New Youth Detention Facility Site Options

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT OUTCOMES REPORT

Department for Education, Children and Young People

Tasmanian Government

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2021, the Tasmanian Government announced that the Ashley Youth Detention Centre would close and be replaced by new facilities, including a new youth detention facility.

A preliminary assessment identified three potential sites in the greater Hobart area for the new detention facility. These were sites at 2B Goodwood Road Dowsing Point, 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon and 466 Brighton Road (between Pontville and Mangalore). Based on this preliminary assessment, the sites at 466 Brighton Road and 972 East Derwent Highway were identified as preferred sites.

The Department *for* Education, Children and Young People (DECYP) delivered a public consultation process from 23 March to 4 May 2023 so that all stakeholders and the community had the opportunity to provide their feedback on these sites. All feedback received through the consultation process has been compiled in this outcomes report and will inform a decision on the proposed site for a new youth detention facility.

The consultation process included newspaper, radio, and social media advertising, direct mailouts, and four community drop-in sessions. Feedback was provided via an online feedback form, emails, hard copy submissions at the drop-in sessions, Ministerial correspondence, and social media.

Across all mediums, the total number of unique submissions received was 340. Of these, 156 were opposed to the Risdon site and 22 were in favour of the Risdon site.100 were opposed to the Pontville site and 10 were in favour of the Pontville site. 52 submissions were considered neutral in relation to the two preferred sites.

The most common reason for opposing a particular site was proximity of nearby properties and community impacts. This included perceptions that a youth detention facility nearby would increase crime in the area, directly impact surrounding properties due to lighting or other operational requirements, diminish community amenity, lower property values, and affect the reputation of the area.

Key issues raised in relation to the Risdon site included the cultural significance of the area to Tasmanian Aboriginal people and the nearby Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre, traffic impacts related to the East Derwent Highway, visibility of the site from neighbouring properties, commuters travelling across the Bowen Bridge and visitors to Hobart (via the MONA ferries), and proximity to the Otago Bay residential area.

Key issues raised in relation to the Pontville site included proximity to commercial operations such as the Lark Distillery and Tasmanian Botanicals, gun clubs located in Mangalore, heritage homes, and schools in the region, lack of public transport, and general visibility of the site.

INTRODUCTION

The Department *for* Education, Children and Young People (DECYP) has committed to undertaking community consultation for all major capital works projects. This is to provide local communities and stakeholders with the opportunity to provide input on capital works projects – ensuring a co-designed approach to delivering facilities that considers and embeds community and stakeholder input and aspirations in new public infrastructure.

The Department's capital works consultation program was established in 2018 and is the mechanism for DECYP to seek input from stakeholders and community to help shape its projects. These consultations commonly include online surveys, one-on-one and group meetings, direct mails outs, advertising, community workshops and open homes, newsletters, and pop-up stalls. DECYP is also committed to full transparency of these consultations so that contributors can have the opportunity to view all feedback received. Outcomes reports containing all feedback are compiled and made publicly available via email distribution lists and the DECYP website.

BACKGROUND

The Tasmanian Government is committed to the reform of the entire Tasmanian Youth Justice System and strengthening the supports and therapeutic interventions provided to young people to divert them from the system. This will see a transition to a new therapeutic model for custodial youth justice, the closure of Tasmania's existing youth detention facility, the Ashley Youth Detention Centre, and the delivery of new purpose-built youth justice facilities.

In September 2021, the Government announced that the Ashley Youth Detention Centre would close and be replaced by new facilities, including a new youth detention facility in the south of the State.

A preliminary assessment identified three potential sites in the greater Hobart area for the new detention facility. These were sites at 2B Goodwood Road Dowsing Point, 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon and 466 Brighton Road (between Pontville and Mangalore).

The criteria for determining suitability of a site for the new detention facility is:

- Located in the greater Hobart region, within reasonable driving distance from the Hobart CBD
- Located away from schools and major residential areas
- Site size greater than two hectares
- Government-owned
- Appropriately zoned under the relevant Tasmanian Planning Scheme as a permitted or discretionary use.

Based on this preliminary assessment, the sites at 466 Brighton Road and 972 East Derwent Highway were identified as preferred sites.

Extensive public consultation was undertaken from 23 March to 4 May 2023 so that all stakeholders and the community had the opportunity to provide their feedback on these sites. Feedback received through the consultation process will inform a final decision on the proposed site for the new youth detention facility.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

Community engagement activities for the new youth detention facility sites shortlist were tailored to meet three key objectives. These were:

- Facilitate effective consultation to raise awareness with key stakeholders and the broader community about the shortlisted sites, the criteria used to assess site suitability and encourage participation in the consultation process.
- Generate community and stakeholder feedback on the shortlisted sites to help inform decision-making by the Minister and DECYP.
- Demonstrate the Government's commitment to genuine, inclusive, and transparent community consultation.

The following activities were initiated specifically to achieve these objectives.

Objective	Activity
Facilitate effective consultation to raise awareness with key stakeholders and the broader community about the shortlisted sites, the criteria used to assess site suitability and encourage participation in the consultation process.	Extensively promote the consultation process via radio, print and social media advertising, and direct mailouts to maximise awareness of the opportunity to provide feedback.
Generate community and stakeholder feedback on the shortlisted sites to help inform decision-making by the Minister and DECYP.	Provide the mechanisms to receive submissions from all stakeholders to be considered and included in the consultation outcomes report, including online, hard copy, and face-to-face options.
Demonstrate the Government's commitment to genuine, inclusive, and transparent community consultation.	Amend the consultation period to close on 4 May 2023 to provide additional time for stakeholders to submit their feedback. Make the consultation outcomes report publicly available.

CONSULTATION OUTPUTS

The consultation process for the new youth detention facility sites shortlist was launched on 23 March 2023. The consultation ran for six weeks and concluded on 4 May 2023. Consultation outputs were:

- Ministerial media release (and subsequent media stories)
- Direct postcard mail outs to all property addresses within two kilometres of the two preferred sites
- Letters and Questions and Answers fact sheets delivered to all properties within one kilometre of the two preferred sites
- Direct engagement with relevant local government general managers for the three shortlisted sites
- Direct emails to the youth justice reform key stakeholder database
- Direct emails to the consultation database
- Consultation landing page on the DECYP website
- Online feedback form
- Dedicated *Get Involved* email box to receive submissions
- Four community drop-in/questions and answer sessions (2x Risdon Vale, 2x Pontville)
- 20x 'live read' radio slots on 7HO FM, HIT100.9 and Triple M radio stations.
- 11x print advertisements in The Mercury newspaper (including four Saturday editions)

- Three weeks of Facebook and Instagram advertising geo-targeting audiences in Southern Tasmania in proximity to the three shortlisted sites.

PARTICIPATION

Community participation in the consultation process for the new youth detention facility sites shortlist was strong across the various engagement mediums.

Participants in the consultation process came from a mix of community members, local residents, and businesses, and stakeholders in the youth justice system. Across all mediums, the total number of unique submissions received through the consultation process was 340.

Online feedback form

A total of 279 unique feedback forms were received. The online feedback form was web-based using the Microsoft Teams platform, which respondents accessed via the consultation page on the DECYP website.

Email submissions

A total of 42 unique email submissions were received via DECYP's *Get Involved* email box.

Ministerial submissions

A total of five unique submissions were received by the Minister's Office or the Office of the Premier.

Social media

14 unique social media comments were compiled by the Department during the consultation process, noting that due to moderation policy requirements, the capacity to provide comments on Facebook pages managed by DECYP is limited.

Community drop-in sessions

Community drop-in sessions were held on 12 and 15 April 2023 at the Risdon Vale Hall and on 13 and 15 April 2023 at the Brighton Municipal Memorial Hall. A total of 208 attendees were recorded for the two Risdon Vale drop-in sessions and a total of 58 attendees were recorded for the two Pontville drop-in sessions. Attendees to the Risdon Vale drop-in sessions provided a total of 63 submissions. Attendees to the Pontville drop-in sessions provided a total of 16 submissions.

Pontville site petition

A petition opposed to the Pontville site was received by DECYP in the days following the closure of the consultation process. This petition, which contained 303 signatures in hard copy and 21 via an online format, listed the name of the signatory, the suburb in which they reside, a space to provide comments, and their signature. Following further analysis, it was determined that 49 of these were either duplicates within the petition or were from respondents who had already provided their feedback via DECYP's consultation channels. This took the total number of unique signatories down to 275.

INTERPRETING THE FEEDBACK

All feedback received through the consultation process has been reviewed and best efforts have been made to interpret it to ensure accuracy and integrity of the consultation process and support informed decision-making by the Tasmanian Government. Feedback has been analysed to provides a snapshot of community and stakeholder sentiment in relation to each preferred site. However, it is acknowledged that sentiment (the number of submissions in favour or against a particular site) by itself is of limited use in assisting decision-making and the reasons provided for being in favour of one site over another are considered important.

In interpreting the feedback, the following approach has been taken:

- Invalid submissions are considered those that have been left blank or are duplicates.
- Duplicate submissions are considered to be those that are either the same submissions received multiple times via the same or different medium, or multiple submissions from the same respondent expressing the same viewpoint. In such cases, to help determine sentiment in relation to the shortlisted sites, duplicate submissions have been counted once regardless of medium.
- Submissions were considered neutral if it was unclear what site they related to, if they did not express a preference for a preferred site, if the submissions were providing more general feedback in relation to the Ashley Youth Detention Centre, the Tasmanian youth justice system, or the youth justice reform project, were opposed to all shortlisted sites, or were in favour of both preferred sites.
- Submissions that expressed opposition to the Goodwood site have been counted as neutral, because this site was already ruled out as a preferred site and only identified through the consultation process as having been part of the initial shortlist of sites for the sake of transparency. Where a submission expressed opposition to the Goodwood site and opposition for one of the preferred sites (e.g. Risdon), that submission was tallied to reflect the opposition to the preferred site.
- Submissions tallied in favour of a preferred site were those that did not express opposition to a particular site, and instead only highlighted their preference. To avoid double counting 'in favour' submissions, those that expressed opposition to a particular site and a view that the other site(s) was more suitable have been counted as being opposed to the particular site.
- Submissions made via the community drop-in sessions have not been counted as unique submissions, and accordingly not included in the final tally in favour or opposed to a particular site. This is because no limit was placed on how much feedback one respondent could provide, meaning that one respondent was able to provide multiple 'submissions'.
- While it is acknowledged the majority of attendees to the community drop-in sessions were opposed to the preferred site in their area, the number of attendees to the community drop-in sessions have not been counted as unique submissions, and accordingly not included in the final tally in favour or opposed to a particular site. This is because attendees were not required to provide their names and personal information, and therefore cannot be cross-referenced to determine if they had already provided submissions via other mediums. Attendees were also not specifically asked whether they were in favour or against a site, and while written submissions were encouraged, there was no requirement to do this. If all attendees were tallied as opposed to the site in their area, this would increase opposition to the Risdon site.
- While the petition received opposed to the Pontville site contained 275 unique signatures, these submissions have not been included in the final tally opposed to this site. This is because the petition only contained names (commonly not full names), suburb, and signature, and did not contain corroborative information (e.g. email addresses, phone numbers or residential addresses). Consequently, these 'submissions' cannot be properly verified. It should be noted that while the petition did include a space for signatories to provide their comments, almost none provided any feedback to

inform the reason for their opposition. However, if all signatories were tallied as valid individual submissions, this would increase opposition to the Pontville site.

- If all the drop-in session attendees/written submissions, and petition signatures noted above were tallied as valid unique submissions, the total number of 'submissions' opposed to each of the preferred sites would be relatively evenly distributed.
- The majority of submissions received that expressed opposition to a shortlisted site cited multiple reasons for this opposition. To ensure transparency, all submissions have been compiled in full in this report. However, for the purposes of identifying response trends, the most common reasons for opposition to a specific site have been summarised and aggregated.

WHAT WE HEARD

SITE SENTIMENT

Channels	Total Submissions Received	Left blank	Duplicates	Unique Submissions	972 East Derwent Highway		466 Brighton Road		Neutral		Total
					Opposed	In Favour	Opposed	In Favour	Opposed/In Favour of Goodwood	Neutral	
Online feedback forms	306	3	24	279	121	21	97	10	2	28	**279**
Emails	69		27	42	33		2			7	**42**
Ministerial submissions	7		2	5	1					4	**5**
Social media comments	19		5	14	1	1	1			11	**14**
***Community drop-in sessions**	79			79	38	1	12			28	
Total	**401**	**3**	**58**	**340**	**156**	**22**	**100**	**10**	**52**		**340**

**Not included in overall submissions tally due to the likelihood of multiple submissions from the same respondent*

- Across all consultation mediums, a total of 340 unique submissions were received
- 156 are opposed to the Risdon site and 22 are in favour of the Risdon site.
- 100 are opposed to the Pontville site and 10 are in favour of the Pontville site
- 52 are considered neutral in relation to the two preferred sites.

Channels	Risdon Vale					Pontville							
	Aboriginal Heritage	Traffic	Visual Amenity	Community and residential effect	Proximity to Prison	Cannabis Odor	Distillery	Gun Clubs	Heritage Aspect	Visual Amenity	Community and residential effect	Schools nearby	Transport
Online Feedback Form	42	57	43	102	25	28	11	18	21	21	63	18	19
Emails	10	7	9	23	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ministerial submissions	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Social Media Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*Community drop-in sessions	8	9	9	18	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	2
Total	52	64	52	126	33	29	13	19	23	22	64	19	20

*Not included in overall submissions tally due to the likelihood of multiple submissions from the same respondent

The most common reasons for opposing the Risdon site were:

- Proximity of nearby properties and community impacts (126). This included perceptions that a youth detention facility nearby would increase crime in the area, directly impact surrounding properties due to lighting or other operational requirements, diminish community amenity, lower property values, and affect the reputation of nearby residential areas considered to be desirable (such as Otago Bay).
- Traffic impacts related to the East Derwent Highway (64). This included concerns around the access requirements off the highway which can be congested during peak travel times, and perceptions that the detention facility would contribute to additional traffic load on the highway.
- Cultural significance to Tasmanian Aboriginal people and proximity of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre (TAC) on the East Derwent Highway (52). This included references to a historical massacre of Aboriginal people nearby, proximity of a childcare facility at the TAC, and the importance of the site and surrounds to Aboriginal people.
- Visibility of the site from the Bowen Bridge and nearby properties (52). This included visibility of the detention facility to commuters travelling to the eastern shore, neighbouring residential properties, and to passengers on board vessels such as the MONA ferry.

The most common reasons for opposing the Pontville site were:

- Proximity of other commercial (Lark, Tasmanian Botanics), recreational properties (gun clubs), and schools (80). This included references to the area being a tourist trail, perceptions about the optics of placing a youth detention facility nearby to a medicinal cannabis facility, concerns about safety/noise due to the target shooting club facilities located in Mangalore, and proximity of schools, including the new Brighton High School currently under construction.
- Community and residential impacts (64). This included perceptions that a youth detention facility nearby would increase crime in the area, directly impact surrounding properties due to lighting or other operational requirements, diminish community amenity, and lower property values.
- Pontville being a heritage area (23). This included concerns that Pontville is known for having a concentration of heritage-listed or historical homes, and that some of these are in proximity to the site at 466 Brighton Road.
- Visibility of the site from nearby properties (22). This included properties that are either adjacent to the site at 466 Brighton Road or have some visibility of the site from other areas.
- Lack of transport (20). This included a lack of public transport, such as bus services/bus stops to the Pontville area for staff, or visitors to the detention facility.

