

Breakdown of Submissions on the DIAR

One hundred and twenty submissions were received on the Tasmanian Planning Commission's Draft Integrated Assessment Report (DIAR) for the proposed Walker Corp. canal estate in Ralphs Bay

Ten submissions were in support of Walker Corp/against the recommendations:

Walker Corp, #107

Walker Corp. consultants, #101, 117, 119, 120

Individual responses: #17, 19, 26, 35, 41

One submission was neutral:

Environment Protection Agency (EPA), #71

One hundred and nine submissions were in support of the TPC /the DIAR and its recommendations/against the development

Conclusion: support for the TPC's recommendations/opposition to the proposed development expressed in at least 91% of submissions.

Submissions in support of the draft recommendations:

(and some quotes we'd like to share).

Save Ralphs Bay Inc

113. Save Ralphs Bay Inc [318.2 kb]

Birds Tasmania

51. Birds Tasmania [422.8 kb]

SRB/Birds Tas. Experts

94. Dr. Iain R. Taylor [11.7 kb]

Council:

27. Clarence City Council [78.1 kb]

State Parliamentarians – present or former:

46. Douglas A Lowe AM [54.5 kb] (former Premier of Tasmania)

Extract: "The processes followed by the Panel, as described in the DIAR, have been rigorous. The quality of the consequential analysis of the proposed development, including its meticulous examination and evaluation of the 547 submissions from the public and relevant interest groups, is exemplary.

The scope of the proposed development is both unprecedented and it has the potential to permanently and irreversibly impact upon both the social and environmental fabric of the affected area to its perpetual detriment.

Presentation of the Commission Assessment Report to relevant ministers in the Australian and Tasmanian Governments will enable closure of this needless and divisive development proposal, and the provision of a defining lesson for present and future Tasmanian

Governments regarding the perception held by Tasmanians of their precious landscape and the irreplaceable natural treasures lying within it.

The Assessment Panel has provided a clear statement of principal in the form of its recommendations in the DIAR and this response firmly urges firm adherence to its fair but conclusive rejection of the proposed development in its entirety.

Recommendation

The objective in forwarding this response to the DIAR is to strongly support the body of the Panel's conclusions recommending the rejection of the proposed development and further, urge an even more determined outcome which will ensure the long-term security of this vital component of the Derwent estuarine system, and irreplaceable waterway for its aesthetic, recreational and conservation value to Tasmania and its southern region in particular."

31. Ross Butler MP [112.0 kb]

Australian Institute of Architects:

96. Australian Institute of Architects [98.8 kb]

Extracts: "The Australian Institute of Architects Tasmanian Chapter strongly supports the recommendation in the draft Integrated Assessment Report (IAR) that the Lauderdale Quay project should not proceed." "Conclusion - The Lauderdale Quay Development Proposal does not uphold good urban land planning principles. Coastal and estuarine bays in Tasmania should not be considered for residential reclamation ahead of alternative land based sites and this project type should therefore be discouraged. The project is foreign, inappropriate and not in harmony with the Tasmanian urban and coastal landscape. The potential outcome of significant private gain for a major public loss is a matter of State significance. Available residential land should be developed before Crown land is given up. The Australian Institute of Architects Tasmanian Chapter believes the proposal cannot be justified now, or into the future, in any form, and that the Draft IAR should be adopted as final in its current form."

Clarence Councillors:

84. Alderman Kay McFarlane [15.3 kb]

89. Sharyn and Peter von Bertouch [71.7 kb]

Tasmanian Greens:

118. Tasmanian Greens [29.3 kb]

Environment groups/Coastcare/TNPA

60. Southern Coastcare Association of Tasmania [198.0 kb]

109. Tasmanian Conservation Trust [1.3 mb]

110. Environment Tasmania [65.6 kb]

112. Tasmanian National Parks Association Inc [57.3 kb]

Windsurfing Tasmania Inc

43. Windsurfing Tasmania Inc [10.5 kb]

Individual submissions + some quotes:

1. Brendan Lennard [81.6 kb]

2. Penelope D Laming [9.5 kb]

3. Jane and Evert Jansen [9.4 kb]

4. Bob Holderness-Roddam [9.9 kb]

“Should you feel able, I would strongly encourage you to recommend that:

a) Canal developments be banned in Tasmania, and

b) That Ralphs Bay be nominated for consideration under the Ramsar Convention.”

