

# LAUDERDALE QUAY PROJECT OF STATE SIGNIFICANCE

## PUBLIC HEARINGS INTO THE DRAFT INTEGRATED IMPACT STATEMENT

### ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE ASSESSMENT PANEL IN PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT REPORT

#### 1. Engineering and construction

##### a. Methodology

- i. Length of construction period*
- ii. Potential delays*
- iii. Visual impact at all stages*

##### b. Dredging and sedimentation from dredging of navigation channel (including risk of heavy metal dispersal)

- i. Dredging including feasibility with respect to depth*
- ii. Development would hinder natural processes*
- iii. Poor flushing*

##### c. Bunding

- i. Stability of temporary bund*
- ii. Sedimentation from dredging and construction temporary bund*
- iii. Environmental issues only*

##### d. Design

- i. Design of revetments including height taking account of wave risks, and stability*
- ii. Adequacy of underlying strata for buildings*
- iii. Adequacy of deposited soil for buildings*
- iv. Stability of island structures and temporary bund*
- v. Source, transport and quantity of imported rock, soil and fill*
- vi. Bridge heights and small boats*

##### e. Dewatering (including water quality issues)

##### f. Noise, vibration, dust and odour

- i. More detailed noise/dust/odour mitigation strategies requested*
- ii. Noise and vibration*
- iii. Underwater noise*

##### g. Groundwater

- i. Adequacy of assessment*
- ii. Implications of*
- iii. Water levels affected*

- h. Geotechnical issues
  - i. Clay drying and compaction feasibility and times underestimated*
- i. Infrastructure provision
  - i. Communications*
  - ii. Facilities (i.e. bike track) do not benefit the wider community*
  - iii. New berthing facilities – availability to public*
  - iv. Pressures on existing infrastructure*
  - v. Sewerage, stormwater and water supply – whether adequate*
- j. Waste management
- k. Flushing, sedimentation and dredging of canals post-construction

## 2. Environmental impacts

- a. Contamination
  - i. Detail of water quality monitoring stations*
  - ii. Development prohibited in Derwent Estuary because of risk*
  - iii. Pollution from runoff including tip leachate*
  - iv. Release of acid and toxic metals from drying sediments, acid sulphate sediments*
  - v. Sediment: quality, transfer, disturbance, risks of, release of acid sulphate and metals*
  - vi. Pollutants – dredging, tailings drying handling and separation*
    - a. Dredging and sedimentation from dredging of navigation channel (including risk of heavy metal dispersal)
- b. Ecology—fauna
  - i. Avian
    - 1. Listed migratory species, particularly waders (EPBC Act)
    - 2. Pied Oyster
    - 3. Habitat, flyway and conservation
    - 4. General
      - i. Studies incomplete*
      - ii. Chequered Blue Butterfly [*Theclineses serpentata lavara*]- Not found in affected area March/April 2009 – Hydro Consulting Survey;*
  - ii. Marine
    - 1. Spotted handfish (EPBC Act and TSP Act)
    - 2. Other marine
- c. Ecology generally
  - i. Inadequate status, surveys, data, detail, inconsistencies*
  - ii. Introduced marine pests*
  - iii. Marine ecosystem/habitat impacts*
  - iv. Recreational boating, including activity and pollution from*
  - v. Vibration effects on marine species*

- vi. *Wave and circulation effects on adjacent shoreline*
- vii. *Derwent Estuary Program*
- viii. *Ecological losses: biodiversity, wildlife, wetlands, sand flats, micro-algae, saltmarsh etc*
- ix. *Incremental habitat loss*
- x. *Monitoring of*
- xi. *Unknown impacts on*
- xii. *Issue of site's geoconservation significance or natural processes not addressed*
- xiii. *Coastal nitrogen pollution and de-nitrification*
- xiv. *General*

d. Environmental offsets

- i. *Effectiveness*
- ii. *Extent and location*
- iii. *Policy guidelines not set out*
- iv. *Not dependent on this development*
- v. *Potential to return area to its current/natural state*
- vi. *Funding for EMP and other offset measures*

**3. Coastal processes and geomorphology**

**4. Climate change**

a. Sea level rise and minimum landform height AHD

- i. *Scientific uncertainty about pace/extent of change  
Sea level rise (including adoption of outdated sea-level rise projections and adoption of mid case sea-level rise scenario rather than worst case, land reclamation level too low)*

b. Other/general

- i. *Geo hazards (tsunami, earthquake)*
- ii. *Wind event modelling and wind effects*

**5. Transport Infrastructure & Traffic impacts**

- a. During construction phase
- b. During 'operational' phase
- c. Other/general

- i. *Heavy vehicles – impacts of*
- ii. *Infrastructure costs*
- iii. *Correctness of models used*
- iv. *Adequacy of impact assessment*
- v. *Public transport needs*
- vi. *Rerouting of highway proposed? – impact of*
- vii. *Safety*
- viii. *Delays, increased volumes*

**6. Economic impacts and analysis**

- a. *Affordability and likely sales in current economic crisis*
- b. *Benefit the rich/disadvantage majority*
- c. *Benefits over time (employment)*
- d. *Economic viability*
- e. *Economics v environment/social*