The most common reasons for submissions considered neutral were:

- General comments not specifically related to the shortlisted sites (12)
- Submissions that expressed opposition to a particular site, but it was not clear which site (10)
- Submissions that raised questions about a particular site (6)
- Submissions that expressed opposition to all shortlisted sites and/or suggested other sites (6)
- Submissions that expressed the view that nothing is wrong with the Ashley Youth Detention Centre from an infrastructure perspective (5)
- Submissions that expressed the view that either of the preferred sites is acceptable (4).

The most common reasons for being in favour of the Risdon site were:

- Proximity to Risdon prison, either as disincentive to young offenders or staff/resourcing benefits (9)
- No reason given (7)
- Better transport for staff or family visitation (3)
- Closer to support agencies (2).

The most common reasons for being in favour of the Pontville site were:

- Further away for residential areas (4)
- Further away from Risdon prison (3)
- No reason given (3).

ADDITIONAL SENTIMENT

Of the total number of unique submissions received, 37 submissions provided feedback in relation to the youth justice system in general and the Ashley Youth Detention Centre. The most common themes were:

- Perceptions that there is nothing wrong with the Ashley Youth Detention Centre itself, that it was the practices there rather than the facilities and that without changing the practices, the same issues will occur at a new facility (20). 12 of these submissions also expressed opposition to a preferred site in their area
- General comments on the youth justice system, including the need for better staff recruitment and attributes, youth justice practices, visitation accessibility, and regional location of infrastructure (9)
- Advocacy for a prison farm model, where detainees can learn agricultural and other practical skills (5).

NEXT STEPS

This outcomes report has been provided to the Minister for Education, Children and Youth for consideration and to inform decision-making. This report will also be made publicly available on the DECYP website.

SUBMISSIONS

ONLINE FEEDBACK FORMS

Opposed to Risdon site
The proposed East Risdon site is not ideal. There are a number of established semi-rural properties at the location with the potential to develop high value land holdings in future developments if sub divided. The average property value is currently above the Tasmanian average in this area which incorporates East Risdon and Otago areas. There is an active community group in the Otago area particularly that is not in favour of this proposal and it is foreseeable there would be considerable backlash through media and also at ministerial level as a detention centre would arguably reduce the value of housing in that area. The Brighton site would be preferred as it would not currently impact on housing in the area as it is more isolated and detached from the community generally. There is more infrastructure available in the Brighton Municipality such as shopping centres, the opportunity to develop better public transport to a growing area such as Brighton / Bridgewater and there will also be a better access to the area via the new Bridgewater Bridge.
I wrote to oppose the proposed Youth Detention Centre at Otago for the following reasons: 1. Visibility 2. Access 3. Residential Proximity. 1. As you cross the Bowen Bridge in a northerly direction the site is very visible, and no matter what materials or colouring the building is it will inevitably look like a prison/ correctional facility. The land size is also limiting as future additions to the complex will be limited by the residential proximity to the left, the Aboriginal land behind and the lagoon on the lower side. The visual impact would be no different than if it were built at the Dowsing Point site. MONA tourists will have a clear view from the ferries of the prison facility. 2. The proposed land is sloping and would make construction of the facility more costly than at the flatter larger site at Pontville. The access would result in entry or egress into either a busy 3 lane one-way traffic flow off the bridge, or access onto a blind corner at the bottom of the hill near the lagoon. Either option is far from ideal, considering that there are frequent accidents at this intersection already. There are also proposed alterations under considerations for improvements of the black spot intersection at the East Derwent Highway turn-off to Old Beach. 3. The proximity to residential dwellings in Otago is not only undesirable due to the stigma of having a complex 'next door' but will also reduce the value of these prestige homes. The type of inmates to be housed in the facility are the likes of the recent stabbing at Harris Scarfe, and the underage driver (last week in Qld) Residential security and peace of mind will be hard to achieve considering the problems that occurred with escapees at Ashley Centre. The provision of adequate lighting will likely have an impact on adjoining properties. I request that you situate the new YDC at the Brighton/Pontville Site, for the following reasons: With Land Size being almost twice the East Derwent property, this allows for future expansion. Sadly, the requirements for these types of facilities will only increase in the future. Flatter site is easier to build on and monitor than an undulating area. Quiet traffic flow and level access simplifies prison operation. Easy access from the highway onto the Pontville Road, or if required from the northbound lane of the highway. Minimal adjoining properties. Floodlight pollution would be similar to the Tasmanian Botanicals site on the east side of the highway. I thank you for your consideration of these points and welcome any further news and updates.

I wish to submit my opposition to the proposed construction of a youth detention centre at 972 East Derwent Highway. Having such a facility so close to a number of residential areas presents a potential safety risk to nearby residents as well as creating a visual eyesore. It would be far more appropriate to construct this facility at a place further removed from suburbia such as 466 Brighton Road. I would kindly ask that in working towards positive youth justice outcomes that you consider a more appropriate site. Thank you.
I wish to submit my opposition to the proposed construction of a Youth Detention Centre at 972 East Derwent Highway. Having such a facility so close to a number of residential areas presents a potential safety risk to nearby residents as well as creating a visual eyesore. It would be far more appropriate to construct this facility at a place further removed from suburbia such as 466 Brighton Road. I would kindly ask that in working towards positive youth justice outcomes that you consider a more appropriate site. Thank you.
Against this being in Otago, we don't have the road infrastructure to support the additional traffic it would bring in, the traffic always backs up hugely in peak hour as is. And it's too close to several residential communities.
As hard working, middle-class residents of the northern suburbs, we have seen an increase in the level of criminal and antisocial behaviour in our community over the last couple of years. Our teenage son who regularly catches public transport to and from school and activities from the Glenorchy bus mall, does not feel comfortable to walk or wait for any length of time in the area. He has seen many altercations and instances of physical and verbal abuse, vandalism, and threatening behaviour. Although we agree that reforms across the juvenile justice system are needed and that early intervention and holistic programs need to be put in place, we also feel that adding another detention facility into the inner northern suburb landscape will have further negative impacts on the ongoing perception and perpetuate the 'stigma' and behaviours associated with the area. This will adversely affect property values and be a set-back for the area in progressing to a liveable and progressive, 'family friendly', community suburb. We believe it is not necessary to have a facility so close to town and residential neighbourhoods. We therefore strongly oppose two of the three suggested sites: those being Goodwood Road, Dowsing Point and East Derwent Highway, Risdon.
Please use Brighton and not Otago. Brighton makes more sense as it is further away, and Otago houses are too close. We are not happy with an eye sore facility being too close to such an affluent suburb. We already have to have septic as we do not have town sewerage connection even though we belong to Clarence City Council.
I object to the youth detention facility being built at Risdon. It will have a negative impact on our currently safe area.
As an [redacted] neighbour to the proposed site at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon, I strongly oppose this site for a youth detention facility. This is a semi-rural residential area and not suitable for such a facility, is also on the boundary of sacred aboriginal land and a significant historical site. I also believe it is a poor choice of site given the extremely large volume of tourists to our state who travel to MONA via boat who will pass by the site on their way to and from the museum, obviously not something we need to put under the noses of such a large volume of tourists. A rural site would be a far better idea than the Risdon site.
I am a resident of Otago Bay, TAS. I oppose the new proposed detention centre location closer to our place. Thanks.
I am sending this regarding my opposition to the possibility of the East Derwent Highway site at Otago being used for a youth detention facility. My concern is for the safety and peace being no longer. The risk of the destruction of habitat for the local wildlife including the Swift Parrot and birds of prey for the facility to be built is not acceptable, let alone the bordering site of the Aboriginal Centre which has regular school groups attending and also the early settlement site of Risdon affected.

The current site of Ashley Detention Centre is wanted in Deloraine as many people in the area rely on the jobs that currently exist. I would think the funding would be better spent updating the current facility and putting the money towards better programs so the youths can be rehabilitated and hopefully be better able to integrate and be valued members of society rather than feeling nothing has changed and returning to their former habits. There is also the fact that many people in the area are opposed to the facility due to moving into the area for a safe and peaceful lifestyle to raise their families and now that lifestyle is being threatened. Many of us have taken out large mortgages for this and are now feeling stressed that the value of our properties will most likely drop and the attraction for future buyers into our lovely area will be affected. It is already stressful with the rise of interest rates and cost of living, we never expected our property values to be affected in such a way and it is really effecting our wellbeing and mental health. It is regrettable to think that after moving from our previous home where we had youths from neighbouring housing department homes, running through the yard to evade police and stealing our children's toys or anything else they could from our backyard. We did not feel we or our children, were safe in our own backyard, so we chose to buy a home in Otago where we felt safe, even though that meant undertaking a larger mortgage and adding more financial pressure. To think we are brought back where we started with the risk of troubled youth, once again, affecting our safety is extremely upsetting.
I attended the meeting at Risdon Vale this morning which provided me with a better insight into the proposal for the Otago site. Still needs more consultation but I feel the decision has already been made about this being the preferred site. Needless to say, there is not a lot of support from we the residents of Otago.
I went along to the advertised meet the project team at Risdon Vale Hall. You had a number of posters with very basic info. I asked a number of very basic but relevant questions and the project team members I spoke to had extremely limited and vague responses. Your website says that you went through a detailed selection process, so why can't your project team answer basic questions. Thought this strange as they were, as advertised, the project team. This question was answered as my children attended a meeting on site at 7pm, and we found out that most of the team weren't even from Tasmania. How can our government treat us with such disdain. It also appears that you could only say by design maybe that very limited people received notification about the proposed site at all. Personally, I am deeply concerned and feel quite angry that the process appears to be deliberately concealed in information sharing and rushed. I personally do not want this facility to go ahead in Otago. Your comment regarding prices going up after it is built is absurd. The Brighton site is a larger site and is more accessible just on the very basic information shown. Please schedule another meeting with a project team that can do more than put posters on trestles.
I reject the proposed site of 972 East Derwent Highway because of the following points: 1. It's close proximity to the historical Risdon Cove. 2. This detention centre will be bordering the Aboriginal childcare centre. 3. It will worsen the already bad traffic congestion on the Bowen bridge, with multiple vehicle accidents happening regularly on a weekly basis. 4. Some of the endangered birds/species are in this area, and this could negatively impact their already limited numbers. 5. Its close proximity to the Risdon prison will create a negative stigma and will be critically detrimental to the youth rehabilitation program which this detention centre aims to achieve. 6. Otago is a family focussed residential only community. The proposed detention facility is an inappropriate and poorly considered use of scarcely available land that shows no respect for our community or its future development. It will damagingly redefine our community. Otago was voted first in "Top Australian suburbs for families in 2023" by the Property Tribune.
I do not believe the Bowen location is suitable in any way and believe the sloping site is far better suited to housing.

With all consideration taken I feel this is too close to our suburb and shared boundaries with the Aboriginal School. The residents of Otago with whom I have spoken are all very distressed as to the plans. The highway planning has not been submitted for us to peruse. Please let us move this to an area where can accommodate workshops and teachings to help with rehabilitation.

Why are we adjacent to Aboriginal School???

The proposed East Derwent Highway location has several problems:

It's too close to Risdon Prison - it will be too closely associated with that facility;
It is too close to the bridge approaches and could also potentially compromise opportunities for future transport corridor connections;
The existing road is very dangerous (especially for cyclists) in both directions. Adding new access infrastructure in that location will potentially exacerbate the problems.

It's the Midland Highway – not "Heritage Highway".

1. The land at Otago was purchased by the Department of State Growth to allow for future road infrastructure from the roundabout on the East Derwent Highway so the road could bypass the single line road around Risdon Cove. The road would run behind the Aboriginal land and come out at the Bowen Bridge removing a very dangerous road area (black spot). If this land is developed as planned, then there will be even more traffic on the single lane road and there will be a fatality because of this decision. There are 600-plus new houses being built in the Risdon and Geilston Bay area. With most of the new residents using the current very poor road system around the Risdon Cove area there will be another 800 to 1200 extra car movements per day each way. Add the traffic from the infill house from Old Beach to Gagebrook at around 1000 new residents and even if only 50% of these people use the east Derwent Highway there will be another 1000-plus car movement each way per day. In all there will be over 2000 extra cars needing to use this road are that is already a black spot, with multiple car crashes around the Bowen Bridge every month.

Already the Bowen bridge is working well over its capacity, with traffic stopped more than halfway across the bridge every night from around 4.00pm to 7.00pm. Adding in another 100 to 130 movements (and most of them will be slow moving trucks or delivery vans), will increase the potential of accidents and even possible fatalities as all the 100 to 130 movements will need to exit or enter the already overloaded road system.

2. Where the proposed development is located there is only one suitable entry and exit point and that is on a blind corner, where two lanes merge to one lane and there is a single lane bridge on the other leading to this entry/exit point. Again, this will place an unacceptable risk on the road users and in my view, there will be fatalities from this proposed development. To make a safe entry and exit point that ensures the health, safety, and lives of public road users is a massive infrastructure project to be undertaken at massive costs to the public.

3. The infrastructure work required will cost 13-15 million dollars:

The approach from Risdon and Geilston Bay would need a second bridge to be built and a dedicated slip lane and turning lane, to allow for safe entry and exit of truck, vans, and cars from the proposed site.

The exit from the Bowen bridge end would need major civil works to cut back the bank on the side of the road to allow for a dedicated slip lane for trucks, vans and car to enter the site safely.

To exit the site towards the Bowen Bridge an entry slip lane would have to be added to the single lane that comes away from the Risdon Cove end and this would also require major civil works to make the exit safe for all road uses and remove a high risk of crashes and even possible fatalities.

4. Major infrastructure around sewage and waste removal.

To connect into the sewage an entire new line would need to be run to the site and cross the entrance of Risdon Cove at a massive cost to the taxpayer. 3 to 4 million dollars.

Civil works would be required on the site as the site is not flat land, and all the land in the area is very heavy in blue stone and would require massive civil works with rock breakers to level the site, cut footing in and place services under the ground including sewerage, power and lighting. 6 to 10 million dollars.

5. All of the massive civil works in the road infrastructure, new bridge, sewerage, underground services and site preparation will destroy irreplaceable aboriginal artifacts and desecrate this extremely sensitive cultural site.

The cost of the civil works alone for this site used all of the funding provide to build both sites in the north and south. $40 million.

The brief given for finding the sites was so narrow and ill-planned the entire project will need to be redone and encompass the entirety of the development, not just land that the government own, and the zoning as the headline.

The placement of the development at Otago would become an eyesore for every law-abiding taxpayer how uses the Bowen bridge. The lighting would destroy the tranquillity of living in the area for all residents, let alone the massive risk to the safety of the community. Security cannot even transfer the children without them escaping (and the child is still at large). Let's remember these children are in custody, like the child who stabbed the worker in Moonah, and the person who stabbed the doctor in the hospital.

The documents provided all talk about the studies on the offender and what's best for them, what studies have been taken of the lawful citizen who has this forced on them? Our house feels unsafe, stressed, and we are fearful for the safety of our children, but it seems that our rights to feel safe in our own community is irrelevant compared to people who live outside the law.

The community has no confidence that our safety, or our children's safety, can be guaranteed with the moving of this facility into the local populated area.

I object to this facility being established at the Otago location due to the following below:
1 - It will be within 200 metres from our home residence.
2 - The council has approved a subdivision for two more residences to be established which will mean they will be even closer to the proposed site.
3 - It is located too close to the current Risdon prison.
4 - The Aboriginal site - Risdon Cove and Putalina (Oyster Cove) blocked in by the Risdon prison now a youth detention centre - really that is a slap in their face right there, they have a childcare centre and schooling at the site as well.
5 - Otago is a prestige/prime real estate area why on earth would you consider this area as a suitable site, a lot of residences have invested a lot of money in their homes for future stability, this will definitely devalue all homes in the area.

