**Name of Project: Kur World Integrated Eco Resort**

**Submission Form: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

**Kur-World: A looming threat to environment and community**

Kuranda, a tiny village in the rainforest in Far North Queensland, is home to a close-knit and diverse community. For generations, Kuranda has welcomed visitors while nurturing and protecting its natural beauty and biodiversity. The environmental importance of this area is widely recognized as a vital part of the Wet Tropics Bio Region ,adjacent to the World Heritage Area, a narrow corridor being home to many endemic and endangered species, the largest of which is the cassowary.

# The Threat

KUR-world, is an 860-million dollar development is proposed for the Myola valley – four kilometres from Kuranda village and two kilometres from the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area. The complex includes resorts, shops, theme parks, a golf course, student campus, over 635 subdivided lots, apartments and villas, accommodation for more than 4000 residents / guests and servicing an additional 550 day visitors.

# Our Issues

## Infrastructure

### Water

* ***Availability* –** Hydrological reports show insufficient resources within the site to support Kur-World, with proposed take affecting established residents and the agricultural sector licenses due to water demand. (ToR 12.23, KW EIS Chapter 7 & 10, Appendix 4B & 6,sub Apx I)
* ***Quality***– Sediment and contaminated run-off from building and waste water treatment flows from increased population are inevitable, affecting established residents, the ecosystem and Great Barrier Reef. (ToR 11.24-11.31, KW EIS Chapter 7 &9, Appendix 6&7)

### Roads

* ***Congestion******and safety*** – The Kuranda Range Road, the only direct route from Cairns to Kuranda, will reach its capacity by the end of 2019 *without* Kur-World. Sufficient upgrades for this kind of growth would take 10-15 years to complete. (ToR 11.52, KW EIS Chapter 13, Appendix 13)

### Sewerage and waste

* **Insufficient planning for disposal** – EIS options include disposing of treated effluent into nearby creeks, the main water resource for established residents and the breeding habitat for the endangered and endemic Myola Tree Frog plus Lacelid frog. (ToR 11.26,11.30, 11.31, KW EIS Chapter 9, Appendix 6)

## Employment and revenue

(ToR 11.39,11.44,11.47-11.51, KW EIS Chapter 4 & 11, Appendix 8A assumed)

* **Language barriers** – Kur-World caters primarily to the Chinese market and will employ accordingly. The local community will be at a disadvantage for long-term, meaningful employment.
* **Lost tourism** – Kuranda will be unable to compete with a tourism facility that buses visitors past the village and out to their own shopping complex.
* **Reduced property value –** Rates (and rents) will rise due to consequential use of existing infrastructure creating costs to ratepayers while property values fall due to land and house releases.

## Environment

(ToR 13.22-13.29, 13.45-13.54, KW EIS Chapter 19)

* **Long-term and irreversible affects –** Impacts will sever the corridor between the north and south extensions of the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area and fragment populations of already endangered species, such as the cassowary. Gene pool diversity is restricted due to the existing bottleneck
* **Further loss of endangered and threatened species** – The Kuranda Tree Frog (fewer than 750 individuals) is endemic to this area. Three of the creek systems containing 40% of the population will be impacted.

## Social impacts

(ToR 11.33-11.42, KW EIS Chapter 4 & 11, Appendix 8A assumed)

* **Loss of identity and sense of place** – The Kuranda community embraces creativity, cohesion and resilience. People are linked by their deep connection to place. Kur-World will overwhelm the delicate balance of this unique and precious lifestyle. (see Kuranda Region Planning Group survey 2016)

## Proponent – Ken Lee, sole owner of Reever & Ocean Pty Ltd

(ToR 9.2, KW EIS Chapter 2)

* **Lack of trust and transparency** – The proponent’s illegal dam construction and removal of native vegetation has already damaged frog habitat and affected water quality and quantity. Baseline surveys for the EIS were taken *after* these illegal actions, rendering the EIS faulty
* **Proponent’s lack of experience –** Kur-World is the first development attempted by this proponent. He does not have the experience to develop in Australia without monopolizing resources and damaging the sensitive environment. Its apparent there is a conflict in value systems between the proponent (and his management team) and the Australian environmental values blocking understanding, when considering the requirements of this sensitive location

**Solution**

Since these concerns cannot be adequately addressed unless this project is scaled down to a fraction of that proposed, we ask that this draft EIS be declined, that a thorough community consultation be undertaken and that a new EIS be presented with sufficient detail to enable the community, the government departments to fully assess the impacts and make recommendations.
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 Please email to [kur-world@coordinatorgeneral.qld.gov.au](mailto:kur-world@coordinatorgeneral.qld.gov.au)

Or Print and post to c/o Project Manager, Kur-World Integrated Eco-resort, Office of Coordinator General, PO Box 15517, City East, Qld 4002, Australia