5. Jim Orpe [100.1 kb]

“I am grateful to the Commission for their careful consideration of the submissions made by residents and concerned organisations in regard to this proposal. It is also clear that the proponent was given every opportunity to provide evidence in support of their proposal.”

6. Ashley McQueen and Sandra Wiggins [49.8 kb]

7. Colin Pyefinch [10.2 kb]

“I am grateful to the Commission for their careful consideration of the submissions made by residents and concerned organisations in regard to this proposal. It is also clear that the proponent was given every opportunity to provide evidence in support of their proposal.”

8. Roseanne Brumby [9.9 kb]

9. Professor John Goldsmid and Hilary Goldsmid [10.0 kb]

10. M C Jones [13.4 kb]

11. Abraham Passmore [9.3 kb]

12. George Thorne [19.9 kb]

13. Zana Johnson [9.5 kb]

14. Georgina L Goward [69.4 kb]

15. Pamela J Tonelli [10.5 kb]

16. Andrew Fisher [9.7 kb]

18. Ron Ward [9.8 kb]

20. Helma Stevenson [9.6 kb]

21. Sue and David Wendell-Smith [9.9 kb]

22. Annette Young [10.2 kb]

23. John Biggs [10.0 kb]

24. Angela Morris [11.1 kb]

25. Angie Nichols [10.2 kb]

28. Stuart and Amanda Lennox [48.0 kb]

29. Samuel Lennox [40.9 kb]

30. Rod and Chris Dowhurst [101.7 kb]

32. Lorraine M Hand [77.3 kb]

33. Pam and Steve Claridge [265.0 kb]

“The TPC has restored our faith!”

34. C. Jade Price [64.0 kb]

37. Christine Kurruish [9.7 kb]

38. Gordan and Pat Bain [83.0 kb]

39. Dr Vivienne Mawson [9.6 kb]

40. Antony Blake & Jane Bange [10.3 kb]

42. Howard Simco [10.0 kb]

44. Priscilla Park OAM [48.7 kb]

“Again I wish to thank the Panel for a very thorough process.”

45. Louise Orpe [10.4 kb]
47. Doug and Margie Duthoit [9.9 kb] (+ climate change)
48. Adam Richardson [12.2 kb]
"I write with my faith somewhat restored in "the system". I applaud the strength, commitment and objectivity of the TPC."
49. Pete, Lee, Hannah and Callum Stevens [99.2 kb]
50. Elizabeth Shannon [9.4 kb]
52. Travis Page [13.4 kb]
53. Peter Watson [9.6 kb]
54. Sue Drake [10.0 kb]
55. John Unicomb [9.8 kb]
56. K J Payne [11.7 kb]
"The Ralphs Bay proposal was a disaster waiting to happen."
57. Jocelyn Salmon [9.9 kb]
58. Charmaine Cooney [9.7 kb]
59. J.D Alexander [560.9 kb]
61. Julia Greenhill [20.2 kb]
62. Jo Goldfinch [17.2 kb]
63. Ellen Glazebrook [71.7 kb]
64. George Park [45.0 kb]
65. Irene Brown [99.8 kb]
66. Maud Hill [81.5 kb]
67. W and R van Beekum [51.8 kb]
68. L and D Hislop [32.6 kb]
69. H and M Elliott [75.4 kb]
70. Dr W Flukes [86.4 kb]
72. Mal Anderson [10.9 kb] (+ sea level rise)
73. Merrill Orr [9.8 kb]
*"Congratulations and thank you, thank you, thank you for your findings in the DIAR.....
Thank you again. Please stand firm against any railroading efforts by Walker Corp."*
74. Gillian Murdoch [350.3 kb] (+ cartoon)
75. Catharine Errey [9.8 kb] (+ sea level rise)
76. Marcus Higgs [13.7 kb] (+ aboriginal heritage + looks forward to canal estate ban)
77. Joanne Sly [10.0 kb]
"I am relieved that common sense seems to have prevailed and I hope the final decision is consistent in relation to this white elephant project."
78. Bernadette Sloyan and James Anderson [83.8 kb]
79. Dr. David Law MB BS FAFPHM FFPH [15.2 kb]
"Whereas the Panel's deliberations have been commendable in addressing a number of health-related factors individually, it is important to stress the potential for cumulative and aggregated impact on members of the community over time. In other words it should not simply be a matter of considering the effects of noise or dust or stress etc., it is essential to consider the combined effects of all these factors over an unusually long project development period."... "In the representor's view the panel have been exemplary in their