How ridiculous to consider building a facility in a prime real estate area! What are you thinking??? Residential areas all around this site you are considering house families who will now be very anxious and worried about the youths escaping and entering their homes etc.

There are privacy concerns, not to mention it will devalue all prime estate properties in the area, you wouldn't put the detention centre in prime estate location like Hobart or Sandy Bay etc so why should it be any different here????? No way!!!!

I fully oppose the idea of building a Detention Centre at 972 East Derwent Highway!

Too close to residences at Direction Drive, Otago Bay, Saunderson's Road & the Aboriginal Centre East Derwent Highway.

This will have an impact on property prices & home insurances!

As Risdon Prison is nearby, already with security & full infrastructure set up, surely there is enough land remaining to build a tower to house these juveniles aged 14 – 18.

I have read where sometimes there are only "ten (10) inmates "being housed!

It is totally wasteful to want to build new facilities when a prison complex exists & there must be land that could be utilised with "Tower" built housing!

I oppose the proposed building at 972 East Derwent Highway & I would like a return reply.

Why is the government considering wasting $40 million on building a new facility! How very wasteful with Taxpayers money!

You have Ashley! You can rename it!

You can provide more security cameras to protect staff & inmates. You can have microphones recording every detail of what goes on.

You need to possibly assess Staff better!

On the other hand, I heard a story of a fellow in Ashley (2nd hand) who had never been sexually attacked, claimed he was & got a big pay out that he wasted on an expensive car & wasted the rest.

We know this goes on/but if you had recording devices everywhere - everyone would be protected!

Why build another Centre/when you have a perfectly good one at Deloraine!

If the government can't run it successfully - find someone who can!

A very, very wasteful government to even consider this!

Easy when it's not your money you are playing with!

Plus you should be listening to the people!

We have been residents at Otago Bay for [redacted] years. We are disgusted that we were not notified in writing of the proposed preferred site at Otago - we only found out via the Otago Bay Neighbourhood Watch Facebook page last week and through other concerned residents. Some residents received written notification, but many more did not. Not good enough!! Otago Bay is a built-up area with many homes, some of which are on small acreage. A lot of retirees live in the neighbourhood, and more recently, young families have been moving into the area. The proposed site at East Derwent Highway is, in our opinion, not suitable, i.e. there is already a bottleneck of traffic on a daily basis, the road would become more dangerous due to a higher volume/saturation of traffic (not to mention the disruption whilst the facility was being constructed and with the additional roadworks which would need to be undertaken). It would be a blight on our neighbourhood and most certainly devalue our properties. We are very disappointed in the obvious deception in regards to the timeframe to voice our concerns and to contribute to the consultation process. Again, not good enough. We feel there is an undercurrent of "what they don't know, won't hurt them" and unacceptable tactics being displayed by the Government and for this, and for the reasons mentioned above, we are very strongly opposed to having a detention centre built in a highly unsuitable location. Without Prejudice.

The site at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon is not suitable, but much rather Brighton would be the obvious choice. I have property in Otago and I for one would not feel comfortable nor impressed if you went ahead with the east Derwent site. I strongly oppose this. The Derwent site does not comply with criteria. You are near Otago, we are a very close-knit residential neighbourhood. Brighton would be a better choice.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the new youth detention facility being at the East Derwent highway Otago site. It is an inappropriate spot for a detention centre and is too close to residential areas. Traffic flow between the Bowen bridge and Otago is very busy as it is, and traffic gets backed up around 3pm onwards. This is just going to make the issue worse. I also thought that land was going to go towards new traffic infrastructure in the future to prevent a standstill in traffic such as we have seen over the past few weeks. You say property prices will not be affected but anyone can see that our properties value will dramatically decrease. And how about safety for our loved ones and children. We chose Otago because of the family lifestyle. Now I am really worried that this will change. Also, what will you do say after you build a detention centre there?! There is always something that is in the pipework's. A really important aspect is the proximity to the aboriginal centre and school.... It's just not right. And you say you can't build and use the

space already at the prison because you don't want that proximity. Well, I'm sorry to say but Risdon prison is only down the road. Plus, if it is there then the clients will be able to see for themselves where they might end up if they don't change.

The land at Otago is also not big enough for future things such as teaching them life skills for their futures. Not sure how you think you will staff this as the RHH and other clinics are having specialist issues finding people. And 40 million dollars for just up to 20 clients. I strongly am against this, and I sincerely hope you listen to us as a community and don't ignore us. We as a community in Otago enjoy our little space. Don't put a sour taste in our mouths because we will continue to fight this and use whatever means we have to protect our community.

An absolute joke that Otago Bay is being considered. And to be put on historic land??

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed waterfront sites for the Youth Detention Centre in Hobart. Whilst I understand the proximity to Hobart and the existing jail makes this an ideal location, I strongly believe that settling on either of the two waterfront sites under consideration would have a significant negative impact on the future of Hobart for decades to come.

Hobart is a beautiful harbour city and one that is still growing. The preferred site is on prime real estate and for better or worse will one day be developed, when it is, it should be used for something that will take full advantage of its prominent position, both to look out from and look in on. The Derwent River is an integral part of the city's identity and one of its key assets. The proposed location of the Youth Detention Centre on the riverfront would be visible and damaging to tourist trails, waterways, public areas, and many other suburbs and would have a significant impact on the aesthetic appeal of the harbour. The construction and operation of the Centre could deter tourism and negatively impact the local economy.

In light of these concerns, I urge the local council to reconsider the preferred site for the Youth Detention Centre. I strongly believe that the Centre should be located in an area that is not visible from public areas, preserves the scenic beauty of the harbour, and reflects the city's values and aspirations. A detention centre on the river would have a significant negative impact on Hobart's future.
Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Otago is not an appropriate site for this development!! Looking at all of the youth detention centres around Australia; they are situated in open rural land parcels and industrial areas with minimal surrounding properties. We chose to live in Otago, and we invested heavily on our land and home. In November 2022, Otago was named "Australia's most family-friendly suburb" by Yahoo finance, elite agent and other businesses. Otago has a median house price of $995,000 and rising. With most properties being well over the million-dollar mark, don't you think this should have been considered? Our voice needs to be heard and the Government needs to consider the negative impact on our community if the Otago site was chosen over Brighton.

Otago has a lot of history with Tasmanians and especially the First Nation people. This site would be very insensitive to this community with history of Otago and neighbouring suburb Risdon cove. The Tasmanian Aboriginal Children's centre would be at the boundary of the proposed Otago site, I don't think this would have a positive impact on these young Tasmanian's being at a school so close to other young Tasmanian's who potentially could be a threat to our community.

As a father of three young boys, I would hope to see the future of youth detention develop at a site where the children could see a future for themselves. Not anywhere close or near to the Risdon prison. It should not look like a steppingstone. But to have the centre for rehabilitation a lot further away from Risdon and able to teach them life and work skills to give them a far better chance of life after being institutionalised. Integrating these children back into community is so important for their outcomes. Put them in a space where they don't feel like their next move is Risdon prison.

Be mindful and considerate that we do not want this development in our family friendly suburb. Please look at all of the other Australian detention centre suburbs; and see how unreasonable this site is to even propose in the first place. Thank you for the time you have taken to read.

The feedback I would like to submit is that area was always put aside for future roadworks to the highway to benefit the whole community, we also need to think about the influx of migration to Tasmania, especially Hobart and its close suburbs, as we don't want to end up with the same issues as Melbourne and suburbs with no infrastructure or adequate transport as we push people further away from the CBD.
With this area potentially taken up by the youth detention centre it will not allow for the future growth of this area, from the potential low cost housing to major sub divisional prospects so close to the CBD and major shopping facilities which could be a major benefit to our current and future housing situation, this would also benefit the cost of living pressures as the travel times would be less, as if you constructed it at your other preference 466 Brighton Road.

Do not agree with Risdon address. Should not be located close to high value subdivisions where values will be greatly affected. Do we residents in this area have any say in the process.

By way of initial feedback - I am very upset that a suggested location of a new youth detention centre is near the Bowen bridge close to the residential suburb of Otago, and also the totally inadequate process of notifying people and seeking feedback.

A statement in the media today that a potential site was at Risdon near the prison is totally misleading. It is closer to the residential suburb of Otago. A detention centre would not be in keeping with the rural living of residents or for the Aboriginal Centre at Risdon Cove - totally inappropriate. In my view the detention centre would be better located adjacent to the prison.

Secondly, in relation to the process: we received notification of the proposal (first we had ever heard of it) in the mail yesterday (27 March) providing only 3 weeks to submit feedback (not 6 weeks as mentioned elsewhere). Why wasn't there more consultation beforehand? There is very little detail to comment on e.g., not clear if it will house bail, remand and support services on the site or over separate sites, design of buildings, aesthetics of fences, offset from road etc. The detail in the question-and-answer sheet is limited (and I would dispute comments about property prices) and the drop-in sessions (rather than a public forum, maybe you want to avoid a repeat of the Westbury opposition to the northern prison) are being held only a few days before the deadline for comments.

I would appreciate more detail on the proposal now if available and will be attending the sessions, after which I will submit more feedback. If you are looking for my response to the proposal to locate it on the East Derwent highway site, then I am opposed.

PART 1/2 Feedback: Proposed Youth Detention Centre – East Derwent Highway (EDH) site
My wife and I have reviewed the very limited information available including the versions of Q&A and attended both public meetings at the Risdon Hall. We see no benefit to our community, only negatives, and consequently totally reject your proposal of siting a detention centre at the proposed EDH location. As residents of Otago, we do not want this facility built in our community.

Otago is a highly regarded family-oriented community - see Top 20 Australian Suburbs for Families 2023 - The Property Tribune – a detention centre would irreparably damage such an asset.

We also believe that the site would be better used as either an extension of the Risdon Brook recreational trail or as a corridor for a highway link between the Bowen bridge and Risdon roundabout (as outlined below).

Specific comments:
The public consultation process was flawed from the start: a very limited number of local residents were notified, and the consultation period was much shorter than 6 weeks (3 weeks). There was little to no information on how the selection process worked e.g., how many sites were considered as the starting pool, what were all the selection criteria, why weren't residents involved from the start? Was the selection process a desk top exercise or were people actually familiar with the sites?

The selection process was supposedly based on a number of criteria including government ownership: surely this does not result in the ideal site because it is restricted from the start. I urge the process to look at a green field site. Also broaden the selection criteria to include potential tangible benefits to the area. In our

view the selection criteria that we were aware of were used too loosely and inconsistently, e.g. in relation to residential areas, schools, visibility.

The selection criteria listed on the documents for choosing a site included "separation from major residential areas and schools", in choosing the EDH site the process has seriously failed in both regards as both are within a couple of hundred metres of the boundary.

The attendees of the meetings were informed of a therapeutic style approach to offenders' rehabilitation, but no specific detail of this approach was forthcoming. What is it and how does it work? I can see why many attendees were sceptical of any change being made to the current Ashley approach and even if there are going to be substantial changes what are they? Surely it is not the fault of the buildings at Ashley but the approach so why build a new facility, why not change the approach within the current facility? I can somewhat understand that a 'therapeutic' and preventative approach may work on lower grade crime offenders, but we were told at the meetings that the detention centre was for high end offenders of serious crime or repeat offenders. Why position a centre detaining murderer's, instigators of violent crime etc within a few hundred metres of a residential area and a school? If you feel it will be totally secure, then why not place it near the CBD close to the services you want? But of course, historically there have been escapes from detention and also from custody as witnessed only days ago.

We disagree totally with the stated notion that property prices will not be impacted negatively but if anything, positively. If the government is so sure of this, then provide a guarantee to homeowners by underwriting future property values.

There are no benefits to the Otago residential-only community – contrary to stated potential benefits in the Q&A documents. There are no local businesses in Otago, little unemployment and currently at least, houses rarely come up for sale to be used as residences by detention centre employees. There are very few rental properties.

PART 2/2 Feedback: Proposed Youth Detention Centre – East Derwent Highway (EDH) site
A supposed benefit of this site was "its close proximity to Risdon" (as stated in the documents). Why was this important as a criterion as there was a stated need to disassociate the detention centre from Risdon to avoid a progression mentality. If you want it close to Risdon – include it on the Risdon site. Otherwise position it a much greater distance away.

The Dowsing Point site was, in part, excluded because of its visibility from the river and the western shore (suburbs). The EDH site is no different – it is elevated and slopes towards the river making it visible by passing tourists/passengers on the Mona ferry, traffic on the Bowen Bridge and western shore residents.
The traffic movement on the east Derwent highway is increasing. There is a definite bottleneck between the dual carriageway on the Bowen and the newly upgraded Geilston Bay/Lindisfarne link ending at the Risdon roundabout. There is an urgent need to construct a dual carriageway between the end of the Bowen and the roundabout. As the existing land cannot easily be widened because of existing properties, waterways, aboriginal land and geology, this parcel of land provides the only corridor for such a highway, desperately needed to handle increasing traffic flow, especially when the Tasman bridge is blocked (as has occurred recently) and traffic is diverted to the Bowen bridge. Building the detention centre on the site would block its availability as an arterial corridor.

Many might say it is great to see the Premier supporting the voice to federal parliament but at the Saturday morning public meeting in Risdon Vale, a 15 year (and current) employee of the Aboriginal Children's Centre stated that the TAC had not been consulted with regards to the detention centre. That you would consider placing a Youth Detention Centre next to aboriginal land, Aboriginal Children's Centre and site of historical and cultural significance is hypocritical and again a fail.

We find it very distasteful to locate a detention centre adjacent to aboriginal land at Risdon Cove for two reasons:

• There is a desire to reduce the disproportionate representation of indigenous people in the youth justice system, and yet you wish to locate a detention centre (which they fundamentally disagree with) on their doorstep.

• There are historical and cultural reasons why Risdon Cove is important. In 1803 early colonial people and convicts initially chose Risdon Cove for a settlement resulting in a documented massacre of local indigenous people, before the settlement was moved to Sullivan's Cove. There is a significant amount of irony in that 220 years later "convicts" may be returned to Risdon Cove; surely this will be very painful for the indigenous community? In part due to this history, piyura kitina (Risdon Cove) was formed as an Indigenous Protected Area 1999 so that indigenous people could "spend time and restore cultural and natural landscape and develop high quality visitor centres". The two are not compatible.

There is extensive and daily discussion about the wellbeing of people in our society. The proposal heralds the alternate approach of therapeutic rehabilitation of serious offenders. While such an approach together with a $40m facility aims to improve the welfare and wellbeing of offenders, it, at the same time, significantly and negatively impacts the wellbeing of residents in our community. Our community has been very anxious and distressed about the proposal, and if it goes ahead, we will continue to be worried about personal and child safety, and the concern attached to its proximity to families. Possible escapes only heighten this anxiety. Does this mean that the wellbeing of 10-20 serious offenders is more important than the wellbeing of 1000+ law-abiding and hard-working residents?

Feedback – Proposed detention centre on East Derwent Highway site
In my previous feedback submissions I have commented on a diverse range of topics, including the lack of transparency of the selection process over and above the 5 dot points listed in the documents. Only 5 selection criteria in such an important decision-making process seems manifestly inadequate in scope (e.g. does not consider impact on residents etc.) and in integrity as it has not been adhered to in any way (proposal near a school and residences). While Q&A briefs and information sessions have provided some detail these have also been inadequate for what is described as an 'extensive' community consultation.
In addition to our previous submissions targeting specific points, we wish to sum up in dot point form here the feelings of the Otago/Risdon community to whom we have spoken. We and they believe the process is:
• Lacking transparency and any genuine interest in the concern of residents.
• A quick fix to a significant problem at Ashley; on the flip side there are still offenders in Ashley but no media reports of any ongoing problems – why is that?
• Moving the problem from Ashley to other locations; surely it is the approach and staffing that does not work, not the buildings.
• Choosing land that is government owned to move quickly to take the heat off the government, rather than taking time to do a decent job to look at all potential sites; don't be murky about it - really do keep it away from residences and schools as is in your selection criteria.
• Providing scant detail on site plans, extent of works on the site, security arrangements, details of the therapeutic rehabilitation etc.
• Initially providing little notification to residents and inadequate time for feedback especially with Easter, school holidays and Anzac day in the middle when people are away; this led people to assume it was a "fly under the radar" process.
• Providing inadequate clarity on whether the support centre and assisted bail facilities will also be on the same site as the detention centre; will this extend to other support services in the future generating an expansion of the footprint?

