

Response to Ronald Hu article, The Mercury 23 March 2019

Uncertainty of proponent's actual plans

It's important to remember that what's proposed is a change to the current planning scheme to allow the rezoning and change of land use of over 3,000 hectares of prime agricultural and environmentally sensitive land. Should the rezoning be approved by the Tasmanian Planning Commission it would override existing zones and codes in the Planning Scheme, creating a development zone quarantined from further planning controls.

The concern is not what the proponents are saying they plan to deliver (as per the Talking Point), it is understanding what the new zones would allow them to do if the rezoning is approved. Until a Development Application is submitted, there is no certainty about what will be delivered or what will happen to the rezoned land.

What exactly would happen if the land was to be on-sold?

Where is the money going? Who will truly benefit?

The proponent's own economic analysis of Cambria Green states: *The proposed investment is assumed to be funded privately. Specifically, it is assumed that foreign investment will fund the construction of the wedding venue, hotel (sky resort), conference centre, and golf course. This will then result in **operating profits from these facilities flowing overseas**, which is captured in the modelling framework.*

As stated in the article: *We aim to part of that tourism strategy, growing the Tasmanian economy. Cambria Green will be paying a lot of taxes to state and federal governments.*

If profits go overseas, how much tax will they be paying?

Cambria Green developer has failed track record in Tasmania

\$140 million estimate - Ronald Hu has history with these types of developments.

In 2006 Ronald was a director of a company Spencer Morgan Pty Ltd that was planning an Eco-Resort development at Musselroe Bay in the Dorset Council. The development was remarkably like the concept shown in the Cambria Green Master Plan, although on a slightly smaller scale.

Although somewhat smaller in scale than proposed for Cambria Green, it was costed in 2006 at \$170m compared to projections of around \$100m for the larger Cambria Green proposal.

The Musselroe Bay developers had planned to recoup a significant portion of their investment through the strata title sale of a large portion of their units.

Questions have been asked about the competency of the Cambria Green management team to deliver the project as presented. Other than Musselroe Bay which seems to have a valid reason for not proceeding, do any of the proponents have a solid track record in delivering Property Developments of this scope?

It would be interesting to hear from Ronald exactly what his involvement in Musselroe Bay encompassed. Has he been – successfully – involved in any other major project and in what capacity?

Where exactly did all the financial statistics come from?

The SGS economic analysis of Cambria Green states it has: *... relied on data and resourcing provided by the project proponent, Cambria Green Agriculture & Tourism Management, and has not undertaken a detailed review of these estimates or checked their veracity.*

It would be interesting to interrogate the statistics outlined in the Talking Point, for example: 30,000 rounds of golf per year = 82 rounds per day (577 per week).

The proponent's traffic assessment states: *Basing the traffic generation on these investigations the golf course could generate up to 200 vehicles/day (to and from the course) with hourly movements of up to around 25 vehicles/hour.*

Loss of agricultural land

Again, from the proponent's own economic analysis: *Although there are some areas suitable for extensive grazing of native pastures, this is of minimal profitability to most operations, suggesting that the loss of agricultural land at Cambria Green will be a minor cost for the community.*

We guess that's why local wineries and agri-businesses are currently – and significantly – planting new vineyards on agricultural land adjacent to Swansea.

Neither this article, nor the proponent's economic analysis submitted to the Tasmanian Planning Commission, makes mention of the project economically sustaining agriculture. A requirement of the Specific Area Plan (the rezoning) is that the tourism use must support primary production use of the land.

Various other thoughts.....

- What are 'temporary retirement facilities'?
- *'Well to do Tasmanians'* sounds like potential to explore discriminatory approach, this kind of terminology is inappropriate.
- Main game here is real estate development. There's no doubt the 200 villas mentioned will be the main play with sales to overseas buyers getting a ride into permanent residency. The Cape Wickham golf course is a perfect example of this with, similarly, 200 villa units for sale to foreign investors. This project needs calling out for what it is: real estate development!!

As stated by Simon Currant in his representation against Cambria: *Swansea and its surrounding small communities are much loved by residents and visitors alike. People come here to experience untouched nature, discover rare migrating shorebirds and other wildlife, visit local wineries, galleries, museums and cafes.*

And from Luke Martin, CEO of Tourism Industry Council Tasmania (The Mercury, 10 January 2019): *We must resist the temptation to follow the example set by some destinations like Cairns or parts of New Zealand in pump-priming the international market with cheap inbound flights or developments that are inconsistent with our core brand attributes.*