

Lauderdale Quays Hearing

ELABORATION OF SUBMISSION BY JIM ORPE (number 212)

Name: Jim Orpe

Address:

Occupation: Currently undertaking Postgraduate research/study at University of Tasmania (Graduate Diploma in Public Policy). Previously a manager in secondary colleges and in national education agencies.

Qualifications: B.A. (Hons) in Government, University of Essex UK. (Specialising in Political Sociology).

Postgraduate Certificate of Education, University of Birmingham UK.

National Diploma in Educational Management, Christchurch College of Education.

Graded full Member of the New Zealand Institute of Management MNZIM.

Substantial professional development undertaken in:

- Qualifications, assessment and moderation
- Change management
- Project management
- Curriculum development

Experience and expertise relevant to this purpose:

Extensive experience in politics and community affairs including candidatures at local, national and international election levels, leadership of local and regional

party committees, and in policy development and election organisation. (England and New Zealand).

Experience in local government as an elected local Councillor for both Colchester Borough Council and Basildon District Council, UK. Chair of the Quality, Personnel and Resources Committee at Basildon District Council. On Colchester Borough Council, served on Planning Committee as Party Spokesperson for four years with extensive involvement in planning decisions and enquiries; also served on Housing Committee.

Experience as elected executive member for the NZ Post Primary Teachers Association. Officer positions at branch level of a number of trade unions.

Experience in policy formulation and implementation on fast paced Government projects in New Zealand (New Zealand Qualifications Authority and NZ Ministry of Education).

Leadership roles in teaching, curriculum development, assessment design and implementation, qualifications design and professional development in Social Sciences (inc Economics, Sociology, Politics). Also an examiner for pre-Tertiary examinations in Social Studies.

Extensive involvement in community organisations as an officer and a member, including United Nations Association, University of Essex Association, School Management Boards, and Sporting Organisations.

Introduction:

This is an elaboration of my submission (number 212).

I am addressing the Commission as a local resident and not as an expert witness.

Sources are quoted from general reading.

Declaration of potential bias:

I am a member of Save Ralphs Bay Inc.

I am a member of the Tasmanian Green Party. (Previously a member of the British Labour Party and the New Zealand Labour Party for a total of 40 years).

The views expressed are my own, and honestly held.

The concept of custodianship:

Please refer to 1.1 of my submission.

We live in exponential times...the rate of economic, technological and societal change is increasing at previously unknown speeds. The rapid change to new forms of economy, technology and society is faster than the capacity of established political, legal and institutional structures to adapt. There is a lag in the responsiveness of institutions to new imperatives. There is a general international scientific consensus that we are in the midst of a change towards low carbon-low energy drivers to economy, technology and society. The fact that Google has only been with us for seven years yet it is difficult to remember how we managed without instant search is an example of the pace of change.

In these conditions it becomes even more essential to ensure that decisions are based on the emerging future rather than as an extension of the past.

The concept of custodianship guides us to avoid causing changes to our resources and environment that future generations may find difficult to reverse. In this Hearing we have heard all parties agree that the decision to locate Lauderdale Tip in the 1970s has proven to be a poor decision which was taken without consideration of long term effects and which causes significant issues for our current generation to solve.

Martin and Berbeek in their book "Sustainability Strategy" (see Appendix A) discuss the concept of custodianship in relation to sustainability. (see Quotes 1 and 2 in Appendix A). A substantial point they make is that this is a matter of **belief systems**. Decisions such as the one we are considering need to be as much **cultural and sociological** decisions as they are **scientific and technological**. Assessments of impacts in this context are **normative** (based on belief systems and values) as much as they are **positive** (based on quantitative analysis).

The issue of strategic planning and the need for a national and regional framework for coastal development:

Please refer to section 2 of my submission.

Additional comments:

The overall strategic consideration that needs to be undertaken involves high level 'values' articulation by the Federal, State and Local Governments which provide the framework for detailed work on land resource and infrastructure planning.