• Providing inadequate clarity on youth remand facilities – are offenders in remand on the same site as convicted offenders?
• Giving priority need to urban location for workers and visitors over local residents.
• Giving priority of wellbeing and welfare to offenders over local residents.
• Compromising the safety of residents. All residents but particularly elderly and families with children, are extremely concerned about possible escapees from the facility. We know this has happened at Ashley and more recently from custody.
As you have witnessed at drop-in sessions, the majority of residents are angry with the suggestion that the East Derwent Highway is a potential site and are even more upset with the implemented process of selection and consultation. The Otago/Risdon community does not want the facility built on this site.

I have recently moved into the Otago Bay area and am getting my submission ready to provide feedback about the proposed youth detention facility at 972 East Derwent Highway. I was unfortunately out of the state at the time of your drop in sessions.

Most of my concerns surround the potential security risks and impacts on property prices which have both interestingly been addressed in your "Question and Answers Factsheet". I am emailing you to gain some further clarity surrounding the evidence used to make these determinations, in the attempt to hopefully ease some of my concerns regarding the proposed facility.

I would appreciate if you could provide a response to the following two questions.

Question 1:

The following quote is taken directly from your Question and Answers Factsheet:

"Does having a detention facility increase crime rates nearby - No. Past experience has shown any concerns about the effects on crime rates were not realised".

Can you please provide the resources or evidence that were used to make this determination?

Question 2:

The following two quotes are taken directly from your Question and Answers Factsheet:

"You can't say that there will be no decrease in property prices - Evidence from other jurisdictions in Australia indicated this has not been the case"

"Does having a detention facility in a community reduce property values? - No. Experience in other locations has shown that property prices in the surrounding areas actually increased in value over time. Property values reflect a range of factors, including the quality of housing stock, access to jobs and services, and broader market conditions. The increase of employees, service providers and others coming to the facility can have a positive impact on property prices if they decide to live nearby."

Can you please provide the resources or evidence that were used to make these determinations? Specifically

• The evidence that was used to indicate that property prices do not go down. And;

• The evidence that was used to shown that property prices in the surrounding areas actually increase in value over time.

Having been involved in development and planning processes before I can only assume that a large amount of work has been put into production this Q&A document. I would appreciate you providing the requested advice in an attempt that I can fully consider some of my current concerns prior to the deadline to provide feedback.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to provide feedback about the proposed youth justice facility site at 972 east Derwent Highway (specific to this site). I am against the proposed location on a number of grounds.

1) Traffic management and traffic safety

I have looked at viable entrance locations a number of times as I drive past this site daily. I know a traffic management plan would form part of any development application, but It appears that the proposed site will cause a number of safety issues and these should be considered when considering whether the site is even viable.

The main road (East Derwent Highway) has been cut through a large hill meaning that there is only one viable access to the site which is where the current driveway access currently stands.

The current driveway and gate is at the current road level and close to the northern border of the block. As you move south along the highway there is an immediate rise in the hill cut out meaning that it would be impossible, or at least unviable to consider any other access. Alternate access would require extensive

earthworks, likely in the millions of dollars, and would likely be unsafe as there would be a significant gradient and limited sightlines due to needing to cut further into the hill.

Access to this site (travelling east – towards Risdon) would require a left hand turn off the East Derwent Highway. There is significant traffic congestion during peak hour and even outside of this time there is considerable traffic flow from the Bowen Bridge. There are also a number of difficult roads to negotiate to manage traffic in both directions coming off the bridge.

To access the site from this direction traffic will either be coming across the Bowen Bridge or on the southbound slip lane from the East Derwent Highway. This slipway traffic needs to merge with the left-hand lane of traffic coming off the bridge. Traffic in the right-hand lane coming off the Bowen Bridge is commonly banked up as this is the lane that needs to be used to travel north along the East Derwent highway. To do this you need to come off the bridge using this right lane, give way, and turn across north bound traffic on the East Derwent Highway heading onto the Bowen Bridge, proceed past traffic giving way to you as you pass under the bridge to continue north on the East Derwent Highway.

The traffic in the left lane coming off the Bowen Bridge often need to negotiate stationary traffic in the right-hand lane, and merging traffic from the slip lane. This lane will need to be used to provide access to the site.

There are no turns across the highway for traffic currently travelling north (west) onto the Bowen Bridge. That is, regardless of where the access is, a person wanting to visit the site from eastern side (Risdon area) would need to turn across 2 lanes of traffic of the East Derwent Highway. This would be near impossible and very dangerous.

If any access were to be granted at this site, it would be dangerous. The area is currently 70kmph and merging into this traffic will be very dangerous. Slowing this traffic would not be a good option as it is a major arterial road for movement of traffic across the Bowen Bridge.

Access to the Brighton site is much easier and safer. It could also accommodate multiple access points. It is bordered by 2 separate roads. One highway, and one smaller with minimal traffic flow. The site is bordered by roads on three of its sides. This seems like a much safer site to consider.

2) This land could be better used for something else in the future.

There is a considerable lack of greenspace and services in the around the Otago and Old Beach areas. There is also a lack of usable undeveloped land. If an area was ever to be used for a hospital, supermarket, service station, fire or ambulance station etc. this would be an ideal site. It would also be a great site to release for housing, or alternatively in the future could be used for parking with a short (overpass walk) to ferry infrastructure. While you could run my same arguments for traffic safety it would be likely that any of these projects would have a much larger budget that could take these things into account. The community benefit of one of these projects would be much greater than the current proposal.

Where could you put a big supermarket development close to road infrastructure between Old Beach and Risdon. This is basically it. Where could you do it around the Brighton site? Basically, one of about 100 sites. 3) Effects of the surrounding suburbs. I have sent two emails asking for some clarification of statements made in the "questions and answers" document. One was sent on the 19 April and a follow up on the 2nd May. I have not received a response to my emails so need to keep potential effects on property profile in my submission. The median house price in Otago (the closest suburb) is over $1,000,000. It is a prestigious suburb due to its amenity as well as other factors. Whereas the median house prices in Pontville and Mangalore (the other proposed sites closes suburbs) are approximately half of that of Otago. It would be much easier for a youth justice facility to affect a median house price of one million, than it would to affect a house price of half that value.

While this proposed facility may have limited effects of property prices it would be worth considering the effects on property prices, safety, amenity and suburb profile between the two sites. It is my belief that Otago would be more heavily affected, than either Mangalore or Pontville. Pontville has already had a detention centre and it didn't seem to do too much to the area. 4) Safety concerns. Very recently a youth escaped custody while handcuffed. It can happen and responses should be considered. If this was to happen at the East Derwent Highway site, there are many residents with young children in the area. There is also a childcare

centre and a school. There are also many young people from surrounding suburbs that could easily assist an escapee or divert the attention of emergency services. Hundreds of residents would need to be locked down. Apart from that the site is surrounded by bush reserves and it would be very easy for someone to hide from authorities.

The other proposed site is basically surrounded by farmland, with minimal residents close by, no school or childcare facility in the close vicinity. It would be a lot easier to manage an emergency situation from that site were one to occur. The other proposed site is a much safer one, which would be one of the reasons that the government choose it for the site of their Pontville detention centre. All the reasons that they applied to selecting that site as a desirable one to establish a detention centre could be used to argue that this area would be equally desirable for a youth justice facility, and far more desirable than the East Derwent Highway site.

I appreciate you taking the time to consider my feedback.

As an Otago resident I strongly opposed the suggested site 972 East Derwent Highway as it is in close residential proximity to major residential areas: Otago, Old Beach, Risdon.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley at 972 East Derwent Highway, Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident I do not want this facility to be

I do not under any circumstances support the Otago location for a southern site.

Insufficient consultation with local communities and a significant failure to engage with bordering organisations.

I've reviewed the limited information that has been provided regarding the potential construction of a juvenile detention centre in the Risdon area.

I am disappointed that this is an option and can't find any legitimate reason as to why the current facilities at Ashley are not being repurposed.

What I can see is an inappropriate use of taxpayers' money being used to fund a project that already has a purpose-built facility.

Whilst I appreciate the events that have transpired, is it not a reason to vacate the purpose-built facility. The move will not address the core issues.

I cannot even begin to understand how building a facility of this nature close to residential homes, endangered wildlife and aboriginal land is an option.

It is already challenging to exit the Bowen Bridge, the congestion remains unaddressed, and accidents are occurring more frequently creating endless chaos for all residents either side of the bridge.

There has been no consideration given to the impact this will have on our suburb. When partnered with the Risdon Prison Complex it will create a corridor of correctional facilities. We pride ourselves on living in Otago and worked hard to buy our home. This is not a suitable location for this facility.

As a local resident I do not under any circumstances support this.

I object to the Detention Centre Facility being built in Otago.
Too close to residential dwellings, aboriginal site and school, traffic control, entry and exit, Risdon brook dam.
The area site in Otago is a ridiculous suggestion to build such a facility, you will devalue all Otago homes.

The Otago site is not an appropriate area for this development. I feel that adolescent children should be placed in an area that is open, low passing traffic and much more mindful of the community. This facility will be a detriment to Tasmanian tourism. Our small community relies heavily on travellers visiting the state and if our roads were not embarrassing enough, driving straight past this centre would not look good!! Passing through now beautiful Otago into Hobart is a scenic route for visitors to our state. Otago has a significant

history with the Aboriginal community and early settlers and the suburb would turn to be associated with detention and crime.

If my child was to be sent to a facility, I would much prefer it to be in the countryside of Brighton, where it is open countryside and not making Otago residents feel insecure about living extremely close to this proposed centre.

The Bowen bridge turnoff outbound from the CBD to Otago struggles significantly to cope with the amount of traffic throughout the day. This intersection is very close to the proposed site. This intersection needs a significant upgrade/ramp to allow continuous flow of traffic under the bridge. It should not be banked up to 3/4 of the bridge at 4-6pm most days. The development would impose more difficulty with traffic flow at these times.

People chose to live in Otago for its history, beautiful waterside peaceful living and close community. It would be very inconsiderate and unfair to have this taken away from such a great community in Tasmania.

- No mention of environmental impact on neighbouring marshland and birdlife
- No mention of impact on neighbouring Aboriginal Children's Centre. This is visited daily by school groups.
- No mention of impact on neighbouring historical site of Tasmania's first settlement
- Brighton Rd site is almost twice as large, and land is level and not adjacent to a major highway, therefore entry and egress access will be easier
- There will be decline in property values in the area. There is no evidence presented to counter this
- Majority of residents reject the proposal to build at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon
- Loss of residential amenity through people not being able to lead their normal lives through tranquillity and stress free with a detention facility in their neighbourhood. This also includes the visual impact of having a walled/fenced/barrier facility in the area
- Closing down the current Ashley Detention Centre and creating a new one does not appear a sound decision. There has been a lot of taxpayer money spent on the existing facility - the same problems are going to occur no matter where it's located unless there is a change in methods and thinking.
- Having it so close to the prison only promotes the thinking and mindset of incarceration. It's like a promotion or graduation from youth detention to adult prison which some may see as the next step in their criminal career progression. This kind of thinking needs to be addressed and discouraged and not consciously or sub-consciously provided to inmates.

I do not approve the new youth detention facility to go at 972 East Derwent Highway!!! This will affect properly value and there is an escape risk, and it won't be a good look to see when going over the beautiful Bowen bridge. It will have bright lights and high fences and it will affect the beautiful safe suburbs in Otago. My family and I live in Otago, and we highly don't approve this facility to be built!

I oppose the Otago Bay site for this proposed development. I could list many reasons, but here's one - I don't want any correction/detention facility in my neighbourhood.

I do not believe putting the youth detention centre on the East Derwent Hwy is a good idea. I think the site should be at Pontville which is away from Risdon prison and from residential areas. I strongly oppose the facility at Risdon.

I strongly oppose the site on East Derwent Highway being used for youth detention centre.

We are in receipt of the information regarding the new Youth Detention Facility 972 East Derwent Highway that you forwarded to us. We have studied your Proposal and have a number of comments and questions in relation to that.

Firstly, we disagree with a number of points you have made. Obviously, there will be a significant increase in traffic volume albeit as you say not in peak hour. This remains to be seen, as there has certainly been an increase in traffic on East Derwent Highway in the last 24 months.

We take issue with your comment that that a detention facility will not reduce our property values. There will obviously be a devaluation of all the properties in Direction Drive & Sollamer Place. By the very nature of it a Detention Facility close to rural residents is not in keeping with the ambience of the area. Although you say we should not be worried about escapes, they do in fact occur and this facility will be built close to existing houses. We would like to know where the entrance and exit points to this new facility will be as that is not shown on the diagram. We would like to draw your attention to our concerns which are as follows. 1. This Detention Centre shares a boundary with the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre which runs the Aboriginal Children's Centre where at least 29 young children gather on a daily basis. This is a concern on many levels. 2. Driving across the Bowen Bridge from west to east the facility will be visible to all, with its bright lights and high fences. The visual impact of any development would be visible from East Derwent Highway even with trees planted. 3. The housing in Direction Drive and Sollamer Place is classed as rural. It is a very quiet and peaceful area and that is why we live here We are surrounded by local wildlife which we enjoy and don't think a Facility such as you are proposing is a good fit. 4. In the past there have been issues with water pressure or lack thereof and we are concerned that more development in this area could adversely affect us. We also do not have sewerage in this area either as Orchard Downs subdivision was always intended to be a low-density rural subdivision and the proposed Detention Facility is in our view, not in keeping with the area. 5. There will be increased traffic flow coming and going to and from this facility on a highway that seems to be choking especially at peak times which is from 3pm onwards in the afternoon. 6. Noise level will increase in the area. 7. We are privileged to have a plethora of native wildlife in our area and any construction will have an impact on the fauna and flora. We believe it would be necessary to take a survey of threatened flora species. 8. Endangered species such as the masked owl and swift parrot have been recorded in the vicinity of this parcel of land and loss of habitat is a great concern. 9. On a daily basis we are privileged to see the spotted quoll, bandicoots, pademelons and wallabies. With increased traffic flow this would further endanger these animals. 10. In closing we believe that if a Youth Detention Facility was built at the proposed site of 972 East Derwent Highway it will have a detrimental effect on residents living in Direction Drive & Sollamer Place. Our lifestyle would be impacted with the constant concern of escapes, worrying about the safety of our children & grandchildren. The environmental damage to habitat cannot be overlooked and for the reasons outlined above we would suggest that this site is unsuitable for the development you are proposing.
The Risdon location is poorly chosen close to residential housing and the Aboriginal children's centre. There I object strongly to this proposed location.
I strongly oppose the selection of 972 East Derwent Highway site, there is no community benefit, Risdon and Otago are residential housing areas, I don't want a commercial facility placed there.
The location of the site at Bowen Park is problematic due to access from the East Derwent Highway there are our sight lines there for any traffic trying to enter the highway. The amount of traffic poses a significant danger.
I fully understand the importance of being accountable for young person's being in a juvenile detention centre but at some point, these young people need to be accountable for their actions and some of their actions are downright disgusting their assaults and violence on vulnerable people within society they need to learn that if you go down this path you face consequences that have an adverse effect on your life. I have been accosted on many occasions and threatened both in my private life and my professional life by the juveniles that reside in Ashley or are on bail or not incarcerated - I am sorry but I feel the 2 facilities in the south of the state both at Goodwood and the East Derwent Highway are too close to housing estates and vulnerable residents of the area. These facilities need to be out of areas and in a confined more out of the way places these juvenile

people need to understand they cannot threaten or carry out crimes without the appropriate punishment. I do not agree with the placement of a youth detention centre at the 2 sites listed at Goodwood and East Derwent Highway.

