

TAROONA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION Inc.

Email: communityassociation@taroonatastas.au
www.taroonatastas.au

President:
Jill Hickie
4 Devon Walk
TAROONA 7053
Ph: 6227 8544

Secretary:
Janette Power
8 Earwood Court
TAROONA 7053
Ph: 6227 8387

8 May 2019

General Manager
Kingborough Council
Council Chambers
Channel Highway
KINGSTON TAS 7250

Dear Sir/Madam

PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT PSA-2019-4 –30-41 Nubeena Crescent Taroonatastas Representation from the Taroonatastas Community Association

I am writing on behalf of the Taroonatastas Community Association (TCA) to lodge a submission regarding the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment PSA-2019-4 –30 Nubeena Crescent, Taroonatastas prepared by Irene Inc. (from herein referred to as “the report”).

The TCA’s core objectives are:

1. to promote Taroonatastas's community services and groups.
2. to effectively represent Taroonatastas residents on matters of community interest.
3. to liaise with Kingborough Council on general maintenance of our public area and on development proposals within our community.

The planning scheme amendment sets the framework for future development of the IMAS facility located at Crayfish Point so is a matter of community interest.

General Comments

The TCA welcomes and is grateful for the rezoning proposal of the forested portion on the Taroonatastas foreshore from the Community Purpose zone (CPZ) to the Environmental Management zone. A community campaign to protect this area last year has resulted in an excellent outcome. The proposed rezoning of this area aligns with its environmental values and is consistent with the Council’s neighbouring Taroonatastas Park. Only recently Kingborough Council accepted the University’s gift of this land allowing the high conservation forested area to be joined with and managed as part of the foreshore Park. This act of generosity has been strongly supported by the community.

However the TCA is disappointed that the Kingborough Council officer report presented to the Council on 8 April 2019 seeking support for the initiation of the PSA, provided little critical analysis of the consultant PSA report and its impact on the surrounding area. It is our view that the Council therefore had little ability to fully understand that the essential problem with the PSA proposed change in the Local Area Objectives is that that commercial use is inconsistent with the CPZ. The CPZ is to provide for services and social infrastructure and to ensure that is it protected from inappropriate use or development. This PSA allows for commercial use in the form of Resource Development in the Community Purpose Zone. *This is inconsistent with the purpose of this zone.*

The TCA therefore objects to the proposed introduction of site specific objectives to the CPZ; and the introduction of an additional discretionary use to the CPZ that will mean that commercial and research based development –previously not permitted, will now be discretionary in the CPZ on the IMAS site . *This is also inconsistent with the purpose of this zone.*

It is the TCA's view that commercial use has the potential to considerably compromise the residential amenity and character of this area of Tarooma in the future through the intensification of this type of development on the site with no defined limits. Section 5.4 of the Council officer report identified this potential conflict but then justified that the inclusion of provisions and Local Area Objectives ensures that the Resource Development use will not impact on residential amenity; and that each development will be subject to an individual planning application and approval and will be discretionary.

We contend that if the planning scheme was to be amended to allow for the lodgment of such commercial planning applications that there is a strong likelihood of Council approval of these applications. It has been shown in many recent community campaigns in other Local Government areas regarding substantial commercial fish farm developments, that support for commercial development and planning scheme amendments to allow them, outweighs the protection of residential amenity, environmental values and local character.

The community is particularly concerned about the impact of increased traffic flows and volumes, and noise that could be generated with increased development of the IMAS site on the small residential street of Nubeena Crescent, its interface with Tarooma Park where children and older residents regularly cross the road to the Dog Exercise Area and at its intersection with the Channel Highway. We are also concerned about the potential loss of native vegetation and mature trees on the western border of the old Crown land title now owned by the University.

Dealing with these issues should not be left to each individual planning application to resolve in an incremental manner; it should be considered at the higher order planning level.

Below are more detailed comments regarding the TCA's objection to the PSA which mostly are in relation to its inconsistency with the *Land Use Planning Approvals Act 1993* Schedule 1 Objectives.

LUPAA Schedule 1 Objectives – Section 32(a)

The PSA report does not satisfy the *LUPAA* Schedule 1 Objectives.