conduct of their review and have addressed the majority of the adverse consequences arising from the proposal. However, to paraphrase the words of a former US Secretary of Defence, there are also the “unknown unknowns”. These abound in the context of this proposal which already carries a large number of known risks and few, if any exclusive benefits. This is a project which proposes fundamentally to disrupt a fragile estuarine ecosystem which is barely recovering from decades of industrial exposure and environmental neglect.

From the perspective of democratic support and social impact it has always been clear, now more than ever, that in the event of approval, the risk of community division and social injury to those opposed to the project would far outweigh the risk of social and economic injury to those in favour of the project should it be rejected.”

80. Melanie Archer [10.1 kb]

“I am greatly relieved that commonsense and reason have prevailed in the face of an outrageous assault on our environment and community by an interstate company intent only on profit at the expense of all else.” + looks forward to canal estate ban

81. Berenice Dunston [98.9 kb]

“My hope is the final Integrated Assessment Report demonstrates the same level of clarity and courage as is evident in the Draft Integrated Assessment Report recommendations and comes to the same conclusion. Also, that the Government abides by the recommendation of the Panel’s final Report.

It is important for me to state that the Panel’s determination that the Lauderdale Quay project should not proceed, has restored my faith in due process and in humanity to a considerable degree. The past six years of fighting this development, in its many guises, has left wounds in the community and in individuals. Your DIA Report has gone a long way to healing many of these wounds.”

82. Mary Jolly [9.8 kb]

“This Report is a victory for common sense and I urge you to support its findings. Environmentally, socially and financially the development was illconceived and would be a disaster with which Tasmanian Governments and citizens would have to deal well into the future.”

83. Alice Graham [10.0 kb]

85. Jane MacDonald [281.1 kb]

86. Barbara Wienecke [10.8 kb]

“In particular with regard to the issues of the project’s impact on local and migratory wildlife we should never forget that global extinction starts with local extinction. Our planet is changing and it is changing rapidly. There is no guarantee that species so far considered adaptable are capable of sustaining themselves in an excessively rearranged environment.”

87. David Nash [9.5 kb]

88. Leah McDougall [11.0 kb]

90. Doris M Graham [9.8 kb]

“As Conservation Officer of the Victorian Wader(Shorebird)Study Group and of the Victorian section of the AUSTRALASIAN WADER STUDY GROUP I wish to express our strong support for the recommendations made by the Draft Integrated Assessment Report in that the Walker Corporation Canal estate proposed for Ralph’s Bay be rejected in toto.

The planet will continue to be enriched by this wonderful Bay, in its many aspects of biodiversity. With huge thanks on behalf of the thousands of resident and international migrant Shorebirds who would have lost their lives as a result of this proposal, and to the Save the Ralph’s Bay Committee.”

- 91. D W Hildred [140.7 kb]
- 97. Nick Lovibond [146.3 kb]
- 100. Jennifer Kitchener [9.9 kb] (+ looks forward to canal estate ban)
- 98. Alison Watson [9.9 kb]
- 99. Emma Lawrance [72.1 kb]
- 102. David Gatehouse [9.7 kb]
- 103. Noela Foxcroft [225.4 kb]
- 104. Barbara Murphy [18.6 kb]
- 105. Dr Kate Rattray [9.9 kb]

"Thank you for considering the evidence so carefully and producing such a balanced and sensible report."

- 106. Brett Lawrance [49.3 kb]
- 108. Rhondda Haldane [9.7 kb]
- 111. Jane Newton-Broad [9.7 kb]
- 114. Axel von Krusenstierna [1.2 mb]
- 115. Dr Thomas Moore [304.2 kb]
- 116. June Graham [354.7 kb]

"This report also proves to me that democracy is working when the average people are willing to stand up and are heard."