

LAUDERDALE QUAY PROJECT OF STATE SIGNIFICANCE

PUBLIC HEARINGS INTO THE DRAFT INTEGRATED IMPACT STATEMENT

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE ASSESSMENT PANEL IN PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. Engineering and construction

a. Methodology

- i. Length of construction period*
- ii. Potential delays*
- iii. Visual impact at all stages*

b. Dredging and sedimentation from dredging of navigation channel (including risk of heavy metal dispersal)

- i. Dredging including feasibility with respect to depth*
- ii. Development would hinder natural processes*
- iii. Poor flushing*

c. Bunding

- i. Stability of temporary bund*
- ii. Sedimentation from dredging and construction temporary bund*
- iii. Environmental issues only*

d. Design

- i. Design of revetments including height taking account of wave risks, and stability*
- ii. Adequacy of underlying strata for buildings*
- iii. Adequacy of deposited soil for buildings*
- iv. Stability of island structures and temporary bund*
- v. Source, transport and quantity of imported rock, soil and fill*
- vi. Bridge heights and small boats*

e. Dewatering (including water quality issues)

f. Noise, vibration, dust and odour

- i. More detailed noise/dust/odour mitigation strategies requested*
- ii. Noise and vibration*
- iii. Underwater noise*

g. Groundwater

- i. Adequacy of assessment*
- ii. Implications of*
- iii. Water levels affected*

- h. Geotechnical issues
 - i. Clay drying and compaction feasibility and times underestimated*
- i. Infrastructure provision
 - i. Communications*
 - ii. Facilities (i.e. bike track) do not benefit the wider community*
 - iii. New berthing facilities – availability to public*
 - iv. Pressures on existing infrastructure*
 - v. Sewerage, stormwater and water supply – whether adequate*
- j. Waste management
- k. Flushing, sedimentation and dredging of canals post-construction

2. Environmental impacts

- a. Contamination
 - i. Detail of water quality monitoring stations*
 - ii. Development prohibited in Derwent Estuary because of risk*
 - iii. Pollution from runoff including tip leachate*
 - iv. Release of acid and toxic metals from drying sediments, acid sulphate sediments*
 - v. Sediment: quality, transfer, disturbance, risks of, release of acid sulphate and metals*
 - vi. Pollutants – dredging, tailings drying handling and separation*
 - a. Dredging and sedimentation from dredging of navigation channel (including risk of heavy metal dispersal)
- b. Ecology—fauna
 - i. Avian
 - 1. Listed migratory species, particularly waders (EPBC Act)
 - 2. Pied Oystercatcher
 - 3. Habitat, flyway and conservation
 - 4. General
 - i. Studies incomplete*
 - ii. Chequered Blue Butterfly [Theclineses serpentata lavara]– Not found in affected area March/April 2009 – Hydro Consulting Survey;*
 - ii. Marine
 - 1. Spotted handfish (EPBC Act and TSP Act)
 - 2. Other marine
- c. Ecology generally
 - i. Inadequate status, surveys, data, detail, inconsistencies*
 - ii. Introduced marine pests*
 - iii. Marine ecosystem/habitat impacts*
 - iv. Recreational boating, including activity and pollution from*
 - v. Vibration effects on marine species*

- vi. *Wave and circulation effects on adjacent shoreline*
- vii. *Derwent Estuary Program*
- viii. *Ecological losses: biodiversity, wildlife, wetlands, sand flats, micro-algae, saltmarsh etc*
- ix. *Incremental habitat loss*
- x. *Monitoring of*
- xi. *Unknown impacts on*
- xii. *Issue of site's geoconservation significance or natural processes not addressed*
- xiii. *Coastal nitrogen pollution and de-nitrification*
- xiv. *General*

d. Environmental offsets

- i. *Effectiveness*
- ii. *Extent and location*
- iii. *Policy guidelines not set out*
- iv. *Not dependent on this development*
- v. *Potential to return area to its current/natural state*
- vi. *Funding for EMP and other offset measures*

3. Coastal processes and geomorphology

4. Climate change

a. Sea level rise and minimum landform height AHD

- i. *Scientific uncertainty about pace/extent of change
Sea level rise (including adoption of outdated sea-level rise projections and adoption of mid case sea-level rise scenario rather than worst case, land reclamation level too low)*

b. Other/general

- i. *Geo hazards (tsunami, earthquake)*
- ii. *Wind event modelling and wind effects*

5. Transport Infrastructure & Traffic impacts

- a. During construction phase
- b. During 'operational' phase
- c. Other/general

- i. *Heavy vehicles – impacts of*
- ii. *Infrastructure costs*
- iii. *Correctness of models used*
- iv. *Adequacy of impact assessment*
- v. *Public transport needs*
- vi. *Rerouting of highway proposed? – impact of*
- vii. *Safety*
- viii. *Delays, increased volumes*

6. Economic impacts and analysis

- a. *Affordability and likely sales in current economic crisis*
- b. *Benefit the rich/disadvantage majority*
- c. *Benefits over time (employment)*
- d. *Economic viability*
- e. *Economics v environment/social*

