Sacrificing the public

WE are dismayed at the new state planning provisions. They appear to make planning more complex and prioritise development no matter the cost to our lifestyle and environment. Where is the public benefit? Does our State Government believe developers will choose to provide public benefit? This is the role of government.

Writing a planning scheme that benefits developers and excludes the public is abdicating governance responsibility. Where do we want to go as a community? We should all be part of the conversation. This affects everyone, young and old. Why can't we have a planning system that sets a strategic direction with broad community support, rather than merely reacting to development proposals?

If protecting our amazing natural areas and biodiversity, sustaining rural communities and preserving our enviable lifestyles are worthy goals, how will allowing more development without public scrutiny help to achieve these? Who will benefit from removing the ability of affected parties and the broader community to appeal inappropriate development? Why is the making of money by a small number of individuals more important than keeping Tasmania a great place to live?

Will Hodgman please explain why you are sacrificing public benefit for private profit.

Alan Pegg. Christine Corbett
Fern Tree

Merc
12 Nov 2016