

Submission regarding Application Number 09 0019



Author Ron Royle 5 Grandview Place SWR 2431
ph 6566 5951
Email: ronandrobynroyle@bigpond.com.au

I am a local resident overlooking the proposed development.
I have no interest, financial or otherwise in the development and no relationship with Shannon.
I am not a fisherman; I do not own a boat and do not use the launching facility.
I have no problem with the proponent being aware of my identity.
I have never made a political donation.

I see such a development as this, is important to expand SWR as a tourist attraction.

I believe that this proposal should be considered in the light of the existing infrastructure of the area, and it is here that I believe a number of problems arise.

1. Parking.

It is reasonable to assume that the area in general is used by fishermen with cars trailers and boats using the river launching facilities. Currently there is parking in the car park for about 50 cars and trailers. (Location 1) During the summer period this is not sufficient and cars and trailers are parked along New Entrance Road and Marlin Drive and **onto the area of the proposed development**. Twenty car trailer combinations on the area of the proposed development are not uncommon. (location 2) In addition there are now mooring facilities for three charter fishing boats (location 3) each licensed for 10 plus a crew of 3 giving a total of 39 people adding say another 20 cars to the area. I would suggest that parking for an additional 50 car trailer combinations and 30 cars are needed now to satisfy current requirements. This is before the proposed development is considered, which could add, say nine boat trailer combinations using the public car park, and say 20 cars which would use the parking facility at the proposed development. So, add all of that up, and the area plus the proposed development is short about 60 car trailer spaces and 30 car spaces.

2. Access to the Area

Access to the launching area currently requires driving through the suburban streets of the New Entrance area which are hardly suitable for cars and trailers as the roads are too narrow and the corners too sharp. There are three possible routes and each has difficulties for car trailer combinations, driving on the wrong side of the road and emerging from a blind corner being a couple of the difficulties. Better access for car trailer combinations are required if the area is to be developed in a methodical and planned fashion

Department of Planning Received 31 AUG 2011 Scanning Room

Comments regarding the proposed development.

1. Parking.

The proposed development has a number of parking spaces that require reverse parking. This means the rather risky combination of reversing cars with trailers and small children in the area. The in-line car/trailer parking area requires a sharp U turn which is hardly good practice. Drive-through central parking for all cars and trailers could be a better solution with a designated separate entrance and exit. The existing car park at the launching ramp is a good example of car-trailer parking.

2. Floor Height.

The calculation of floor height is based on projected/predicted sea level heights in 50 to 100 years. These projections/predictions were made at least as far back as 1988 and yet the State Government uses this projection/prediction as a starting point some 20 years later which is completely illogical and self perpetuating. The intervening 23 years up until now have shown them to be totally fallacious. There is no way that a case can be made for the sea level rise to be even 60mm in the intervening period leaving 340 mm rise over the next 27 years, or about 12mm per year compared to an actual 2mm currently. The difference between projections/predictions and fact, have in the past been justified by the "hockey stick curve" which has now been shown to be in error. In fact I believe that the "hockey stick curve" has been quietly dropped by the IPCC. Further, comparison with the Null Hypothesis indicates the absolute fallacy of these supposed sea level rises by a factor of about 5:1. A more practical floor height would be say, half a metre above the road level, which is about 1.5m AHD giving a floor level about 2m AHD, given that in the event of a major flood any occupants would have moved the 100 metres in 6 hours or so to higher ground on Marlin Drive.

Suggestions to Improve the Infrastructure.

1. Parking.

Inspection of the area from the launching ramp to say the Tavern shows that there is no available area for public car parking. Demolishing the children's playground is hardly a rational solution and would not even satisfy current requirements. Not mentioned in the Parking paragraph above is the fact that quite a few car/trailers park at the coal wharf about half a kilometre to the north. (Location 4) This is done not only for the additional parking area provided but also to provide easier access to the launching ramp. On launching the car and trailer is driven to the coal wharf where the driver steps onto the boat which has not had to wait at the launching area for the driver to park and return to the boat. The return is even more efficient, the driver is dropped off at the wharf and returns to the ramp to pick up the boat which can wait in mid stream and not cause congestion at the ramp. When the trailer returns to the ramp the boat comes in and is towed immediately away. Currently the boat has wait at the ramp while the car driver retrieves the car and trailer causing delay and queuing at the ramp.

Currently there is little area for extended parking at the coal wharf but there is a significant area about half a kilometre further north which is used as a car park and could be extended and formalised significantly. (Location 5) There is no access to boats at this point however a small cantilevered jetty with ladder would solve this problem.

2. Access to the Area

To remove trailer traffic from the New Entrance area would require a new road to bypass the area completely. As it happens this is possible and at reasonable cost. At Gordon Young Drive there is an unnamed access road to Back Creek. If a new road was built from this road and close to Gordon Young Drive to the Causeway just before the bridge, traffic would have access to the river without going through any New Entrance streets. (Location 6) This road would follow approximately the disused railway permanent way and go through the disused old quarry, which should satisfy any environmental issues. In fact the map which is attached shows this road as extant, so somewhere the idea has been seriously canvassed. Further that part of the causeway from the new road to Quarry Road could be closed and returned to bushland. (Location 7)

I believe solutions such as these are required to match the infrastructure to the proposed development, and should be constructed before the development takes place

Kangaroos.

Mention is made in the proposal about roos, and while the subject does not effect the proposal directly it has been mentioned and therefore I would like to make comment on this subject.

The real and escalating problem is caused by the current number and rapid growth of numbers of these animals. It is difficult to count the number in the area as they move around a lot and the area is not exactly defined. They tend to congregate in the river flat and up to the rural area behind the proposed development. From where I sit now in at my desk in Grandview Place (location 8) I can count 15 roos on the block next door and 37 on the 3 vacant blocks across the road. This is plus joeys and nearly all mature females have joeys. So, that some hundreds are in the area under consideration is quite possible.

At the moment when the roos move between the sub-areas within the area under consideration they are able to cross roads where there are no fences. However as the area is developed and more fences are erected the access for the roos is closed off. This causes the roos to move along the roads rather than cross them, with greater traffic problems. To give a vivid example: For the roos to cross Marlin Drive they do so at the vacant block at number 64 (location 9) as this is the only block in the road with no fence. If and when this block is fenced the roos will have no option but to travel along Marlin Drive and the surrounding roads, (Riverview, Grandview and Salmon), with resulting traffic mayhem. It should be taken into account the fact that local residents are well aware of the problem; however tourists, including fishermen, do not appreciate the situation, particularly pre-dawn when the fishermen and roos are most active.

This item is not of direct consideration to the proposed development however I believe it does form part of the overall responsibility of the Department for development of the New Entrance area.

I thank you for the opportunity to present my thoughts.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kevin M. Ryan". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the typed text.