(a) to promote the sustainable development of natural and physical resources and the maintenance of ecological processes and genetic diversity

The report argues that the proposal satisfies the requirement of Schedule 1 of LUPAA as required under Section 32 (a) in that it will “provide substantially greater understanding of existing natural resources”. This is not the case. The proposal simply adds commercial use and that is not necessary to provide increased understanding of natural resources.

b) to provide for the fair, orderly and sustainable use and development of air, land and water

The report argues that the proposal “consolidates existing land use within an appropriate location”. This is not ‘fair and orderly development’ as it extends over the entire IMAS site and adds a new commercial use which currently is not permitted and is contrary to the CPZ.

c) to encourage public involvement in resource management and planning;

The report states in the executive summary and Section 6.3.1. that the PSA was prepared in consultation with the TCA. It is noted that the University did communicate with the community with regards to the coastal forested foreshore land that was under threat. University and the developer representatives for the commercial rock lobster breeding hatchery also attended a TCA committee meeting late last year and provided a broad indication of what was proposed. We however were not provided with any details or the report. The University officers then advised that the report would be sent to the TCA for comment – which was received just four days before Council’s consideration at its meeting on Monday, 8 April. This was insufficient time for the TCA to constructively comment. So by definition public ‘involvement’ in the process effectively stopped at this point.

(d) to facilitate economic development in accordance with the objectives

The proposed development, for which there is currently no planning application, is for a tropical rock lobster hatchery. We understand that further breeding trials are required before it can be seriously developed in Queensland. So the development of this hatchery will bring economic development to northern Queensland. It seems illogical to develop such a hatchery in cool temperate climate of Tasmania. Considerable investment is needed to breed tropical lobsters in this cold climate with well insulated buildings needed to retain high tropical water temperatures in the tanks. Once completed the research will be transferred to north Queensland where it will be more cost effective to run these operations. We ask what are the economic development benefits to the local community and the State?

We also contend as stated in (a) commercial development doesn’t necessarily bring greater understanding of natural resources.

Section 5.2.1 – modification of the use standards

The modification of the use standards in the CPZ to provide discretion for Resource Development that doesn’t cause unreasonable impacts on the amenity of residential land use within 100m of the site boundary, is unacceptable to the TCA . These proposed changes have little consideration of the residential amenity of the surrounding area beyond the 100 metre zone that has been defined around the site. We contend that the impacts travel well beyond this 100 metre zone. This has been shown during the past history of IMAS and previous TAFI facility with problems encountered in managing noise from the pump station, odours from the treatment of the tanks and increased traffic impacts on the surrounding residential area and Tarooma Park. The

modifications of the use standards are not acceptable – there should be no delineation of distance around the site boundary with such impacts.

Section 5.2.2 Changes to Local Area Objectives of the Community Purpose Zone

The introduction of commercial and research uses to the CPZ is inconsistent with the Community Purpose Zone and is not acceptable as it does not fit with the purpose of the zone (referred to in previous comments.)

Modification of the CPZ Use tables to allow for Resource Development is inconsistent with the CPZ for the reasons stated above.

New pump station

In addition to our comments on the PSA – the TCA wishes comment about the poor process and management of the development of the new pump station which the report states would be complete by February 2019. It has not been completed and the construction site is an environmental disaster and blight on the coastal landscape of the Derwent Estuary with a large stockpile of fill dumped directly on the shoreline with no erosion and sediment control systems to protect the estuary.

For the past six months the pump house construction has come to standstill with the excavated banks slowly collapsing and large boulders and soil falling from the cutting and slowly filling the excavation pit. The University should provide updates with some simple signage erected on the fence directed to the hundreds of local and visitors who regularly walk the Taroona Coastal Foreshore track

Is there potential for a more considered and negotiated solution?

The TCA believes that that there is a need to acknowledge existing use rights as for some years some commercially funded research has been occurring at the IMAS Crayfish Point facility. But the question is how much, and how can this align with Community Purpose Zone?

We contend that research must be the primary activity on this site. There must be defined limits on the level of commercial activity with commercial activity deemed to be *only ancillary to research on this site*. This must include defining the level of and volume of traffic, noise and odour.

Perhaps one way to resolve this would be to require the University to prepare a Master Plan for the overall IMAS site which would define the planning framework, site values (and surrounds) and limits for commercial development and constraints for its future development.

We are willing to work with the University on such a plan.

Yours sincerely



Jill Hickie
PRESIDENT