I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed youth justice facility site in East Derwent Hwy. I feel that this site is not suitable for several reasons.

The construction of the facility at this site will cause considerable traffic issues on an already limited single lane part of the Highway. As a resident in the area for many years, it is my experience that any disruption to the flow of traffic on the road, will cause lengthy delays. Should the facility be built here, then this disruption to traffic will continue with vehicles, buses, custodial vehicles etc coming onto and off the property at all hours of the day and night, will have a detrimental effect on an already problematic stretch of the Highway.

Another reason why I feel this site is not suitable is the proximity to Risdon Prison. The idea that the young people are being sent to "Risdon Prison Lite". I believe that the proximity to Risdon, is not in the best interests of rehabilitation of young offenders. A site well away and with no connection to the adult prison would permit a better outcome for the individual concerned. I understand that there is already a high likelihood that young offenders will end up in adult detention, and I feel that having them almost co-located at Risdon will add to the expectation that one day you will end up around the corner.

I have major concerns about the amenity of the area to have such a significantly large facility built here. This area is not currently serviced by TasWater in regard to sewerage, the cost of running sewer to this site, or providing for WTS or septic services to this site would have a major impact on the area.

The impact on the quiet residential areas of Otago and Risdon cannot be underplayed. This facility will bring noise, activity, light pollution and most probably lower property values in the area. Many people have moved here to have a quieter lifestyle away from suburban noise, lighting, neighbourhood disturbances etc. The facility will ruin that.

I believe the most appropriate site would be the Pontville site, away from residential areas.

The site on the East Derwent Highway is close to vulnerable people and aboriginal land, as well as high flowing traffic.

After looking at the proposed sites it is my opinion that the Risdon site is not a good choice and that the Brighton site would offer better future development.
1/We already have a prison in Risdon that is both unsightly and at times causes issues for the local community(escapees)
2/ this site is too close to a major historical massacre site, which should be protected.
3/ the Risdon site is too close to the indigenous centre which already is dealing with a damaged past and does not need to see itself as a pathway to prison.
4/ the public transport system is not efficient once over the Bowen Bridge from any direction.
5/ the Risdon road from the Bowen bridge to the Derwent highway road about is already very difficult to navigate without further traffic entering and exiting.
6/ people do actually live in this area and are already dealing with the activities of disenfranchised youth and adults.
Ashley detention didn't work because of systematic disruption, not because of where it was, are you just going to move the problem.

The Brighton site is a much better site because
It is neutral historically.
It has more land.
It is away from built up areas.
It can be seen from all sides.
It is away from the prison.
It is away from cultural sites.
Public transport can be direct from Hobart or the Midlands.

The Risdon site is for too prominent as a location. It is also far too close to built-up residential areas such as Risdon Cove and Risdon Vale. It would also be a bad look on the side of the river that the MONA ferry and interstate visitors regularly pass by. The Pontville site would be a much better and appropriate location.

I am surprised and shocked that land so close to Otago would be considered suitable for this sort of facility. I am also not happy with the short period of time for consultation. It's not a six-week period as noted online. We received notification yesterday and have up until the 17th of April to leave feedback, with Easter in the middle of that time frame. We have also found that not everyone who lives in Otago has received information regarding this proposed development.

Thank you for the opportunity to attend briefing sessions on the proposed new Youth Justice Detention Facility.

I note firstly that I do not have a "not in my backyard" issue as we are moving out of Otago shortly. However, it is difficult to see why there is a need to propose such a facility in a tranquil established neighbourhood such as Otago when an alternate site at Mangalore appears to be more suitable from several aspects and has a history of housing troublesome children.

Following the Wednesday (12th) evening presentation at Risdon Vale I wish to make the following observations:
1. Unfortunately, the meeting was poorly organised with poor acoustics and very little discipline in the manner in which the questions were put, and answers were given. No rules of expected behaviour were announced at the commencement and audience people interjected continually and spoke over the top of each other with several people repeating their questions / statements.

2. Infrastructure considerations: I do not believe that due consideration has been given to the engineering aspects of such a facility in the Otago area. As good project practice one would expect that the first priority in proposing a site for a facility such as this would be to consider the supporting infrastructure and services in a relatively detailed engineering methodology to see whether they were fit for purpose. The briefing document made no mention of power, water, sewerage, drainage, lighting, heritage, etc. and only hopeful statements on public transport, visual amenity, noise, etc. I do not expect detailed design done at this stage but sufficient background studies and analysis for pass or fail criteria. Poor planning leads to poor outcomes and cost escalations.

3. Traffic considerations: I believe that this is the major concern for the proposed Otago site. As a resident of some 22 years in this location I have seen considerable growth in traffic density to the point that now with increased regularity the Bowen Bridge east bound traffic from around 3 pm on weekdays is almost at a standstill in both lanes, often right across the bridge and sometimes to the Dowsing Point Army Depot. This situation often lasts through to 5 pm. Inattention by drivers in this situation often contributes to nose to tail collisions, further exacerbating an already frustrating traffic congestion and delay.

The briefing document gave no comfort that any study of traffic congestion had been done, making the glib statement that "the new detention facility is not expected to significantly increase traffic volume". That is patently wrong. There are to be 100 staff, obviously not all on shift at the same time but quite a number coming and going at the time of shift change-over. There will be increased public transport in the area according to the briefing document. There will be custodial personnel including Police no doubt trafficking the area. There will be family and friends visiting. There will be delivery suppliers' vehicles coming and going. There will be infrastructure service personnel from time to time coming and going. Just to mention a few.

The facility is on the opposite side of the ingress/egress to the Bowen Bridge so the majority of this extra traffic will have to cross the path of an already heavily trafficked East Derwent highway. It is hard to believe that there will not be an increase in the traffic congestion in the area.
Unfortunately, it is far too common for Government agencies to give poor consideration to the effects of their building and infrastructure proposals on the local neighbourhoods. The Department of Health is about to build a new Ambulance Station in Timsbury Road in Glenorchy and they have given little consideration to the poor road design at the intersection of Howard and Timsbury Roads and given no feedback to

submissions. The Mangalore site has far better highway access and highway speeds right into the city via the Brooker Highway.
We strongly disagree with the Youth Detention site suggestion at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon. Not only will this dramatically reduce the land value of the many properties in the area, it will also create many other issues including suburb stigma, localised violence/and or vandalism, an eye sore to all travellers on the highway, bridge and river where our states most troubled teens will be put on display for all visitors to our state to see. The road works, traffic delays and rubbish build-up whilst being built will cause major disruptions to an already very busy morning and afternoon commute. To Whom it may concern, We strongly disagree with the site suggestion at site at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon. Not only will this dramatically reduce the land value of the many properties in the area, it will also create many other issues including suburb stigma, localised violence /and or vandalism, an eye sore to all travellers on the highway, bridge and river where our states most troubled teens will be put on display for all visitors to our state to see. The road works, traffic delays and rubbish build-up whilst being built will cause major disruptions to an already very busy morning and afternoon commute.
I consider the new detention centre should not be able to be viewed from normal roads. The site at the end of the Bowen bridge in not suitable. The government should be prepared to purchase private land for the facility and pay above market price. More time is required for public consultation so everybody can have input. Not a rush job as this appears to be. A site like the former Hayes Prison Farm but well away from roads could be ideal. The kids need to be looked after, not locked up in a prison environment.
The Brighton address is surely a far more obvious choice than the East Derwent Highway especially considering this is presented as a not gated development. The proximity to residential housing along with the Aboriginal property at Risdon Cove that includes a childcare facility makes the East Derwent Highway option simply a no.
I feel that this is to close a proximity to young families, and people who have set up for retirement. It will lower the property values and increase the criminal activity already happening. I say no to the proposed Risdon site.
Having reviewed the information provided I am strongly against the proposed site at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon. Key reasons for this decision include: The surrounding area of Risdon and Otago is predominantly residential on large lots. There are serious traffic issues are already along this section of the Highway, there have been numerous accidents near this location, and increased traffic will cause flow-on issues. This proposed site borders the significant Aboriginal site including a Children's care centre already in Risdon Cove. The elevated position overlooking the river is visible, especially to tourists on the river. It will also be visible from positions on the western shore of Northern Hobart. A much better position would be somewhere less visible and not near residential areas to disrupt residents.
I have lived in Otago for [redacted] years. I moved here for the peace and quiet. I am extremely against a youth detention centre in my neighbourhood, let's face it, most people would be. My concerns are the monstrosity of an ugly (prison) call it what you want it won't change the fact it is a building housing criminals. Good hardworking, taxpaying, law-abiding people have invested a lot of money into their homes and this area. I do

not believe for one moment that this will not affect house prices. I have never seen Risdon prison increase Risdon Vale's house prices. What a terrible thing to look at coming off a major Hobart bridge, no consideration for people trying to come home from work in an already congested area with traffic and there will be an increase. What a disgrace hemming in the poor Aboriginal land, Risdon Prison one side and detention centre the other side and they were not consulted. I am a [redacted]-year-old resident who has worked hard, lived in the area for [redacted] years and about to retire and now have to worry about living near dangerous criminals and what happens to my house nest egg price. I am retiring shortly and have wondered what I will do and now I have the answer and that is fight this to the end. Believe me I cannot wait, and I will have time on my hands to assist the committee formed. Shame on the Liberal Government for not being transparent and I believe trying to get this through sneakily, I will definitely be voting with my feet in the future.

Sadly, I believe [redacted] has tried to get a Liberal member to attend the information sessions.

I have reviewed the information available which is not very informative.

I find putting this centre in Otago to be unsatisfactory because of several reasons:

Traffic hinderance to an already congested area Eyesore in a beautiful country setting especially seeing from the bridge and Derwent River bordering historic site (who knows what will be found in this area) Bordering a childrens facility Animal wildlife and habitat disruption Devalued properties, saying people should not say not in my backyard is offensive, of course hardworking, law abiding citizens who have worked extremely hard and put a lot on money into their homes have the right to say this Local residents have the right to be fearful of having criminals bordering their properties, some being extremely close A lot of money being spent when there are probably places already available for a small amount.

I find it disgusting and disturbing that a centre like this can be built in such a peaceful country area like Otago with such history behind it.

After looking at the information regarding the Youth Detention Centre at the proposed site off the Bowen Bridge I write to express my displeasure of this occurring.

I believe it will be an eyesore to the area, lovely to look at every time I come home from work. It says there will be screening but I believe this will take a lot to cover this up.

I feel the lighting will be annoying to the residences close by. Bellerive residences have complained continuously in regard to the lighting in their area and I think this will be the same.

I think there will be a lot of hinderance with the roadworks to the area, it is bad enough of a night time getting home now without adding to it.

Apparently, the Youth Detention Centre is going to receive a lovely name so it does not give the area a stigma. I beg to differ, you can name it what you like but I still think it will give our area a stigma. I bought in Otago Bay which is a very prestigious area and holds it housing prices very well but I believe this will not be the case if this centre is built in this area. You can say it won't, but I live here and not willing to take the risk after the centre has been built and my house price drops.

I am sure the Ministers involved would not like it either.

I am a rate payer, I live in the area, I am a voter and I do not want this in my area, and I will vote with my feet if this happens. I will be also voicing my opinion to other Otago Bay residents.

Put it in Risdon Vale where the prison is already, find some land. I am sure ministers like Roger Jaensch would not want it built near him.

I'm opposing the detention centre site at the Bowen Bridge area. Brighton is far more suitable for this facility. The area could not sustain further usage based off traffic flow and infrastructure. The area is of cultural significance and to house a facility of this type does not go with the area. Not to mention this area is a prime road for tourists. Having a caged facility overlooking the bridge is an eyesore. We as a community within the

area will continue to oppose such a development when there are far better areas to be used away from family residential areas and thoroughfares.

As a resident of Otago Bay, I strongly object the proposal of building a facility on our doorstep. We chose our home [redacted] years ago for its natural beauty and peaceful surroundings. I strongly believe that the facility will impact this and also add to the increasing traffic, especially on the Bowen Bridge which is becoming more congested weekly. I believe that the Brighton site would be more suitable as it's in a more rural environment which won't impact traffic or the close proximity of neighbours.

The site on the Derwent Highway I feel is the wrong site to use because:

1. On the boundary of a school
2. The road between the Bowen Bridge and the jail roundabout needs to be greater capacity, the land is needed for this purpose as the traffic congestion is getting a lot worse and dangerous at times
3. Close to residential homes

I've reviewed the very limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you were to rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident, I do not want this facility to be built in our area.

I reject the proposed site of 972 East Derwent Highway after carefully considering all the data made available because of its close proximity to the residential areas, historic site/land and bordering near the Aboriginal Childcare Centre.

It would be visible from all the angles and would be detrimental to the already bottle-neck traffic congestion and multiple motor vehicle accidents already happening every other day. It also puts the community at risk of increased crime from the inmates if they tried to escape and from their visitors who might have a criminal background. I do not feel safe in bringing up my family in such a location.
Furthermore, it endangers the already existing wildlife and flora and fauna. Otago/Risdon is a family-oriented community and I fail to see any positive impact that a detention centre would bring to the surrounding suburb in respect to financial or any businesses. It is concerning that the public consultation held was at a short notice and lacked transparency. In regards to the documentation made available to the general public.

Unfortunately, I fail to see any positive impact that a Youth Detention Centre would bring to our community if the site of 972 East Derwent Highway was selected.

Don't put this facility in the Risdon/Otago area!!! Traffic impacts potentially huge and will devalue property in the area. Plus, it won't resolve a problematic youth detention culture and system so how about you just fix up Ashley.

Locating the new Youth Detention Centre to the proposed site at Otago will be the beginning of the end for the Risdon Cove area as we know it.

With the huge mass of 'troubled, welfare dependent and low socioeconomic people' already existing in this area, it's irresponsible to consider adding another element to the out of control issues that currently plague this community.

Locating the youth detention centre in close proximity to the prison is a huge and fundamental error for the city of Hobart. It will however, be very convenient for the criminal's family who will be able to visit their kid in detention then drive 'just around the road' to visit dad at the prison - what an outing!!

So, add the:
- youth detention facility to:
- Risdon prison
- Risdon Vale - low socioeconomic community

There will be an inevitable name change from:
- Risdon Cove to 'CRIMINAL COVE'

Please do not locate new Youth Detention Facility near existing Risdon Prison.

I live in a property [redacted] directly overlooking the proposed Risdon site. I am unsure how this fits into the criteria of being located away from residential neighbourhoods as there are a number of properties surrounding me as well as many on the other side of the proposed location.

With the proposed detention centre being a 24/7 operation, it would have significant impacts on our current lifestyle with the additional noise and light pollution generated by a detention centre.

An additional concern would be of negative community image, which in turn would the property values of this area.

The proposed shortlisted site for the New Youth Detention Facility near the Bowen Bridge - East Derwent Highway is extremely problematic in many ways.

