



No vote for marina

I WAS pleased to read the letter from N. Youens ("Track record", Sound Opinion, May 6) questioning Rockingham Mayor Barry Sammels' track record regarding the environment, as I felt my blood boiling when I read "Cape Peron Team Collects Statistics" (*Sound Telegraph*, April 22).

I am wondering why the mayor and his mate Phil Edman keep speaking to the newspapers as if their proposed Cape Peron development is going to go ahead and saying that the council is supporting this too.

They seem to have convinced the new council chief executive officer as well.

I know there are several councillors who do not support the proposed development at Cape Peron and I was one of several thousand local people who signed a petition that was tabled in Parliament against this proposal.

There are many issues at stake here and I feel it is wrong for our elected mayor to continuously go against public opinion.

He is obviously aligned with the Liberal Party and an astute observer will have already seen they have scant regard for the environment and the long term, being more interested in development at all costs (for

example, uranium mining, the Barrow Island-Gorgon gas development and genetically modified crops).

With climate change and the threat of rising sea levels it is up to all of us, especially those who have the power to make decisions that can have long-reaching implications, to seriously conserve and account for the environment — because without it and its services such as clean air, biodiversity, water and so on, none of us will survive.

The Cape Peron "team" mention investigating seagrass regeneration.

It is my understanding this has been researched and found to not work.

Healthy seagrass is necessary for several marine species to successfully breed and live, including the fish that many people wish to catch.

Also, the contentious issue of whether the proposed canal development will adversely affect the water and quality of Lake Richmond is a case for applying the precautionary principle of sustainable development.

The ongoing costs of maintaining the canals and who pays also need to be clarified.

As a tourism graduate of Murdoch University I also question the assertion that this development will attract tourists.

From my research most people are seeking unique, quiet, beautiful natural areas.

There are many marinas and canals and they are much the same wherever one goes.

The location that is proposed will also be fragmenting the foreshore development and competing with the businesses already here as people would need to decide which area to head for, unlike the Wanliss Street proposal that will integrate with these.

Economically, I don't think this development will benefit.

There may be construction jobs in the short-term while it is being built but long-term employment would only be in the hospitality area and that is notorious for providing casual seasonal, part-time, low paid work.

Any long-term economic gains would not justify the huge environmental and social costs — it will be unaffordable for the majority to live there and once it is developed there is no going back.

I suggest therefore that Cr Sammels and Phil Edman listen to the many concerned residents and voters out here and do not persist in pushing this unsustainable project.

JULIE BYRNE
Palm Beach