

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE SUBMISSION

To the Public Works Committee,

Subject: Proposed Tasmanian Youth Justice Facility – Pontville

1. Introduction

I make this submission as a long-term resident directly affected by the proposed Youth Justice Facility at Pontville.

Having lived at my property for 26 years, where I raised my children and experienced significant life events, including the passing of my late husband. This home represents not only a financial investment, but also a place of deep personal and emotional importance.

2. Position

While I support the provision of appropriate youth justice facilities within Tasmania, I strongly oppose the selection of this site in Pontville due to its incompatibility with the surrounding environment and the significant negative impacts it will impose on the rehabilitation of the youth destined to be housed in this facility as well as on the local residents.

3. Inappropriate Location

The proposed site is located in close proximity to:

- a gun club
- a marijuana plantation
- a whiskey distillery
- a major highway

These surroundings are incompatible for a facility intended for vulnerable young people requiring a safe and supportive environment.

4. Amenity Impacts

The development will introduce:

- 24-hour operational activity
- increased noise levels
- security lighting

- loss of privacy

These impacts are inconsistent with the expectations of the Rural Living Zone and will result in a significant loss of amenity.

5. Traffic Impacts

The anticipated 280 vehicle movements per day represent a substantial increase for local rural roads and will create:

- safety concerns
- noise and disturbance
- reduced residential amenity

6. Stormwater and Environmental Considerations

The scale of development introduces risks relating to stormwater runoff, erosion, and downstream impacts. There is insufficient assurance that these matters have been adequately addressed.

7. Planning Scheme Considerations

Under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme:

- Clause 24.3.1 requires that development must not cause unreasonable loss of amenity
- Lighting provisions require that light spill does not affect adjoining properties
- Traffic provisions require that vehicle movements do not adversely impact surrounding areas
- Stormwater provisions require appropriate management of runoff

The proposal raises serious concerns regarding compliance with these provisions.

8. Community Opposition

The development was approved by a narrow 4–3 Council vote despite substantial community opposition, including numerous written objections, petitions, and statements from organisations such as Anglicare Tasmania, Save the Children, and Laurel House.

Hundreds of community and expert objections were effectively overridden by a single-vote majority. This fails to give proper weight to community input, contrary to Section 57 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.

9. Consultation Concerns

The consultation process did not adequately reflect or respond to community concerns and lacked meaningful engagement.

The Summary Report attempts to create the appearance of a fair, iterative process, but the substance shows the opposite: the site was predetermined, and the consultation was used to justify a decision already made. This is not genuine engagement. It is a procedural box-ticking exercise.

10. Scale and Visual Impact

The proposal includes:

- an 8,200m² facility
- buildings up to 11.8 metres in height
- a 6-metre security fence

These elements are out of scale with surrounding development and will significantly alter the visual character of the area.

11. Personal Impact

The facility will be located directly behind my property, significantly affecting my sense of safety, wellbeing, and enjoyment of my home.

12. Suitability for Purpose

The surrounding environment does not provide a suitable setting for the rehabilitation of young people.

13, Lack of Accessibility and Essential Services

The public bus service to the site stops at Brighton which is a considerable distance to the site. The Bus timetable to Brighton is not very frequent thus making it difficult for families of young people who rely on public transport, which will make maintaining contact difficult.

Essential services are a significant distance away. The nearest hospital is too far away to provide timely emergency medical care. The nearest police station is also distant and covers a great distance which would create delays in response times for incidents or emergencies. This site fails both basic requirements.

14. Conclusion

The proposed development is incompatible with the rural character of the area, creates significant planning and amenity concerns, and is not appropriate for this location.

Southern Midlands Council have been very unprofessional regarding the whole project, the meeting at which the project was considered by the Councilors. Have attached a link to the audio of the Southern Midlands Council Meeting at which the development was approved.

15. Recommendation

I respectfully request that the proposed development be reconsidered and relocated to a more suitable site.

Signed:

Annette Nichols

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

Date: 23/03/2026