- The creation of this complex is definitely not suited to the site which is directly overlooking the Derwent River and Bowen Bridge (the site is also elevated). The location will only draw focus on the facility and take away from the natural and historical features of this unique area.
- The land area itself is historically linked to Tasmanian Indigenous history, especially in relation to the deplorable massacre that took place in this area. Using the site as a detention facility is in essence bad taste, disrespectful and poor planning especially in relation to the indigenous culture and the history of this particular area.
- The visual impact that the facility would have on the main line of site from the Bowen Bridge, Mount Direction and the Derwent River overall is affected greatly.
- The historical (National Trust) 'Cleburne' homestead would be impacted and overshadowed unfortunately by this new facility built in close proximity. The site itself needs a more suitable structure (for example: an indigenous early settler museum) that would complement the homestead and not damage the homestead's historical presence.
- Residential areas are definitely impacted by this development in this particular site - regardless of the statement about not affecting residential areas. It is quite obvious that many residences will look down and onto the facility as homes are built nearby above and below the location area. Lighting, noise, increased (all night) traffic, visual pollution and stigma of the facility will impact the suburb of Otago and surrounds especially as the suburb is a semi built up area and not rural.

Property in the sensitive reserved areas at the base and around Mount Direction (including surrounds) would be significantly affected by lifestyle quality, property values and changes to privacy and feelings of security.

I currently live in the Otago Bay area and believe that the proposed area is definitely too close to homes with families both you and old. This is the first time that I have been made aware of this and find it a real concern the lack of communication between to the community. I feel like a facility of this size should be situated in a more remote location. Therefore, I believe that the Brighton and Pontville area would be more suited for a project of the capacity.

I live in [redacted], Otago, and am concerned about the possibility of the YD Facility being located here.

These are some of my concerns:

1. Where the roads leading to and from the facility will be going. How big a carpark will be required and whether that will be seen from the highway and/or the bridge?

2. How big is the actual facility going to be? Will there be training facilities built to facilitate training/learning so the children can gain meaningful employment or plans for future development? What impact will that then have on the size of the complex and the effect on the surrounding suburb? Once it is built, there will be little options for us locals to object to further development, we will be stuck with it.

3. Safety of the residents should a youth escape. The youth staying there include violent offenders. Up until now we have enjoyed living in what we would call a safe community. I would no longer feel safe with this facility so close.

4. Ease of access to the facility. The facility is going to be placed right by a major bridge and highway. There are no footpaths at all in the area that would provide a safe route into or out of the facility by foot. Is it proposed a bus stop be placed nearby for visitors or a footpath from the bus stop currently located at the bottom of Sollamer Place or near the Risdon turnoff that would be safe and protected from highway traffic?

5. Whatever any government official says, the value of the surrounding properties will be affected. Let's be honest - Risdon Vale is not the preferred place to live in Hobart, it is the cheapest place closest to the city. It has remained that way for many, many years. We have spent considerable money on mortgages and improvements to our property over the 16 years we've lived here and having this facility so close to us has the potential to make the valuation plummet. Will we be compensated? Absolutely not!

6. There are many people who now commute from New Norfolk, Sorell, Dodges Ferry, Huonville, Kingston etc. Why were those areas not considered as appropriate? Surely not all workers at the facility live in the city. Surely there would be parcels of land between the city and Kingston, or any of the other places mentioned above, that could facilitate such a facility and would affect far less residents.

We ask that further consideration to the impact this facility would have on any suburb chosen and ask that consideration be given to put the facility in less a less affluent area.

I strongly oppose the new site at Otago. This will change the whole character of the area. Not good!

I strongly oppose the site on the East Derwent Highway.

I am extremely unhappy with the proposal of the site at Risdon. The main reasons being that traffic always makes it virtually impossible to turn right out of Risdon Cove, the impact to my house in terms of value and for safety reasons. I do not believe such an eyesore at the end of a well utilised bridge at the bottom of a beautiful hill is appropriate.

I oppose the new proposed youth detention centre here on East Derwent Highway, Risdon.

I feel the proposed site at Risdon Cove is inappropriate, it borders onto the Risdon Cove Site which has a sad and horrific history of our First Nations people, if this land is available do the right thing and hand it back to our First Nation's people. If the government want it close to Risdon then build it at Risdon, the site is sloped and it will dominate the area which is the gateway to East Risdon and surrounds. It will further add to the misery of this culturally significant site, please hand it back.

972 East Derwent Highway is unsuitable for a new youth detention facility:

1) The most glaringly obvious reason is the extreme insensitivity of sandwiching Risdon Cove (the site of an Aboriginal massacre) between a youth detention facility and the Jail.
2) The criteria for determining suitability states that it be " located away from schools and major residential areas" but it would be right next to a major residential area – Otago.
3) It is very close to Cleburne historic homestead bed and breakfast at Risdon and will adversely affect their business.
4) The 2B Goodwood Road site was decided against as it is 'highly visible from Derwent river and eastern shore' – however the 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon site would be highly visible to all traffic coming across the Bowen bridge.
5) Whenever there is a car accident in Hobart we end up with traffic jams on east Derwent highway and Bowen bridge already in peak time without needing more traffic in the area.

1) In the public consultation meeting at Risdon Vale Hall on Saturday 15 April somebody asked why the youth detention centre could not be located at the existing Risdon prison and one of the government representatives said that it would be like a primary school/high school scenario when the youth see the Risdon jail as the next destination. How is it different to locate it 2 kms away in the same suburb? It will still give them and everybody else the same impression.

2) Also, it would be good for State Growth to keep this piece of land for further Bowen bridge developments/extensions given Hobart's current traffic issues. Whenever the Tasman Bridge is clogged/closed due to an accident in the CBD, traffic also comes to a crawl at the Bowen bridge/East Derwent Highway due to redirected traffic, and by using this land for a detention centre you are taking away future options to solve this as the traffic will only get worse in the future.

I would prefer the detention centre did not go at 972 East Derwent Highway.

I would like to register my objection and concerns for having a Detention Centre in my area. I own a property at [redacted], Otago and I feel this is certainly not the type of area for such a facility.

This would definitely impact on the value of all properties and cause unrest to residents who have come to this area to enjoy a peaceful and relaxing lifestyle without having to be concerned about potential escapes and noise which would come with this type of facility. Also, the extra traffic in the area is concerning with all the coming in and out day and night.

This will create a stigma to the area because who would want such a facility next door, and the devaluation of my property would be inevitable. We didn't decide to settle in an area where we would be faced with such a confronting situation. People living in this area take a pride in their properties and want to enjoy the tranquility and peace which it offers. That would be taken away from us if this facility was to go ahead.

Therefore, I strongly object.

Please do not place the facility at Risdon. We are a quiet and happy area and do not want to see this cause issues. Also, it will affect housing values in this area as it is quite built up and suburban.

I'm providing feedback regarding the proposed site in Otago. Had we known a detention centre would be built next door, we would not have purchased the house. The letter indicated that there would be no devaluation of property. While I have no evidence to prove one way or another, house prices would inevitably not go up over the next decade or more due to neighbouring a detention centre. This lack of growth is equivalent to devaluation of the property. I could additionally complain about the light pollution, increased traffic, ugly aesthetic, lack of compensation to capital growth and being uncomfortably close to any escapees, but these are my personal problems with the site. Tasmania is known for its natural beauty. To build a jail on the foothills of the Meehan Range, that can be seen from the Derwent River will significantly damage the aesthetic of the area. This is a huge disservice to the Greater Hobart community, who pride themselves on our natural scenery. The increase in traffic congestion on this section of the East Derwent Highway is also not to be understated. It would be inconsiderate to voluntarily create extra traffic along a major section of highway that is bottlenecked by a single lane in each direction. I believe the Brighton site is the more responsible choice (Although there are still certainly better options) for a detention centre. It is close enough to Hobart, but it is also serviced by modern roads and there will be a lessened impact to the aesthetic of Hobart.

The site at East Derwent Highway is totally inappropriate for many reasons.
This area is culturally significant and should be put aside for future land handback to the First Nation's community. To suggest that this area should be used as a detention centre disrespects the indigenous community. Sandwiching the present first nations land between two detention centres would create the impression that they are connected. We are supposed to be bridging the gap not facilitating the notion that the first nations people have a direct connection to crime and detention. We should be lifting the aspirations of this community not suggesting that this is where they belong, amid institutions in which they are overrepresented already. Proponents of this proposition obviously need to walk these acres, visit, and explore government hills, see Bedlam walls and still existing cultural remains and then think of suitable projects for this land that will lift the esteem of the indigenous population.

Just image the MONA visitors and the conversation on board the ferries as they see the detention centre in pride of place next the indigenous land. I doubt very much that the commentary would be positive and

suggest the placement of this facility on this land was a great achievement of this government. No doubt the triathletes will have the same views. What an advertisement for Hobart and Tasmania.

I purchased my property in Otago [redacted] years ago and would most definitely would not of considered this property if this proposed facility was in use at the time. Regardless of tree line to hide the facility from view it's still there in my suburb. Also, on one hand you say minimal traffic increase because of low numbers staying in the facility and then on the other hand 100 employees plus visitors plus deliveries daily. My preference is to keep it well away from the suburbs. Mangalore is certainly much more rural than our wonderful place to live.

I provide feedback on behalf of the owners of the ~[redacted] the proposed site for a new Youth Detention Centre. We understand that the original site was ~630ha owned by [redacted] and included our site, your identified site and included a church (East Risdon Cemetery) on the same road. This land holds extreme heritage and aboriginal significance, which can be seen at the Tasmanian Aboriginal Cultural Learning Centre - piyura kitina (Risdon Cove), 838 East Derwent Highway.

Our property can be traced back to the establishment of Hobart and has been [redacted] for some time. We have recently planted a vineyard and are in the process of upgrading the facilities to [redacted] for private and public benefit.

The proposed location for the new Detention Centre is sloping in gradient and will mean that a facility of this nature with high anti-climb fences and bright lighting will be visible from our property, as well as other residents of Old Beach. This will obviously affect the value and utility of our site and those around.

As such, on heritage and aboriginal significance as well as a commercial basis, we strongly oppose the proposal to build a new Youth Detention Centre at 972 East Derwent Highway.

I am opposed to the Risdon site being used as the site for the new youth detention facility. The therapeutic residential youth justice facility is essential to changing the way custodial youth justice services are provided in Tasmania. I agree that a new model is required, and that Ashley is not a suitable location or model.

The overwhelming majority of the Otago residents including myself are not supportive of the proposed Risdon site. We are of the opinion that the Risdon site is not the appropriate site for a new therapeutic model.

The new therapeutic model is focused on breaking the cycle of youth offending and addressing trauma, rehabilitation, and the criminogenic needs of young people. Co-locating this facility with the adult prison is not desirable and considered detrimental to the program, its residents, and their rehabilitation. Yet despite this as being a non-disputed fact, the facility is still proposed to be in the same suburb as the adult prison at Risdon.

The real-world reality is that the wider community will see this new model of therapeutic residential care as "the children's prison" with the adult prison so close by and both located at Risdon. This will result in ongoing stigma in the community to both the facility and the residents.

According to the question-and-answer document "Reforming Tasmania's Youth Justice System" page 5, these proposed sites were identified due to separation from major residential areas and schools.

The Risdon site neighbours the Aboriginal Children's Centre.

Otago which is a suburb of 557 people (according to the 2021 ABS Census) has a significantly high proportion of home ownership (94%) versus renters (6%) according to Domain demographics data. Personal median income in Otago is higher than both the median weekly income for both Tasmania and Australia. In addition, The Property Tribune, Australia's Real Estate News: Top 20 Australian Suburbs for Families 2023 states "Otago in Hobart ranks top of the list".

The proposed site at Risdon will also negatively impact on any future development of a highway to link the eastern end the Bowen Bridge to link with the Grasstree Hill roundabout, linking with East Derwent Highway.

I would welcome the report of the community consultation process publicly disseminated rather than simply informing Government with the feedback from the consultation process. This would demonstrate that the Government is truly engaged in a consultative process and that the feedback is being taken into consideration.
The East Derwent Highway location is ridiculous. There are several private residential houses close by as well as a main highway. The Brighton location is not any better either to be honest. This needs to be well away from private residential houses as it will impact them greatly in the future in resale and will impact on the suburbs and insurance costs.
It is difficult to enter feedback when some of my questions have not been answered despite me sending in multiple formats. I do not agree with building the Youth Detention Centre on the East Derwent Highway for a number of reasons. 1. It is stated that it is once in a lifetime to get youth justice right. It is also a once in a lifetime opportunity to solve the dreadful congestion on the eastern end of the Bowen Bridge. I realise there would not be huge amounts of traffic from the proposed centre, but that government owned land is in the perfect place to realign the highway and to redesign the intersection. I know that there are no plans for this in the pipeline but those who use that intersection and section of road know that the current traffic conditions are not fit for current conditions let alone future traffic needs. I beg that this land not be used without first consulting with the department responsible for future planning for the East Derwent Highway. 2. The YDC needs to be further away from Risdon. There is already a stigma for the area. I am worried about a secure facility being built but I am even more concerned that the non-secure supported accommodation may also be built in the area. No-one has given me guarantees that it is only the secure facility that is planned. The area must not be allowed to become a reform precinct. 3. Otago and Risdon are deceptively heavily populated. I do not believe a YDC should be built in a suburban area. It also should not be built beside an area where children visit daily. I am seeking answers to a couple of more questions before framing my feedback in regard to the proposed East Derwent Highway site. 1. The traffic on the eastern end of the Bowen Bridge to the Risdon Roundabout is unsustainable and does not meet current needs let alone future needs. I am not concerned that there will be extra traffic involved with the proposed detention centre. I am concerned that that land is likely needed for a future transport corridor. What consultation has been done with Transport Tasmania to ensure that land is not needed for the future of smooth traffic flow in the future? 2. Can a guarantee be given that the site is only for the detention centre? What is the likelihood that the supported bail and other supported accommodation will be located on the same or neighbouring sites?
I have concerns in regards to the site at 972 East Derwent Highway, Risdon in that, how much traffic is this centre going to create and where is the road to enter and exit coming from? The traffic in our area has increased dramatically as when the Brooker Highway was being upgraded as everyone detoured via Risdon to get anywhere. Once the upgrade was finished, the traffic volume didn't decrease, it has either stayed the same or increased even more. We are a thoroughfare for those travelling to both the western shore & eastern shore and at the moment, the highway around the pyramids (between the Risdon prison roundabout and the Bowen Bridge) cannot cope with the traffic volume. The road surface has degraded quite a lot so my question is, will this be upgraded to cope with increased traffic? Secondly, for us to leave our suburb and head towards Lindisfarne (for example), as it is we could sit at the end of Saunderson's Road for minutes on end waiting for a break in the traffic. At certain times of the day, we literally cannot get out in a safe manner. So, if the centre goes ahead around the corner, how much more traffic do we have to deal with in trying to get out of our suburb. We are to the point of either needing lights or a decent roundabout. Is this something that will be considered when looking at the entry and exit point for the centre and how much traffic it will create? I'm most disappointed that as a suburb, we have not been informed of the proposal considering how

