

### **Bill to ban Canal Estates - lobbying points:**

- A legislated ban on canal estates is needed in Tasmania to prevent the years of negative impact, risk exposure and costs associated with these developments. The State Coastal Policy is NOT adequate to the task of preventing canal estate construction in Tasmania. A new State Coastal Policy is some years off. In any case, a wealthy developer would have every expectation of crashing through the provisions of a Policy by means of a legal challenge. A legislated ban sends a clear signal that canal estate developments are not wanted in Tasmania. In relation to the canal estate prohibition in the Regional Land Use Strategy for Southern Tasmania, the Associated Report of Clarence City Council states: 'It is considered that this matter should be dealt with through legislation.'
- The Canal estates (Prohibition) Bill 2011 is NOT 'anti-development'. It is opposed to ONE particular style of development only - canal estates. Community support for canal estates in Tasmania is close to zero. Since the Canal estates (Prohibition) Bill 2011 was tabled on March 16 this year, Planning Minister Bryan Green's office has received NOT ONE letter opposing the ban.
- Tasmanians warmly welcome positive sustainable developments which celebrate the state's natural assets instead of destroying them. Tasmania is currently seeing NEW INVESTORS spending big money in the state on projects which enhance Tasmania's natural image and do not seek to destroy unspoilt coasts in the pursuit of short-term profit.
- Canal estate developments are MAJOR intrusions into wetlands. They are enormously destructive and once the damage is done, it is irreversible for all practical purposes. According to Walker Corporation's Draft Integrated Impact Statement (Executive Summary page VII) the proposed Ralphs Bay development would have involved the excavation of 2,000,000 cubic metres of material from Ralphs Bay. To picture this, imagine a heap of excavated material 100m high, 200m long, 100m wide. Canal estates take many years to construct. During construction, precious wetland ecosystems are destroyed and local residents endure years of noise, disruption, unpleasant smells and massive loss of visual amenity. According to the Walker Corporation's Draft Integrated Impact Statement (page 332) the proposed Lauderdale Quay development would not have been completed until 2028 - if all went well.
- The Ralphs Bay canal estate proposal was assessed by the Planning Commission as a Project of State Significance. It is highly unlikely any future developer would seek such a rigorous, comprehensive assessment. Instead, if canal estates are not banned, future assessments of canal estate Development Applications would fall to Council staff. In remote coastal areas of Tasmania, under-resourced small Councils would be unable to provide a comprehensive assessment of a canal estate proposal put forward by a multimillion dollar corporation. A small coastal community would struggle to muster the resources to oppose such a development. Appeals would end up in the adversarial environment of the Resource Management and Planning Appeals Tribunal rather than in an inquisitorial Tasmanian Planning Commission assessment. The difficulty, stress and expense of the exercise would be enormous.
- After completion, canal housing estates often result in expensive long term management issues. Canal estate residents, local councils and state governments face significant ongoing costs for environmental monitoring and efforts to remediate worse-than-expected outcomes such as increased dredging frequency, poor water quality, nuisance algal growth, pests such as mosquitoes, loss of sand from beaches, impacts of acid sulphate soils, monosulphidic black ooze and so on.
- It is already difficult to secure adequate insurance for properties in canal estate developments and other property in low lying coastal areas. This poses major risks to individual property owners, councils, ratepayers, state governments and taxpayers who may be asked to provide support when insurance protection fails.

- Tasmanian coastal councils will be dealing with the impacts of climate change for decades to come - inquiries, assessments, risk mapping, mitigation, remediation, adaptation. It would be sheer folly to leave Tasmania's coast 'Open For Business' when the business concerned is canal estate development. Coastal council staff will have their time taken up with responses to damage and loss of property as sea levels rise and areas of low lying development face beach erosion, rising water tables and the impacts of increasing severity and frequency of extreme weather events.
- A prudent common sense approach would be to ban the construction of housing subdivisions in low lying coastal wetlands. This is what the Canal estates (Prohibition) Bill 2011 will do. The canal estate ban can save Tasmanian coastal councils and communities from massive unnecessary impacts and expense.
- NSW banned canal estates in 1997 precisely because of their damaging effects. Victoria banned canal estates in 2008. Western Australia has considered a moratorium or ban in the light of difficulties experienced in that state.
- Walker Corp. needlessly spent millions of dollars on its fruitless bid to build a canal estate in Ralphs Bay - developers need absolute certainty that Tasmania will not permit canal estates, so that they do not waste time, resources and reputation on such efforts in future.
- the Tasmanian community fought for years to defeat the Walker Corp. proposal, and had to raise well over \$100 000 in public donations to defeat the canal estate - communities should not be put through all this again in future.
- Tasmania needs appropriate, responsible developments in appropriate locations. Canal housing estates are fundamentally unsustainable and should be banned. The Canal estates (Prohibition) Bill 2011 will do this.