The current planning regimes do not take account of the effects of exponential economic, technological and societal change including key considerations such as:

- Climate change
- Moves to a low carbon future
- Moves to a high fuel price future and lower energy use
- Increased societal support for custodianship of the environment
- Changes to family structure and stability
- Issues of an ageing population

Significantly they do not address the shift in societal view on the balance of self-interest rights against protection of shared interests. Recent work by Clarence City Council has addressed the climate change issue and the Council is to be commended. These issues and the responses to them need to be incorporated in a high level strategic document.

There needs to be a regional consideration of future urban design and growth together with transportation needs for the wider Hobart region.

Future planning needs to shift from the "if you want to build speculative housing to make big profits you can do it over here" approach to a more comprehensive strategy for housing, service provision and transportation.

A key value in this framework should be the role and function of the coasts of Tasmania and the sustainability of the ecosystems based there. A presumption against development other than for proven need, for wider societal benefit.

Issues arising from the claims about waterfront land availability and the nature of demand for this style of housing:

Please refer to section 3 of my submission.

Item 3.3 in my original submission is closely connected to my key conceptual agreement above; that is the rapid change in economy, technology and society means that simply projecting the current paradigm forward as the market analysis report does is inadequate.

The emerging international discourse around urban and regional planning is centred on re construction around transport and scarce resource points (such as health care). The 1990's/2000's trend to dispersal to 'greenfields' lots distant from centres is unlikely to sustain over the period quoted in the market analysis report.

An article by Sally Glaetzer in *The Mercury* on 3 July commenting on a report by the Residential Council of Australia suggests that that average households would shrink in coming years meaning more multi-level and townhouse style development would be needed. The Local Government Association of Tasmania is quoted as suggesting a plan would be needed to limit urban sprawl and protect vital agricultural land. Signs of changing trends and demands?

Item 3.4 in my original submission refers to demand for waterfront land. A key consideration here is that society needs to judge between powerful competing demands for the use of all waterfront and coastal land. The demands of the community include use for recreational access, visual amenity, conservation needs and social/community ownership/control. These conflict with any demand for private secured ownership/use of the same land.

Concerns about the methodology and results of the cost benefit analysis:

Please refer to section 4 of my submission.

The qualitative assessment is opinion based on the reports submitted by the proponent. A different group of people sitting to examine the impacts and drawing on all points raised by submissions as well as the proponents reports may well draw different conclusions.

Just as an example to show how different value sets would lead to different conclusions, one of the claimed economic benefits is:

"Appreciation of property values in the local region driven by the development of a high quality canal estate and associated infrastructure."

Economic benefit to whom? A higher pricing regime for homes on the Eastern Shore would make housing in the area more expensive for first home buyers and for those on limited incomes, would lead to rental rates increasing, would lead to rating revaluations leading to increased rates burdens on those with fixed incomes..... The point being that this kind of economic change is multifacteted and not just a simple 'tick' for the economic gains box. It depends on values. The assessors in this report have a development bias (economic development is good, rising resource cost rates are good etc).

Now, the report claims no economic costs of the project, but in my value set which includes social equity the above concerns about house price rises would need to be included as an economic cost to those sections of the community.

The net score for economic impacts would be lower than the + 9 claimed. This in turn would bring down the overall net score for the project. This could be repeated by reconsideration of a range of items included in the report.

In my view this kind of analysis must be completed by an independent body not a consultancy working for the proponent, thus enabling consideration of different value sets in making the assessments.

Appendix A: PV Martin and M.Verbeek

"Sustainability Strategy" The Federation Press, 2006.

Quote 1 from page 143:

"Greater duties are slowly being grafted onto the Western legal system as society seeks more effective custodianship of the environment. The re-emergence of the concept of custodianship reflects the growing awareness of resource inter-dependence and the limits of self-interest in protecting shared interests. It reflects a paradigm shift which is causing society to deal with resources differently. As with all paradigm shifts, the new regime involves adjustments in economic interest and challenges previously unquestioned concepts of rights, driven by what will always be- in the early stages- not the view of the most powerful in society."

Quote 2 from page 148:

"The basis of the challenge of sustainability is a problem of belief systems. Civilisations which found ways of living within a natural system resource base without the use of powerful technologies often did so by developing systems of responsibility to the land and future generations."