close we are to the site in question. The only way we knew about this, was from a letterbox drop from others.
I strongly disagree with the site suggestion at Otago Bay. Not only will this dramatically reduce the land value of the many properties in the area, it will also create many other issues including suburb stigma, localised violence/and or vandalism, an eye sore to all travellers on the highway, bridge and river where our states most troubled teens will be put on display for all visitors to our state to see. The road works, traffic delays and rubbish build-up whilst being built will cause major disruptions to an already very busy morning and afternoon commute.
Not in favour. Too close to families 😢, homes, and more traffic. We have delays now coming over the bridge and there will be hold ups while it's being built. We have a lovely area at Otago Bay, and this will so be sad for the home's that will be close to the facility. So that's a no from me.
I strongly oppose the site on the East Derwent Highway. This is not the correct place for the centre!
The land at 972 East Derwent Highway should not be used for a detention facility. Prime riverfront views are not the appropriate theme for such a facility. The location should be in a borderline regional area on the outskirts of Hobart surrounds. Not within arm's reach of Hobart's major trouble spots.
I write to object about the proposed detention centre at the end of the Bowen Bridge. We already have a prison close by that we can't avoid viewing. Why should we or anyone else have to be reminded daily where our hard-earned money goes as we drive across the bridge. You may well have screening, but you can't screen noise, lighting, traffic and all the facility. This is prime land for building housing which we so desperately need in Tasmania. These facilities are better off being built where the offenders can contribute to society maybe farming being outdoors. This facility will have a drastic effect on the value of property and housing in the area. The traffic at the end of the Bowen bridge is already chaotic at certain times of the day as it is. If you look at the space at the Risdon prison, there is sufficient space to build another facility for the misplaced youth. We can only put in the strongest terms our concerns and objections to this going forward.
Otago Bay isn't the answer, no public consultation, Traffic is already a nightmare on the Bowen, too many family homes in the area, real safety concerns for the public and you have to see what they do in Glenorchy bus mall. Plenty of space on the Risdon prison site.
Risdon detention centre is too close to residential families. Historical value of Risdon cove settlement ruins a sacred place. Too close to Risdon prison will cause further psychological damage to the states troubled youths. No other detention centre is located in a suburb carrying a median house price of $950,000. Crime rate will increase. Traffic congestion will increase. There is no benefit to our suburb as there are no other services, only residential houses with families. The proposed site will be directly next to the aboriginal children's school. Breaches of their safety are going to significantly increase with a detention centre next door to it. The proposed facility needs to be on similar land to the Hayes prison farm for youths to prosper and integrate back into our community.
I do not consider the East Derwent Highway option to be appropriate. This land is both rural and residential. Buildings for detention purposes do not fit in this environment. The site is fully exposed to motorists on the Bowen Bridge and on the East Derwent Highway. I do not see how this can be helpful for anyone. The site is not far from Risdon Prison. I consider that concentrating facilities for offenders, even if there is a therapeutic intent, is inappropriate for detainees or for the community. Would you please provide specific examples of where existing detention centres have not resulted in a decrease in property values but, in fact, an increase in value? I am still waiting for a response to my question about the claim that value of nearby properties actually increases. I have asked for specific examples. Please in the interests of an open process, answer my query.

The proposed site on East Derwent Road is indeed close to a very substantial subdivision with high quality and valued properties and do not agree with this site. The traffic and accidents on the Bowen Bridge at this time will be at least doubled if this site goes ahead. Without extreme spending on infrastructure the area will be more of a bottleneck.
The preferred site of 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon is a terrible idea. The amount of traffic at peak hours on the highway is already overwhelming for commuters. Please consider the Brighton site as the only preferred site.
The site at Risdon is not suitable. It is adjacent to an area of huge cultural significance, being a massacre site, and that in itself should be enough to rule the site out. It is home to the TAC who I'm sure do not want to be associated with a youth detention centre. There is a childcare centre within close proximity to the proposed site as well. There are also a large number of homes nearby. As far as I can see there are more homes in this area close to the proposed site than there are at Brighton. The Brighton site seems to be a better option.
As my property will overlook the site I am concerned about the proximity to the site, the light pollution and security as we have previously had concerns when there have been escapes from Risdon Prison.
I understand the need for youth detention facilities but choose carefully. Risdon - don't do that. It's close to residential areas and transport, it's a very busy part of the Eastern Shore and high traffic. Absconding would be easier. It will have an immediate impact on the value of every resident's property that lives within a short radius. Do you want to put those at-risk kids so close to Risdon Prison - what message does that send - next stop just up the road - you can see it from here? Pontville - Do that. More quiet and secluded. Less attraction to abscond. It's more quiet, more peaceful, less surrounding residents, away from the Risdon Prison a better reflective space for recuperation and repatriation for the at-risk youth.
I am opposed to the selection of 972 East Derwent Highway for the proposed development of the youth justice centre as Otago and Risdon are residential areas.
I object to the Detention Centre Facility being built in Otago. To close to residential dwellings, aboriginal site and school, traffic control, entry and exit.
I oppose the site being built at 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon because, we bought a family home here to raise our children & grandchildren in a rural setting which escapes the traffic, the noise, the bright lights & the need to worry about potential escapes from such a facility. The inevitable devaluation of our property is also of great concern. To say the facility won't be visible from the Bowen Bridge is a joke as its right there in front of you perched on the bank. The other concern is the entrance, will it be from the Highway which will impact traffic flow? Or via our quiet street?? Surely a bigger parcel of land where the neighbouring properties are larger in size & acreage would make more sense?
Whilst the new facility is required, I will only support the facility being constructed at Brighton Road. The other suggested location, on the East Derwent Highway is too close to residents and will potentially lead to even more congestion on the bridge and the East Derwent Highway. The last thing needed in this area is more vehicle congestion! Living close to the East Derwent Highway's proposed site, I also have grave concerns for security in the surrounding areas. It would be essential that those involved in the project provide guaranteed reassurance, guidelines and support should there be an issue at the facility. My family's safety and security are my ultimate goal and personally, I will not tolerate any potential negative impact on my home and family. Once again, I appreciate this opportunity to provide feedback and ask that I be kept updated. Thanks.
Why do we have to have two locations proposed in the south and none in the north or northwest is this to keep Mr Ferguson happy with his constituents so that he gets votes at the next election. I live in the vicinity of Risdon Prison, and we do not need or want another correction facility in our area. Imagine what reputation

we will attract and what our socio-economic standards would be when we have tried so hard to improve the standard of living particularly with the new subdivisions being developed.
I am strongly against this project being built in the Risdon/Otago region. As a resident of Otago, I would like to have Otago remain a quiet, peaceful neighbourhood, with a low rate of crime, and I believe this project will interfere with the peacefulness of our area, devaluing our house prices, and changing the reputation of our suburb. I strongly oppose the East Derwent highway location and opt in favour of the Brighton location.
The Otago site is a totally unacceptable location. We reside next door in [redacted] and would not feel safe. I park my car [redacted] and would not feel safe with this facility next door when [redacted] to my car. Anyone in this facility is there for a reason. The fact that the location is not secured, and residents can come and go as they please is not ideal.
I object to this facility being established at the Otago location due to the following below 1 - It will be within 200 metres from our home residence 2 - The council has approved a subdivision for two more residences to be established which will mean they will be even closer to the proposed site 3 - It is located too close to the current Risdon prison 4 - The Aboriginal site - Risdon Cove and Putalina (Oyster Cove) blocked in by the Risdon prison now a youth detention centre really is a slap in their face right there, they have a childcare centre and schooling at the site as well 5 - Otago is a prestige/prime real estate area why on earth would you consider this area as a suitable site, a lot of residences have invested a lot of money in their homes for future stability, this will definitely devalue all homes in the area .
Dear Clarence Council, I am writing to express my objection to the proposed youth detention centre at Risdon, primarily because of its prime location with stunning river views. While youth offenders need rehabilitation and support, they do not require luxurious surroundings, and such prime real estate would be better suited to other purposes that would benefit the community more directly. Furthermore, the negative impacts on the local area would far outweigh any potential benefits. The proposed facility would undoubtedly change the character of the area, leading to increased traffic, noise pollution, and a general decrease in the quality of life for local residents. Additionally, the potential for the facility to generate negative publicity for the area could have a detrimental effect on local businesses and property values. The site at Brighton would be a more suitable location for the proposed facility. Not only is it still in close proximity to the existing Risdon Adult Prison and public transport, but it is also located in an area that has historically been associated with correctional facilities, making it more appropriate for such a development. In summary, I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed location of the youth detention centre at Risdon and instead choose the site at Brighton. It would be a better outcome for the local community, and the valuable land close to the city could be put to better use. Thank you for your consideration.
Not happy with the Risdon, East Derwent Highway location, is too close to residential area and this area has already the other major detention facility (prison) nearby. It would be a significant concentration of negative perceived facilities and possibly also devalue any of the area's residential properties. I believe the Brighton location would be better suited - especially in light of a larger area available for it and historically the

previously existed refugee centre. The Risdon location would also have little room for expansion if that would be required in the future. I certainly don't want to live near another detention facility.

I've reviewed the limited information you have made available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program nor our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident, I do not want this facility to be built in our area at the proposed 972 East Derwent Highway site.

As the current [redacted] East Derwent Highway, I've had the past [redacted] years to observe and enjoy the huge variety of wildlife on the property. This includes Wedge Tailed eagles, Sea Eagles, plain and eastern-barred bandicoots, wombats, wallabies, tiger quolls, and a huge variety of birdlife including Swift Parrots which come to feed on the bluegum and other eucalyptus flowers during spring and summer. I'm concerned that the roads, lighting, extra traffic etc will be detrimental.

I have lived at the [redacted] East Derwent Highway for [redacted] years and believe the proposed detention centre will be a big mistake. There is an amazing amount of wildlife onsite here and the close proximity to Aboriginal land and an Aboriginal school/childcare facility should be taken into account.

I strongly oppose the Risdon site, it is in very close proximity to multiple family-oriented suburbs, not to mention the learning centre extremely close by. It is very close to our beautiful Derwent River, tourists regularly travel the MONA Ferry along this section of river, I would imagine a detention centre is the last thing they would be wanting to view!

More importantly, this is the site of the first British settlement in Tasmania as far back as 1803, this is of historical significance, it would be disrespectful to build here.

The Pontville/Mangalore site is much more central for Northerners visiting juveniles, easy access to the main highway allowing faster access for emergency services, a lot less housing in the immediate vicinity, unlike the East Derwent Highway proposal. A larger amount of land than the EDH site, allowing for possible multiple expansions in the future.

I oppose the youth detention Centre being built at 972 East Derwent Highway, Risdon. I am concerned for the safety of our children. There will be more traffic. And it will devalue my house. Please do not build the Risdon at Risdon.

Hi, my name is [redacted] and I've lived at the [redacted] property at [redacted] for a number of years and would like to share my concerns and maybe give some insight into the property and area in regard to building a youth detention facility. I'll just list them out. Also apologies in advance for the length of this!

Traffic/Access
Access into and out of the property can be impossible at least an hour either side of peak time and especially when there are accidents in the area or even further off, it doesn't take much before it is dangerous to turn right into the drive and difficult to turn left off of the merge lane I can't imagine how this can be made better without a major redesign, my concern is someone will think it's a simple matter of adding a turn-in lane and that will end up being inadequate and a massive bottleneck once it's actually built.

Bus Routes
From personal experience the public transport access is pretty much non-existent, at the closest bus stop outside the property buses often won't stop because they are already in the right lane and won't or can't change across and I've never had one able to drop me off there for the same reason. Accessing the property from the bus stop near Saunderson's Road means walking across the thin causeway with the traffic or walking on the other side of the barrier on the rocks and the drop off into Bowen Park Lagoon. The other bus stop near Direction Drive means a walk on the edge of the highway or the gravel verge, then the bike path and either the highway service lane or the grassy bank.

Conservation Area/Wildlife
I'm concerned about the impact a fenced and lighted facility on the edge of a conservation area will have on

the wildlife, they don't understand the arbitrary line on a map between parks and wildlife zoned area and state growth zoned area. As it is at the moment, we have spotted quolls, echidnas, bandicoots, a wombat, wallabies, possums, native hens, owls, bats and scarily large tiger snakes among others, they often come right up to the area around the house and are also in the surrounding bush and grassy areas. There is also a very large wedge tailed eagle, several smaller hawk type birds and various rosellas and parrots that come and go from the southern blue gums. I can't help but feel concerns about wildlife are mostly ignored, dismissed and scoffed at when things are proposed to be built.

Cultural significance
Being so close the Risdon Cove landing site and it's interesting history will there be any procedures put in place if culturally significant items or sites are uncovered during excavations, although it's only hearsay we've heard from a range of different people (many that are familiar with the site) that there would be lots of culturally important items uncovered if any construction where to go ahead and that that was one of the main reasons the East Derwent Highway was never extended through the site, my concerns here are it could end up another debacle like the Brighton Bypass/Jordan River Levee Bridge (Kutalayna) site in the early 2010s.

Weather/Wind
The site does experience some very high and impressive winds especially during spring, the North Easterly and Easterly winds come in off the river and accelerate greatly up the hill, in the past we've lost small sheds, large shed roofs, various roof panels, had large trees and always large branches down, we've also had tarps, car and machinery covers and horse rugs blow away never to be found again!

Sewage/Wastewater
The property has a small septic system with a drainage garden and no storm water collection, I'm sure people much smarter than me have thought of this already but what sort of system will a large facility plus staff entail and how much digging and pipe laying through here and the neighbouring properties would be needed to connect to a proper sewage and waste system or would it all be contained on site?

Part 2
Neighbouring properties
This confuses me, the listed criteria for determining the site states that it be located away from schools yet the property next door is the Aboriginal Children's Centre. Also, it's a shame for the lady that bought the property at [redacted] Sollamer Place which directly borders the Northern edge of the site who did have [redacted] there, no amount of screening will disguise the fact that there is a detention centre on their doorstep. I also feel bad for our neighbour that recently bought 1036 East Derwent Highway (Cleburne, the historic site and BnB) and spent considerable effort and expense renovating it only to have the prospect of a detention centre directly overlooking them. I guess we are lucky in a way that we are only renting and don't have much of a financial stake in the area, a lot of the neighbours that do though are furious and rightly so.

That's all that comes to mind at the moment, my opinion is that this is not a suitable site, I hope this is of some use.

I am a resident of Risdon. I live in [redacted] Road Risdon, the first street off [redacted] Risdon from East Derwent Highway Risdon. My [redacted] between the Aboriginal Centre Risdon Cove and the Bowen Bridge closest in proximity with houses to the proposed site for 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon. Just making it clear I do not agree with the Risdon proposal. Furthermore, I do not wish for a detention centre/facility i.e., the proposed site 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon to be placed anywhere near the proximity of my residence. My elderly parents live at Otago Bay, they also do not agree with the proposed site of 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon. A more rural setting like the proposed site of 466 Brighton Road (between Pontville and Mangalore) would be more appropriate and less intrusive to the residents of our community.

