

SUBMISSION ON THE LAUDERDALE QUAY DRAFT
INTEGRATED IMPACT STATEMENT

Title	N/A
Organisation (if relevant)	The Public of Tasmania
Name	Lachlan Michael Rule

Summary of key issues

- Tasmania's coastline is one of our greatest treasures and of immense beauty and importance to our culture as a state, and, as such, should not be for sale.
- Ralphs Bay is conservation area and its continued survival as a functioning mudflat is integral to the recovery of the River Derwent.
- This proposal puts Tasmania's "Clean and Green" image and the associated business it represents at significant risk.

Detailed submission

Below I have listed the reasons for my opposition to this development:

Personal-

As a local resident and member of the South Arm Peninsula community, I believe this proposal is the wrong development in the wrong place; it makes no sense in terms of the area and the ethos of the Lauderdale community and locality.

Ralphs Bay is such an important part of the local culture, to destroy it is to rob all of Lauderdale, and its surrounds of an important part of their local identity, and Tasmania as a whole, an important part of its natural heritage.

I am a seventeen year old Hobart College student, who now resides primarily in Kingston. Having grown up seeing that bay every day it has become a part of my life and I'm sure part of the lives of many in the community (certainly those trying to save it!), to destroy it would be to erase a significant part of the collective experiences, that which binds us together as people and as part of a community, of the locals and of all Tasmanians.

Economic-

Aesthetic and emotive grounds aside, the approval of this development would represent another nail in the coffin of any right Tasmania as a brand would have to claim to be “Green”.

Tasmania will never be able to compete with China for manufacturing, and will never challenge Silicone Valley for our technological innovation. Tasmania’s greatest strength in an era of increasingly specialised economies lies in our ability to market ourselves to the rest of the world as being pristine and clean.

There is mounting evidence from Queensland and New South Wales (where these developments have been banned, as is the case in Victoria) that Canal Estates are toxic and harmful to the coastal and aquatic environments of the surrounding areas.

NSW planning legislation states in State Environmental Planning Policy No. 50, “[SEPP No.50] *Bans new canal estates from the date of gazettal, to ensure coastal and aquatic environments are not affected by these developments.*”. If this development were to proceed it would adversely and permanently affect Tasmania’s “Clean, Green and Clever” global brand. We can not afford as a small economy to put at risk such an integral facet of our economy. Couple with this the negative effects that having Ralphs Bay as a giant construction site for 10 years will have on local business and tourism to the south as a whole and the very real potential this development has of bombing (who would ever want to live in the middle of that bay?) and it is a big economic gamble to take in uncertain economic times.

Environmental-

Ralphs Bay at Lauderdale is also an important migratory and water-bird nesting and feeding ground, the destruction of which would leave thousands of birds, many of which have flown from China and beyond, without homes.

Ralphs Bay has been the habitat of these birds, some of which are listed as endangered (i.e. The Pied Oystercatcher and the Red Necked Stint), for hundreds of years. While Walker Corp. claims that the problem of their existence can be solved by simply moving them to the side a little bit into another portion of the bay, common-sense would suggest that animals primarily controlled by instinct aren’t going to be quite as accepting of their habitat being destroyed as Walker Corp. would have us believe.

The deep water section of the bay is also home to the endangered Spotted Handfish, which, due to its endangered status is protected under both Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* and also the Federal

*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*¹ and as such should prevent the approval of this development in and of itself.

Legislative-

Finally, the Tasmanian State Coastal Policy sets out very clearly in Chapter 2, Section 1, the guidelines for coastal development, which, upon reading, should instantly dismiss this development, I refer specifically to paragraphs:

- 2.1.1., which states *"It is acknowledged that there are conservation reserves and other areas within the coastal zone which will not be available for development."*,
- 2.1.3., which states *"Siting, design, construction and maintenance of buildings, engineering works and other infrastructure, including access routes within the coastal zone will be sensitive to the natural and aesthetic qualities of the coastal environment."*,
- 2.1.5., which states, *"The precautionary principle will be applied to development which may pose serious or irreversible environmental damage to ensure that environmental degradation can be avoided, remedied or mitigated."*
- And 2.1.6., which states *"In determining decisions on use and development in the coastal zone, priority will be given to those which are dependent on a coastal location for spatial, social, economic, cultural or environmental reasons."*.

The *State Coastal Policy 1996* is breached in a number of ways by the Walker Corp. proposal.

- 2.1.1. Ralphs Bay was designated, and still is, a coastal reserve and thus, this development should not be approved.
 - 2.1.2. This development obviously does not fit in with the *natural and aesthetic qualities* of the surrounding area as Ralphs Bay is an entirely flat bay, therefore building any structure, let alone a Canal Estate would permanently destroy the natural and aesthetic
-

qualities of the bay as it would destroy half of it, and would obscure the rest from view. Thus, this development should not be approved.

- 2.1.5. This development obviously poses *serious or irreversible environmental damage* to the bay and as there is very little evidence showing how dredging a heavy metal laden bay will affect the surrounding environment and what affect this development will have on the local aquatic and bird life. The precautionary principle essentially states, if one doesn't know what it will do, don't do it. Thus, as we don't know what affect this development will have, it should not be cleared for construction; this development should not be approved.
- 2.1.6. In a survey carried out by state Liberal Leader, Will Hodgeman and two by the Save Ralphs Bay group, the local community unreservedly said no to this development. The local community has said no to this development; they are its social users. Local business has questioned the effect the increased competition and construction will have on their business; they are its economic users. The birds of Ralphs Bay, I would imagine, would oppose this development; they are its environmental users. The windsurfers of Tasmania oppose this development; they are its cultural users. Thus, if the opinions of those who matter are taken into account, this development should not be approved.

In conclusion, the Tasmanian Coastal Policy should give this development a big no, State and Commonwealth Threatened Species legislation should give this development a big no, the local community has given this development a big no, common sense gives this development a big no, this development is out of date, out of touch and just not right for Ralphs Bay.

I urge all on the panel to make the right choice and stand up for suitable development, those without voices, the Tasmanian public and the continued viability of Tasmania's "Clean and Green" image. Thank you.

Lachlan Rule