

DSRA Committee Meeting 6
June 1, 2018, 2pm

Present: David, Danny, Neville, Robyn (minutes)

1. Minutes of previous meeting – accepted

2. Correspondence

Tony Pollard – review of Emergency Management Plan to begin in September

Multiple – in response to request for input re Cambria Green proposal

3. Treasurer's report – balance \$1365

Landcare grant – declined

Expenses – domain name renewal (\$32.89), survey monkey software (\$288)

4. Committee composition – Cherry & Grant's resignations, handover

Nominate acting president – Neville

Decision to continue with committee as it is, as all projects are covered. Will co-opt others if/when needed

5. Cambria proposal – survey results (attached)

Next steps – written report for submission to Council – Robyn to draft; Dave to draft background

Tasmanian Planning Commission – representative needed

6. Access ways – meeting with Mel Kelly & Tony Pollard

Tentative date: Thursday, June 14. David Cooper & Barry Smith to represent DSRA. Mel has also invited Fiona Steele (CLS), Lesley King (TFS), Linda Overend (PWS), Steve Heggie (PWS)

Robyn to email Mel to accept date, clarify purpose of meeting, suggest Swansea venue

7. Rubbish bins

Robyn to email Tony Pollard suggesting regular bins emptied on normal route, DSRA to organise suitable anti-tamper devices

8. Bagot Point – met with Jason Jacobi on site. Waiting to hear from Jason about further steps. Dave to follow up re emergency muster point
9. Constitution – ticking over

Meeting ended: 3pm

Cambria Green

Summary of DSRA survey results

Explanatory notes:

- strongly agree & agree are aggregated, as are disagree & strongly disagree
- the balance for each question is the percentage who answered neither agree nor disagree
- an asterisk (*) indicates that the score for strongly agree (or disagree) is higher than the score for agree (or disagree), suggesting particularly strongly felt opinions on the issue
- highest & lowest scores for each group of questions have been highlighted
- 71 submissions received; 14 from couples. Please note that results from couples aren't counted twice as this would have to be done manually

Q2. Potential benefits

- 2a. employment opportunities linked to this project are important to me: agree 51%; disagree* 21%
- 2b. business opportunities linked to this project are important to me: agree 43%; disagree* 25%
- 2c. increasing the viability of existing local businesses is important to me: agree* 79%; disagree 3%
- 2d. increased services and shopping options are important to me: agree 46%; disagree 26%
- 2e. increasing property values are important to me: agree* 46%; disagree 24%

Q3. Airstrip – I would like ...

- 3a. the airstrip to be moved so it is further away from existing dwellings: agree* 58%; disagree 10%
- 3b. guarantees that flights will be subject to time restrictions: agree* 82%; disagree 4%
- 3c. guarantees that aircraft will comply with noise emission standards: agree* 93%; disagree 0%
- 3d. guarantees that flight paths will be restricted: agree* 80%; disagree 8%
- 3e. guarantees that the number of flights per day will be restricted: agree* 73%; disagree 10%

Q4. Aquifer – I would like guarantees ...

- 4a. about water not being drawn from the aquifer: agree* 93%; disagree 3%
- 4b. that water from the golf course will be recycled to prevent leaching: agree* 97%; disagree 1%
- 4c. all developments will use above-ground waste water treatment: agree* 91%; disagree 1%

Q5. Golf course

- 5a. I support the idea of an 18-hole golf course in Dolphin Sands: agree* 51%; disagree* 30%
- 5b. potential use as a nearby safer place during bushfire: agree* 61%; disagree* 18%
- 5c. concerned about the golf course's potential impact on wildlife: agree* 61%; disagree 15%
- 5d. 485 Dolphin Sands Rd will not be the main access: agree* 68%; disagree 6%
- 5e. concerned about proximity of the golf course to Moulting Lagoon: agree* 54%; disagree 18%

Q6. Development

- 6a. concerned about overall size of the proposed development: agree* 56%; disagree 17%
- 6b. concerned about potential changes to housing density: agree* 69%; disagree 14%
- 6c. concerned about potential changes to subdivision rules: agree* 73%; disagree 14%
- 6d. concerned about easing of height restrictions: agree* 79%; disagree* 8%
- 6e. concerned about reductions in setbacks: agree* 87%; disagree* 7%
- 6f. concerned about the visual impact of the proposed development: agree* 62%; disagree 15%
- 6g. concerned about noise pollution during construction & operation: agree* 55%; disagree 18%
- 6h. guarantees that jobs will be made available for locals: agree 87%; disagree* 1%

Q7. Amenity of the peninsula

- 7a. concerned about ecological footprint: agree* 68%; disagree 11%
- 7b. guarantees to offset environmental impact: agree* 85%; disagree 7%
- 7c. concerned about the impact of increased tourist numbers: agree* 51%; disagree 23%
- 7d. services for tourists, eg litter bins & toilets: agree* 86%; disagree 7%
- 7e. danger to walkers & cyclists from increased traffic: agree* 68%; disagree 16%
- 7f. road network upgraded to suitable standard: agree* 93%; disagree 3%