

Executive Commissioner Resource
Planning and Development Commission
3rd floor 144 Macquarrie St
Hobart. TAS. 7000

04.03.09

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of Lauderdale and have been for some twenty years. I have followed this Walker development proposal with interest from its early conception as a proposal of 'State Significance'. My major concern initially had been the threat of re-opening of the canal as this would have divided Lauderdale into two districts. This proposition however had since been quashed as impractical.

As for the current "Lauderdale Quays" proposal, I do have concerns. On the plan it all looks very nice admittedly, but weighing up the long term problems that this housing experiment will face, is something else. I am not against development per say, but this proposal does have two major problems that are out of kilter with marinas in the Derwent generally.

Constitution Dock is shielded from prevailing winds but is flushed by river currents. Bellerive dock does face south-westerly winds but is still flushed by river currents. Ralph's Bay at Lauderdale faces prevailing westerly and south-westerly winds but flushing is only tidal. I don't envy the task of the panel to judge the long term outcome over many years especially with such a large project such as this.

Therefore this new project, now re-defined semantically as a "Land-Reclamation Development Plan" still has these two glaring flaws that could lead to its ultimate failure as a worthwhile project: These are predicated on the fact that the site's location is only flushed tidally; and that the prevailing winds are westerly and south-westerly. The former will produce sedimentation and stagnant water, and the latter will concentrate the marine jetsam and flotsam, and household litter to the eastern side of Ralph's Bay. Stagnant water and litter are a bad combination, with water unable to be flushed back into the Derwent efficiently. It will cause a constant pollution problem, expensive to clean up and maintain.

This poor flushing problem could only have been rectified by re-opening the canal into Frederick Henry Bay, had it been practical. But that action would have polluted Frederick Henry Bay with marine pests, constantly silt up the canal, would divide the suburb, and later destroy the local oyster industry. Too many problems!

As a matter of fact, on the 21st of February I witnessed an act of gross vandalism where somebody deliberately polluted Frederick Henry Bay with sea stars. This incident was promptly reported to the authorities so the problem could be cleaned up before they could take hold and do damage. The risk to the local oyster farm industry is too great to risk!

Now you judging members of the RPDC are faced with the responsibility of adjudicating the rights and wrongs of this housing estate development in Ralph's Bay. This revised Walker proposal could pose serious health ramifications to the local public, with future liabilities to both investor and council rate-payers alike. You all will have to decide wisely and realistically the pros and cons of future implications generally. It's in your hands now! Judge fairly and honestly, that's all I can ask! Best of luck and I hope you all make a responsible decision that acts in best interest of everybody.

Yours Truly
Mr. J.D. Alexander