, and peaceful environment. The proposal is inconsistent with the established character of the area and raises several significant concerns for residents.

1. Incompatibility With Rural–Residential Character

Mount Kelly has experienced substantial residential growth and rising property values due to its appeal as a safe, family-oriented lifestyle area. The introduction of high-density, transient workforce accommodation does not align with the existing planning intent or the expectations of current residents.

This type of development risks altering both the visual and social character of the community, potentially creating an appearance similar to a temporary accommodation park rather than a rural–residential neighbourhood.

2. Limited Integration With the Local Township

The proposed site is geographically isolated from the township. As a result:

- Non-resident workers are unlikely to participate in local community activities
- There is reduced opportunity for social integration
- Local businesses may not receive the economic benefit typically associated with workforce accommodation located closer to town

This means the development will bring **no meaningful economic return** to the community while introducing **significant local impacts**.

3. Safety Concerns for Families and Children

Mount Kelly attracts families specifically because of its reputation for safety and low-risk living. A **transient, unsupervised** workforce population introduces several concerns:

- Lack of community connection or accountability
- Increased potential for antisocial behaviour
- Higher risk associated with alcohol use, drug use, or unsafe driving (particularly unsafe if commuting from in-town back to Mount Kelly)
- No established support measures to manage issues if they arise

The area currently has limited police presence and limited Council responsiveness, which heightens the risk if problems occur. Item 6 expands on these concerns.

4. Road Safety and Traffic Risks

Seasonal and non-resident workers are often unfamiliar with:

- Rural road conditions
- Cane haul-outs
- Cane trains
- Harvesting machinery
- Slow-moving agricultural equipment

Mount Kelly roads already experience routine incidents during peak seasons. Increasing the number of inexperienced drivers significantly elevates the risk of accidents for residents, children, and local farmers.

5. Impact on Property Values

The introduction of high-density, transient accommodation in a lifestyle-property area is likely to:

- Depreciate surrounding property values
- Reduce the desirability of the area for families
- Undermine long-term investment made by existing residents

Residents have chosen Mount Kelly for its rural lifestyle, privacy, and safety. This development is inconsistent with those values.

6. Precedent and Existing Concerns

Council has already permitted residents to live in caravans and temporary structures in the area, which has raised concerns regarding:

- Compliance
- Oversight
- Long-term planning integrity
- The emergence of “spotter-style” behaviour with no formal monitoring of properties
- Limited pathways for residents to seek timely support when issues arise

Introducing a large non-resident workforce population may intensify the challenges the community is already experiencing. Even a single instance of disruptive behaviour can have a noticeable impact on a small rural area. Approval of this development may also set a precedent for other vacant landowners to pursue similar proposals in the future.

Conclusion

The proposed non-resident workforce accommodation is not compatible with the established rural-residential character of Mount Kelly. It presents risks to safety, property values, and community cohesion, while offering no economic or social benefit to the local area. Mount Kelly residents have nothing to gain from this development.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Council reconsider the proposal and prioritise developments that align with the long-term vision and values of the Mount Kelly community.

Can you please confirm receipt and acceptance of this objection by return email.

Regards,

Connie, Justin, Ryan, Lachlan and Charlotte ELTON.