- f. *Ecosystem services costs*
- g. *Impact on businesses*
- h. *Impact on property values for South Arm residents*
- i. *Market analysis adequacy/accuracy*
- j. *Net benefit analysis adequacy/accuracy*
- k. *Short-term gain versus long-term consequences*

## **7. Social, cultural, health and general community impacts**

- a. *Social and cultural (including Aboriginal and Heritage)*
  - i. *Caters for minority*
  - ii. *Community integration and sense of place*
  - iii. *Cultural "well-being"*
  - iv. *Adequacy of documentation/study of Aboriginal and European heritage*
  - v. *Psychological impacts (school)*
  - vi. *Recreational (impacts on)*
  - vii. *Social cohesion between 'old' and 'new' residents/social inclusion*
- b. *Health*
  - i. *Effect of construction on recruitment of doctors*
  - ii. *General*
  - iii. *Mosquitoes and Ross River Fever*
- c. *General*
  - i. *Contradicts current policies*
  - ii. *Consultation: inadequate time for, lack by Walker, unfair/biased method*
  - iii. *Redundant process appealing to the RPDC*
  - iv. *Responsibility of parliamentary representatives to promote ecologically sustainable development*
  - v. *Public against this development, demonstrated in three community surveys*
  - vi. *Proposal inappropriate, destructive, unpopular*
  - vii. *Tasmanians don't want proposal (no social licence)*
  - viii. *Clean, green image/ your natural state*
  - ix. *Inappropriate to the natural landscape*
  - x. *Sense of place lacking*

## **8. Planning and design**

- a. *Strategic planning generally*
  - i. *Affordable housing requirement not addressed, project will not be affordable*
  - ii. *Development control requirements inadequate*
  - iii. *Development Plan Overlay should include proposed subdivision*
  - iv. *State policies – non-compliance with*
  - v. *Strategic planning criticisms*
  - vi. *Banned elsewhere*
  - vii. *Destructive/old-fashioned*
  - viii. *Gold Coast style development inappropriate*
  - ix. *None in Tasmania/forms a precedent*

b. Need for the development

- i. Further information/clarification/insufficient argument*
- ii. Market analysis inadequate*
- iii. No unmet need*
- iv. Inappropriate site*
- v. Other land available/no shortage of land*

c. Site suitability

- i. Consideration of other sites inadequate*
- ii. Exposed location (winds)*
- iii. Unnatural to build on tidal land/poor site choice*

d. Sustainability of the development

- i. Compliance with State Coastal Policy, other strategies & codes of practice*
- ii. Contrary to sustainable development objectives*
- iii. Cumulative Impacts unsustainable*
- iv. Environmentally, socially and economically unsustainable*
- v. Increased carbon footprint*
- vi. Intergenerational equity*
- vii. Potential increase in crime*
- viii. Potential white elephant/liability by State and local government, ratepayers*
- ix. Precautionary principle not heeded*
- x. Promotes tourism*
- xi. Sustainable design cannot ensured*
- xii. Potential white elephant/liability for state and local government or rate payers*

e. Urban form

- i. Maximum building heights not justified, height mitigation measures not addressed*
- ii. Project not physically integrated with Lauderdale*
- iii. Effect of wind and spray on building design not explored*
- iv. Variety of building design/planning controls*

f. Visual impact

- i. Development out of character*
- ii. Significant visual alteration of Ralphs Bay*
- iii. Variety of building designs/ planning controls*
- iv. Vistas to Ralphs Bay and Mt Wellington*
- v. Visual impact/profile of development, appearance generally*

**9. Municipal boundary, conservation area and jurisdiction**

a. Conservation area/public land

- i. Biodiversity/complex ecosystem/habitat*
- ii. Derwent Estuary Program*
- iii. Designated to protect values*
- iv. Development of a reserved area - setting a precedent?*
- v. Meets some of the criterion for Ramsar listing*
- vi. Misinterpretation of status, extent and ecological values*
- vii. Need to protect coastline*

- viii. *Public land/ privatisation of public land*
- ix. *Status of the Conservation Area*

b. Other

**10. Management, differential rating and public ownership**

- a. Ownership of assets and infrastructure
- b. Management structure
  - i. *Jurisdiction and effectiveness of Lauderdale Quay Management Service system*
- c. Differential rating to cover cost of ongoing maintenance etc.
- d. Insurability and liability (property)
- e. Responsibility for unforeseen future expenses;

**11. Other general issues**

- a. *Reports not peer reviewed/inadequate*
- b. *Rhetoric in documents*
- c. *Will improve existing environment*
- d. *Compensation case/track record*
- e. *Profit driven*
- f. *Lack of commitment to infrastructure provision*
- g. *Not a Tasmanian company*
- h. *No ongoing responsibility*
- i. *Rhetoric/lack of transparency in DIIS*
- j. *Interstate experience with canal estates*

**12. Performance, conditions and bonds**

- a. *Environmental impacts are not reversible*
- b. *Impact of incomplete or failed development*
- c. *Inadequate/unknown security provided*

**13. Determination of the extent of the conservation area as a consequence of the hearing.**

**14. Range of Matters - Submissions**