



## What's wrong with the proposed "Lauderdale Quay" canal estate development?

### *What does the Draft Integrated Impact Statement (DIIS) tell us?*

#### **It's too big, it's too destructive and it's our Crown land**

"The physical footprint of the proposed Lauderdale Quay development extends over an area of approximately 146.5 hectares... The project area is Crown Land..... The intertidal flats located within the north-eastern arm of Ralphs Bay cover a total area of approximately 160 hectares, of which approximately 85.5 hectares (or 53%) would be directly affected by the proposed Lauderdale Quay development. The remaining development footprint covers existing sub-tidal areas of Ralphs Bay (i.e. 60 hectares)". *DIIS page 82*

"Earthworks will remove a total fill volume of approximately 2 000 000 m<sup>3</sup>". *DIIS page 95.*

Picture TWO ONE HUNDRED METRE BY ONE HUNDRED METRE BY ONE HUNDRED METRE CUBES OF EXCAVATED MATERIAL SITTING SIDE BY SIDE ON THE RALPHS BAY SANDFLATS – this is how much Walker plans to dig up and turn into islands. Does this sound like the "negligible environmental impact" claimed in Walker Corp's media statements?

"Dredging operations will involve the extraction of 935 000 000 m<sup>3</sup> of submerged material. Material will be drawn primarily from the navigation channel, and will extend some 1.3 km into Ralphs Bay... The duration of dredging operations has been programmed to occur for approximately 18 months." *DIIS page 95*

What on earth is going on with this figure? Are we to picture a cube almost ONE KILOMETRE x ONE KILOMETRE x ONE KILOMETRE out there in the bay? Surely this is impossible? Walker appears to have misplaced three zeros in its DIIS, if this quote from the Engineering Report, Appendix G, is any guide:

"Dredging operations will involve the extraction of 935,000 m<sup>3</sup> of material, primarily from the navigation channel, extending some 1.3 km out into the bay from the entry into the main access waterway (refer concept design drawings). An assessment of this work foresees an 18 month duration to undertake dredging operations." *Engineering Report, Appendix G, page 9*

If the DIIS is "out" by a factor of 1000 in this instance, how reliable are the rest of the figures?

#### **It won't be finished until 2028, if all goes according to schedule**

"The reclamation phase... is expected to be completed over a 12 year period in total, with development of the landform, which is assumed to be undertaken over a four year period between January 2011 and December 2014, but could take up to seven years." *DIIS page 331*

"The second stage construction phase of the Lauderdale Quay development is anticipated to be undertaken over a 15 year period between the year ended June 2013 and the year ended 2028,

and comprises the construction of the built form of the development including 542 dwellings and a commercial precinct.” *DIIS page 332*

### **The artists’ impressions in the Walker brochures are just that – artists’ impressions**

“The program of construction of the ultimate built form is dependent on the buyer.” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page VIII.*

Walker Corp. is NOT building the houses – it sees the development as a land release, and it plans to sell the newly created blocks of land. Home owners will (or won’t) build according to their personal preferences. The attractively matched housing styles of the Walker Corp’s brochures are a fiction.

### **It will stink – literally**

“Odour modelling indicated minor exceedance of odour concentrations at a number of residential receivers along South Arm Road.”. *Executive Summary of DIIS, page XIII*

What will this smell like for residents of the South Arm Peninsula as we drive right along the foreshore?

Why will it stink? Because of the billions of dead and rotting organisms in the “dredge spoil” – crabs, marine worms, sea snails, *Katelysia* clams and other bivalve molluscs, protozoa, the phytoplankton which form the base of the whole food web, and bacteria which play vital roles in nutrient cycling. This is the sandflat web of life which sustains the resident and migratory shorebirds we see feeding on the sandflats.

All this is only “waste” to Walker Corp.

“These wastes include putrescible wastes..” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page XV*

### **There are too many impacts on the community**

#### ***The windsurfers..***

“The Lauderdale Quay development (construction and operation) will impact on the area currently utilised by windsurfers, and will likely result in a reduction in this activity at the site. There are few similar alternative sites for this activity in the local area, and this will be experienced as an impact for people who windsurf, and as a diminution of the character and usual interest this activity lends to the surrounding community” (*Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, Appendix F, DIIS, page xvii*).

#### **Noise**

“In the longer term the majority of construction work will generate noise levels between 10 – 20 dB(A) above background noise levels and exceed the nominated noise limits. However it has been determined that construction scenarios are anticipated to impact any one residence for only short periods of time (i.e. less than 4 weeks).” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page XIII*

#### **Traffic**

“South Arm Road bordering the development to be upgraded with two roundabouts and an intersection with right turning lane..” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page XII*

#### **Visual impact**

“The highest impact to the view is from those vantage points along South Arm Road that look across the bay to the distant summit of Mt Wellington. The existing view from these vantage points will be altered with a view to a new waterway and new building development.” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page XVIII-XIX*

## What about sea level rise?

“The adopted design level of 2.5m AHD.. will protect the development, as it takes into account 1.4m AHD for the 100 year storm surge level and provides allowance for wind set up, sea level rise and freeboard at 0.2m, 0.5m and 0.4m respectively.” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page VII*

### **Is this adequate protection against sea level rise?**

Not according to Professor Will Steffen, Executive Director, Australian National University Climate Change Institute and Science Adviser to the Australian Government’s Department of Climate Change. “Sea level rise is accelerating... 21<sup>st</sup> century sea level rise of at least 0.5m is a certainty. A rise of 1 to 1.5m is more likely. According to palaeo-evidence, a rise of up to 4m this century is possible.” (“The Science of Climate Change: Implications for the Coastal Zone.” Keynote address to the Coast-to-Coast conference 2008, 19 August 2008).

## Habitat destruction

“The proposed Lauderdale Quay development will result in the removal of approximately 52% of the existing intertidal mudflats and associated shoreline habitats at Lauderdale which provide foraging, roosting and nesting resources for resident and migratory waders..... it is inevitable that the loss of resources, particularly areas of good quality wader foraging habitat, will result in impacts that cannot be completely mitigated or offset.” *Executive Summary of DIIS, page XV*

## It’s too polluting

“The ultimate disposal location for dredge tailings is within the development’s waterways.” *DIIS page 101*

## **The net benefit analysis reveals the environmental harm outweighs the economic benefit. The claimed “net benefit” is marginal at best**

See table on page XXIV of the Executive summary. Using weightings, the negative impacts of the economic, social and environmental ‘costs’ are all down-rated. The social and environmental ‘benefits’, in contrast, are weighted so as to increase their points value in the table. Even so, the claimed “net benefit” is marginal. The “Total Score” for the alleged economic benefit is +9. Even with these rubbery figures, the Total Score for the environmental costs is given as -10. In other words, **Walker Corp admits in the DIIS that the environmental damage of its proposal outweighs its claimed economic benefits.**

### **ES3 Qualitative Assessment Summary and Net Position Across Economic, Social and Environmental Benefit and Cost Aspects**

Aspect	Number of Impacts	Total Score
<b>Economic</b>		
Benefits	9	9
Costs	3	0
		<b>Net Position 9</b>
<b>Social</b>		
Benefits	9	14
Costs	12	-9
		<b>Net Position 5</b>
<b>Environmental</b>		
Benefits	5	8
Costs	22	-18
		<b>Net Position -10</b>
		<b>Total Net Position 4</b>