

**From:** Scott Leitch  
**Sent:** Monday, 13 July 2009 12:07 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Carol  
**Subject:** Expansion Submission Ralphs Bay

Dear Carol,

Following find my expansion of original submission.

---

Executive Commissioner,  
Resource Planning & Development Commission  
Hobart, Tasmania

Re: Destruction of Ralphs Bay Conservation Area  
As Detailed in DIIS Executive Summary.

Expansion of Original Submission 473

My name is Scott Leitch.  
My fields of interest include;  
Natural values  
Rational thinking  
Business development  
Real Estate Sales in Lauderdale / South Arm Peninsula  
Recreational opportunities  
Social division and cohesion  
Aesthetics

My original submission was based on the Executive Summary of the DIIS proposing the destruction of a large portion of the tidal flats of Ralphs Bay. This expansion is submitted with further consideration of the DIIS and related events.

## **NECESSITY**

**Despite well paid attempts, this has very clearly not been demonstrated!**

The inadequate and unfocussed market analysis assessment fails dismally to prove a case for the proposed development. Table (15) showing slowing boat ownership growth rates across the whole of Tasmania is not a compelling result to justify the destruction of the Ralphs Bay Conservation Area. Table (16) showing registered moorings merely indicates that the vast majority of boat owners in Tasmania have boats which do not need mooring.

The conclusion drawn from these tables does not substantiate the creation of a vast housing estate at the expense of a highly valued natural asset. Solutions to perceived future boat storage issues need to be addressed in a smarter and less destructive manner.

The market analysis identifies a finite resource of waterfront lots in Hobart. This is true, however that does not make it imperative that we create (build) more, and once again, not at the expense of highly valued natural assets. The Tranmere / Droughty

Point development corridor and interchange of existing waterfront lots will satisfy buyers for many years to come.

A recently published and widely promoted public survey failed to identify a single motivated real buyer for any of the lots proposed in the Ralphs Bay project.

### **The Real Market.**

For the past ten years I have worked in the real estate industry and in particular have sold and consulted on properties in the Lauderdale / South Arm region. The distant spectre of the proposed destruction of Ralphs Bay has been a topic of discussion for most of my real estate career. This discussion has become more prevalent in recent times as the Walker Corporations whim has threatened to materialize.

Over this period, hundreds of people have talked very openly to me about the proposed housing estate. Anecdotally I can safely state that 80% of these people were strongly opposed to the concept and would never consider buying there. Of the remaining 20%, only one person has ever stated to me that they would buy land created through the proposed development. This prospective purchaser is a property developer by trade. Those who felt strongly (very few) for the development, were obsessed with the perception that the project would bring vast financial benefits to them. Some of those people forwarded supportive submissions for the project. It seems their vested interest is financial gain.

Whilst informal, I was interested to hear honest responses from real people in these discussions. Some of the more candid statements include:

“You would have to be mad to live out there”.

“We don’t need this”

“I would go to new restaurants”

“What a disgraceful proposition”

“Over my dead body”

The recently published and widely promoted public survey evoked a very strong statement from the sector of the concerned public who are strongly opposed to the Ralphs Bay destruction. The same survey evoked a pathetic response from the sector of the concerned public who are in support of the Ralphs Bay destruction. This survey was a perfect opportunity for Walker Corporation supporters to formally and publicly announce their rationale, determination and desire for the project. The whimper of support could barely be heard!

The 95% against and 5% for result, is surely a defining market survey. It cannot be denied. For the RPDC deliberations on this matter to conclude in favour of the proponent would cast a shadow on a seemingly democratic process.

There is too much to be lost and very little to be gained in allowing this environmentally destructive, socially divisive and irresponsible scheme to go ahead.

### **What terrible fate awaits us?**

If the proponents whim is satisfied and the destruction is sanctioned, we can expect;

Many years of further social division.  
Loss of natural assets and amenity.  
Visual degradation of a once beautiful bay.  
Physical degradation to this glorious natural asset.  
Unacceptable noise pollution.  
Unacceptable and uncontrollable odour pollution  
Disturbance of stable heavy metal sediments.  
Annihilation of vast numbers of crustaceans, shells etc - all part of the crucial food chain.  
Dangerous precedents for future coastal destruction.  
Loss of habitat for established bird populations.  
Loss of feeding grounds for established bird populations.  
Displacement of local and migratory bird populations.  
Inappropriate and inefficient use of resources.  
Unnecessary creation of further recreation options.  
Mechanical effluent discharge into waterway.  
Unfair multi faceted encroachment on Lauderdale Primary School students and teachers.  
Deprivation of opportunity for students to enjoy existing natural assets.  
Dangerous road usage through vast numbers of truck movements.  
High risk of sediment flow to affect marine environment.  
Market uncertainty and no guaranteed outcomes.  
Further uncertainty as developer changes proposals to increase profitability.  
Local, national and international condemnation of environmental credentials.  
Loss of local residents sense of place and custodial responsibilities.  
Alienation of disaffected population let down by undemocratic outcome.  
Degradation of multiple sites where fill is derived.  
Loss of public respect for government instrumentalities.  
Powerlessness experienced through loss and disrespect of concerned residents.  
No guarantees of employment for local residents.  
Huge risks of ongoing costs to the ratepayers.  
Risk of project failure due to financial climates beyond Walker Corporation control.  
Risk of project failure due to financial climate within Walker Corporation.  
Aesthetics of existing Bay damaged forever.

### **What terrible fate awaits us?**

If the proponents whim is denied and Ralphs Bay remains in its present form.

The peaceful seaside village of Lauderdale will quietly prosper.  
The residents of Lauderdale will live happily with their chosen lifestyle location.

Regards,  
Scott Leitch