- f. *Ecosystem services costs*
- g. *Impact on businesses*
- h. *Impact on property values for South Arm residents*
- i. *Market analysis adequacy/accuracy*
- j. *Net benefit analysis adequacy/accuracy*
- k. *Short-term gain versus long-term consequences*

7. Social, cultural, health and general community impacts

a. *Social and cultural (including Aboriginal and Heritage)*

- i. *Caters for minority*
- ii. *Community integration and sense of place*
- iii. *Cultural "well-being"*
- iv. *Adequacy of documentation/study of Aboriginal and European heritage*
- v. *Psychological impacts (school)*
- vi. *Recreational (impacts on)*
- vii. *Social cohesion between 'old' and 'new' residents/social inclusion*

b. Health

- i. *Effect of construction on recruitment of doctors*
- ii. *General*
- iii. *Mosquitoes and Ross River Fever*

c. General

- i. *Contradicts current policies*
- ii. *Consultation: inadequate time for, lack by Walker, unfair/biased method*
- iii. *Redundant process appealing to the RPDC*
- iv. *Responsibility of parliamentary representatives to promote ecologically sustainable development*
- v. *Public against this development, demonstrated in three community surveys*
- vi. *Proposal inappropriate, destructive, unpopular*
- vii. *Tasmanians don't want proposal (no social licence)*
- viii. *Clean, green image/ your natural state*
- ix. *Inappropriate to the natural landscape*
- x. *Sense of place lacking*

8. Planning and design

a. Strategic planning generally

- i. *Affordable housing requirement not addressed, project will not be affordable*
- ii. *Development control requirements inadequate*
- iii. *Development Plan Overlay should include proposed subdivision*
- iv. *State policies – non-compliance with*
- v. *Strategic planning criticisms*
- vi. *Banned elsewhere*
- vii. *Destructive/old-fashioned*
- viii. *Gold Coast style development inappropriate*
- ix. *None in Tasmania/forms a precedent*

b. Need for the development

- i. Further information/clarification/insufficient argument*
- ii. Market analysis inadequate*
- iii. No unmet need*
- iv. Inappropriate site*
- v. Other land available/no shortage of land*

c. Site suitability

- i. Consideration of other sites inadequate*
- ii. Exposed location (winds)*
- iii. Unnatural to build on tidal land/poor site choice*

d. Sustainability of the development

- i. Compliance with State Coastal Policy, other strategies & codes of practice*
- ii. Contrary to sustainable development objectives*
- iii. Cumulative Impacts unsustainable*
- iv. Environmentally, socially and economically unsustainable*
- v. Increased carbon footprint*
- vi. Intergenerational equity*
- vii. Potential increase in crime*
- viii. Potential white elephant/liability by State and local government, ratepayers*
- ix. Precautionary principle not heeded*
- x. Promotes tourism*
- xi. Sustainable design cannot ensured*
- xii. Potential white elephant/liability for state and local government or rate payers*

e. Urban form

- i. Maximum building heights not justified, height mitigation measures not addressed*
- ii. Project not physically integrated with Lauderdale*
- iii. Effect of wind and spray on building design not explored*
- iv. Variety of building design/planning controls*

f. Visual impact

- i. Development out of character*
- ii. Significant visual alteration of Ralphs Bay*
- iii. Variety of building designs/ planning controls*
- iv. Vistas to Ralphs Bay and Mt Wellington*
- v. Visual impact/profile of development, appearance generally*

9. Municipal boundary, conservation area and jurisdiction

a. Conservation area/public land

- i. Biodiversity/complex ecosystem/habitat*
- ii. Derwent Estuary Program*
- iii. Designated to protect values*
- iv. Development of a reserved area - setting a precedent?*
- v. Meets some of the criterion for Ramsar listing*
- vi. Misinterpretation of status, extent and ecological values*
- vii. Need to protect coastline*

- viii. *Public land/ privatisation of public land*
- ix. *Status of the Conservation Area*

b. Other

10. Management, differential rating and public ownership

- a. Ownership of assets and infrastructure
- b. Management structure
 - i. *Jurisdiction and effectiveness of Lauderdale Quay Management Service system*
- c. Differential rating to cover cost of ongoing maintenance etc.
- d. Insurability and liability (property)
- e. Responsibility for unforeseen future expenses;

11. Other general issues

- a. *Reports not peer reviewed/inadequate*
- b. *Rhetoric in documents*
- c. *Will improve existing environment*
- d. *Compensation case/track record*
- e. *Profit driven*
- f. *Lack of commitment to infrastructure provision*
- g. *Not a Tasmanian company*
- h. *No ongoing responsibility*
- i. *Rhetoric/lack of transparency in DIIS*
- j. *Interstate experience with canal estates*

12. Performance, conditions and bonds

- a. *Environmental impacts are not reversible*
- b. *Impact of incomplete or failed development*
- c. *Inadequate/unknown security provided*

13. Determination of the extent of the conservation area as a consequence of the hearing.

14. Range of Matters - Submissions