I am extremely concerned about this proposal of a detention centre in Otago Bay/Risdon area. It's already a huge traffic issue at peak times with traffic jams on the bridge a regular occurrence. This will increase congestion in this area. It's also very close to residential areas that have I am sure are less than impressed with

the idea of a detention centre being built so close to their homes. Lowering the value of this highly respected area.
I'm a resident of Otago Bay only a very small distance from one of the proposed sites at Bowen Banks. I would be completely opposed to the centre being considered at the East Derwent Highway address. Otago Bay is a wonderful and privileged place to live and raise a family, I have no doubt that if this centre was constructed here it would be a waste of premium land, furthermore it would disrupt a close community that have all worked hard to live in this area. There would be absolutely no benefit to our community, instead it would likely lower property prices, increase insurance prices and undoubtedly when driving home each day we would be reminded of it as we drove over the Bowen bridge by the prison-like construction of the facility. This facility could be positioned at a much more discreet location which would benefit everyone. I don't know anyone who would like to drive home and look at this next to their homes and urge the decision makers to consider how they would feel about having this placed at close proximity to their families and homes.
I note that one of the negatives of the Goodwood site is its high visibility - it is very obvious that the Risdon site is even more highly visible and to more people, being on a busy main highway serving thousands of people every single day. And the eastbound Bowen Bridge traffic will have a direct view. Mt Direction is a Hobart landmark which can be seen from just about everywhere, and this facility will be right in its front yard. We have not been made aware of the exact building that would be erected but clearly the fencing and night lighting required, will certainly be visible to everyone living in the area and to every passer-by, and to anyone who can see Mt Direction.
I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed detention centre site on the East Derwent Highway. Such a location would surely be better used for residential housing. It is prime real estate. As a resident of Otago Bay, I am uncomfortable with the current proposal. I have concerns regarding property valuation, safety/security, and the general aesthetics of a major development in the proposed location. Thanks for considering my concerns when making a final decision.
Future growth is limited for this site due to its size. Waiting lists to enter the detention centre will not benefit the youths as the proposed site only allows limited children to be there at any one time. No scope for skilled labour to be taught on a larger more rural site, restricting natural integration of the detainees to become more civilised and limiting future job prospects. Neighbouring Aboriginal School has not been consulted as per Saturday's consultation meeting on the 15th of April. This breaches criteria outlined by government for safety measures and are not being met with its close proximity to the detention centre. Risdon Prison stigma - is at odds with a therapeutic centre. Close proximity to the Risdon Jail will play mentally on the rehabilitating youths and this will cause damaging effects merely by being so close to the Risdon prison. Professional doctors views will verify this to be highly likely as per Saturdays 15th April consultation. Intersection difficulties, traffic management report has not been shared. It is already a congestion and a bottleneck at the best of times. Proximity to residential area. Potentially causing more crime in the area and effects to social well-being of the nearby residents and young families.
Siting of facility at Otago adjacent to Aboriginal Children's centre (nearest neighbour when googling site on Google maps) might be construed as racially insensitive.
My response to the proposal for a youth detention centre in Risdon area is that it fails some of the criteria stated.

1. Visibility. The developed land will be clearly visible from many spots, including from the Brooker Highway at Goodwood and from much of the Bowen Bridge, when travelling towards Risdon. Screening is unlikely to be sufficient. 2. Lighting. Currently the lighting during and after events at Elwick is excessive and this proposal will add to the light pollution. 3. Traffic. Currently traffic overloads the narrow road near Risdon Cove, as well as the turning lane off Bowen Bridge. Cyclists have no separate lanes in the proposed area. Bus services are infrequent. 100 proposed staff working shifts plus daily service providers will impact more than just local traffic. Further points that should be considered: 4. Close proximity to Aboriginal land at Risdon Cove (piyura kitina) may be seen as provocative, with higher proportion of aboriginal people reported to be in custody in jails and detention centres. 5. Close proximity to Risdon Jail does not seem to be particularly necessary, as it perpetuates the long-time stigma of the area. 6. The area near Risdon is much smaller, with fixed boundaries, and therefore less flexible, than the Brighton proposed site.
Don't put this facility in the Risdon/Otago area!!! Traffic impacts potentially huge and will devalue property in the area. Plus, it won't resolve a problematic youth detention culture and system so how about you just fix up Ashley.
The East Derwent site is unsuitable unless there is additional expensive work to manage the traffic issue which already exists around the Bowen Bridge. There is a bottle neck for traffic at peak times and poor design leads to hold ups and frequent accidents. Extra traffic entering and exiting the area will only add to the issue. Increasing traffic flow is already evident as the area from Old Beach grows.
I oppose the build at Dowsing point. I believe it would be better suited to a less built-up area, and this is very close to mine, and a lot of other homes in Otago Bay. We have a calm quiet neighbourhood and I believe a youth detention centre in this area would strip the neighbourhood of this, as well as a lot of the land and beauty that makes Otago Bay a nice area to live in. I also believe it would impact the traffic of this area, which is already getting particularly bad near peak hour, and that the Brighton site would be much more suited to this.
The proposed site on East Derwent Road is indeed close to a very substantial subdivision with high quality and valued properties and do not agree with this site. The traffic and accidents on the Bowen Bridge at this time will be at least doubled if this site goes ahead. Without extreme spending on infrastructure the area will be more of a bottle neck. Not in favour of the Risdon site as it is too close to substantial residential area.

Opposed to Pontville site
Would prefer not to have it at Pontville.
As a resident of Pontville whose family has been here for generations, I'm strongly opposed to the Pontville site. I can remember the Wybra Hall days, and most of the time it was of little issue, indeed the lads at the back of the school bus never caused any problems. However, I also remember our horses being stolen by lads trying to escape Wybra and the anxiety it caused. Our house is large and old with many outbuildings and [redacted] the proposed Pontville location. Such dwellings seem to be a magnet for escapees as they

provide hiding places and or possibly useful stuff. My wife already suffers excessive anxiety and is already concerned when [redacted], add the fear of escapees from the detention centre and I doubt she will cope. Giving me the choice of sundering my marriage or selling our family's property and moving, this is not a choice I should be forced to make. I note with some disdain that you say one of the other sites is less preferable because of its proximity to the Elwick Racetrack and the DEC, so instead you prefer a site that is within stone's throw of; guns, drugs and alcohol, the very things of most interest to the criminally minded. That makes a great deal of sense. Public transport to Pontville is irregular while the other sites are on regular bus routes. Finally, if the government had the forward planning ability of a lemming feeding up for winter why didn't they keep the Hayes prison farm property and reuse that real estate. Instead, you inflict your inability to plan on another community.
Pontville/Mangalore site will be too close to Brighton primary and future high school. Close to rural properties and the growing area of Brighton and the outer suburbs of Brighton. Brighton is meant to be an up-and-coming area and trying to attract more population, this will decrease people's interest to move to the area.
As locals, we do not want a youth detention centre anywhere near Brighton.
Find it crazy that you'd want to build a detention centre for delinquents next door to a medicinal marijuana plantation. Ten out of ten to the [redacted] that thinks that would be ok. Why is the government so sneaky when it comes to doing things like this? There is never any community consultation or consultation with the respective councils. And especially never any consultation with the people who live in that area. I'd like to know if any of the people that have recommended these sights live anywhere never the proposed sights. I'm guessing NO!!! Not sure why the govt would want to waste money on a new facility when the old one would have been ok. Thought it was only the people that worked there that were the problem, so wouldn't it of been easier and a shit tonne cheaper to have a massive clean out of the staff and get some decent human beings to run the detention centre. You can't run from the problems associated with an institution like this, building a new one doesn't erase the past or the damage done to the past kids who suffered abuse there, and if you think a new centre will stop this sort of thing happening again your living in a fantasy land with all the fairies and elves that live there. Would like to see the costings of this project and how much has been spent up to date, as a taxpayer I feel this sort of information should be released.
Not at Pontville/Mangalore!!!!! Go at Goodwood near Risdon Prison because usually that will be their next home when they are older.
After reviewing the information regarding this project, I strongly disagree with the location at Pontville. Our family has moved to this area for quality of life and quiet country lifestyle. This project will impact this immensely. Property values will drop even though you say they won't. They will. People bordering this project will be massively affected both mentally and financially. The facility of Ashley, although dated, could be still used. Bricks and mortar do not affect the treatment of kids, people do and building this facility will not change that. The people of this community do not want this. This community consists of a lot of older people and young families and people are fearful for their safety.
Having a facility of this size and security built in Brighton will be an eyesore from the highway. The facility should be built further back from the highway like the location in Risdon.
The preferred site at Risdon would be more suitable as it is closer to the Risdon Prison complex. I am against the Pontville site being chosen as I believe it will bring down the historic value of the area and I would not like to have to drive past it all the time.

After attending one of your information sessions at the Brighton Hall I am more upset at the prospect of the centre being built behind my home. I have lived in my property for [redacted]. It is the most peaceful, beautiful place and I am hoping it stays that way. I love my way of live and the fact it is quiet and dark of a night, I'm not sure if mentally I could handle having lights on 12 hours a night and I'm sure as hell not selling, they'll carry me out in a box. How will you make it do I can still have my peace and quiet and stillness with darkness of a night?? My children have [redacted].

When you make decisions about the way you affect people's lives and how things would change the way they currently live you need to take a lot of different things into the picture. You need to think how this would affect my life if this was going to happen in my backyard and then maybe you might understand how I am feeling.

The Pontville site should be retained to complete the Highway to Launceston. Why are we keeping that dangerous roundabout when we are building a brand-new Bridgewater bridge.

Do not build on the Pontville site - your proposal is very short sighted.

1. We were at our local church St Marks on the weekend. The Pontville site is visible from here. We do not feel safe with the detention centre in Pontville near the church.

2. We went all the way around the Pontville site. It is visible on all sides (except at the roundabout). There is no way you will ever be able to 'screen' out the building on this site as the land is low.

3. A direct neighbour to the Pontville site had a working tourist cellar door business last year. He had to close as his marriage dissolved but he is intending to reopen when he gets back on his feet. Your proposal will kill any opportunity he has to reopen his business, tourists will avoid this area.

4. The heritage homes in Pontville and Mangalore are significant. They should be protected the Midlands Council should zone the area with a heritage overlay to protect them and stop the heritage significance being further diminished.

5. The Pontville/ Mangalore roundabout is dangerous. Fix the roundabout!

6. There is no public transport to the Pontville Site.

7. The facility will create light at night-time that is not suitable on the Pontville site. Protect the dark night sky in Pontville.

Last year on the land directly adjacent to the Pontville site we found an injured Tasmanian Devil. She was with a baby. We rang Bonorong who came to collect her to heal her wounds likely from a car.

Last week on the road in front of the Pontville site we found a wallaby killed by a car with a live Joey in her pouch we took her also to Bonorong.

It is clear the Pontville site is important to our native animals. Protect the habitat of our native animals stop destroying it.

No one here at our home is indeed impressed with your choice of sites for a southern detention centre. We live on the border of Brighton and Pontville and already are experiencing more than an acceptable degree of hooning and bad behaviour in the streets and on the road at Pontville near Pontville Hall and oval. We constantly hear cars revving and doing burnouts which of course the police cannot stop due to unavailability of officers in the area. Many of the offenders are coming out from Bridgewater and Gagebrook. We do not need to encourage more of this antisocial activity with visitors and/or past inmates of such a facility almost over our back fence. There is no logical reason as to why the current facility near Deloraine is suddenly outdated and no good. We moved out here from suburbia to escape the city evils and now we are threatened with this as a nearby neighbour. Thank you but a most definite No.

Mangalore is not suitable. This land would be used for housing and property value will drop this project there are no service in this area.

Sounds like the decision has been made a I didn't not get any mail on this I don't want this in our area as you are not listening to the people from Mangalore there is no public transport 1 bus a day should be sent next to your house see what you think then I will be fb this to start a campaign to move it away from this area.
My Name Is [redacted] & I'm [redacted], I live by [redacted] Road, The detention centre facilities proposed will be [redacted] & I don't want it to go there as I enjoy the peace & quiet & can't afford to live anywhere else because I'm on a [redacted] as I [redacted]. I have to take medication & look after [redacted] & it doesn't take much to set me off, I often have [redacted] at night as I hear [redacted] at times. I don't need any undesirable characters [redacted] people in public. That's why I don't [redacted] & I live [redacted] as well, [redacted]. I know what these young people are like also as [redacted] in Deloraine when it was first opened in the year 2000, [redacted] Some had to spend years in detention for what they'd done. Even the staff in Ashley's [redacted] re-offended more than a few traffic offences. Most of these offenders can't be trusted & more times than not they re-offend until they end up in Risdon Prison anyway. Also I lived in [redacted] for 11+ years as well, 7 years was spent [redacted] to put up with some very undesirable characters most of which were young on illegal motorbikes [redacted] in 2017, I moved out of [redacted] with [redacted] out to Pontville where I am now to get away from all of that terrible rubbish! So no, I'm sorry but I don't want these people in detention centre facilities proposed to go there [redacted] as it will bring all of those bad memories back to me again & my peace & quiet will be gone. Please put it at Risdon closer to the Risdon Prison & Hobart CBD. Also, I believe it would give Pontville and it's surroundings a bad name, In what was once a nice & quiet heritage area with rich history will now be little more than a prison reform centre suburb for under 18's similar to Risdon Vale is, or Deloraine was. If it goes ahead & ends up at 466 Brighton Rd, then I would be highly disappointed in the Tasmanian Government.
Brighton is not a suitable area; the public transport system is in no way sufficient to support family access. There are no other support services in close proximity to the proposed site. Those are just for starters, I'm sure you'll get a raft of other reasons from Brighton residents.
The Brighton site is totally unsuitable as it will be smack bang in the middle of a housing growth area after the Bridgewater bridge is finished. It lacks any sort of external services such as busses. Your consultation with the community to this point has been zero. You have put a thought bubble out there and not consulted at all. Sounds similar to the northern prison. You didn't learn from that and you're doing the same now.
I strongly object against a youth detention centre at Pontville/Brighton, it should be built at Risdon (where the current jail is nearby) so they can share facilities. No public transport at Pontville Brighton. Risdon has public transport. Residents around Pontville (opposite proposed site) object strongly and there's none opposing the Risdon site. All facilities at the Risdon jail (kitchen/laundry etc) can be shared with the new Risdon detention centre therefore saving money. There are no facilities at Pontville Brighton. Too close to the Midlands Highway. Risdon is closer to Hobart for future staff to travel to work. The proposed Pontville Brighton detention centre is very close to a dope farm and a rifle range. Youth at the detention centre at Risdon can do work experience at the Risdon jail.
I do not like the idea that the Brighton site is so close to primary schools, soon high schools and even day cares.
Brighton Municipality is a fast-growing area, with many young families. It is a safe and respectable area, with growing property value. Placing a youth detention centre would have a hugely negative impact. The residents of Brighton do not want a detention centre and its negative connotations in our municipality.

The Pontville site will directly affect the value of my property and my lifestyle. The site would be in plain view of nearby residents such as myself and passing motorists. It's bad enough I have a giant cannabis farm to look at let alone a youth prison. You need to find somewhere further away from people's houses.
I do not think that having this site at Brighton very close to a gun club is very good place for children to be close to.
I believe the Pontville location is a bad idea for the following reasons. No public transport will disadvantage low-income families. Residents will have a marijuana, distillery, and rifle range as neighbours, not a good view for them to think about in plain view. Is part of the heritage highway with most houses surrounding the area heritage listed. Will be the first thing tourists will see when entering the greater Hobart are when travelling from the north, nothing says welcome better than a prison! Brighton council area that includes Bridgewater has a negative reputation in most Tasmanian minds already, this will cement in people's minds that impression, not good for increasing pride in the community . No information has been given to Southern Midlands Council for community discussion
New development occurring in Brighton is great however as a single female and first homeowner, being so close to a detention centre makes me feel unsafe. Construction of the new high school with a small percentage of adolescents who already may already struggle with their home environment. Glorifying a detention centre down the road seems ridiculous. How will this affect the crime rates in Brighton, what's the impact to the housing prices, the increase in cost it will bring to insurance prices on homes and vehicles and the overall safety of the community? We do not want a suburb like Risdon Vale where the adult facility is and the amount of escaping inmates into the local community creating constant fear amongst the local community. I do not want to feel unsafe in my own home.
The proposed site on Brighton Road is not suitable. It is in a residential area and close to a primary school and soon to be a high school.
The proposed centre does not fit in with the residential focus of this area. We do not need another Wybra Hall which was still being used when I was growing up. We moved to Mangalore for a quieter country lifestyle not far from Hobart for doctors as we get older. This centre will devalue our properties and the area overall. There was not enough advertising of the consultation meetings as lots of us would have attended. Please we do not want another Wybra Hall to disturb our wonderful lifestyle. Please look at Hayes Prison Farm which is fit for purpose. Let's keep it away from residential areas.
There is a school being built on Brighton Road and Brighton itself is growing with more subdivisions being completed and the area is becoming more residential. This is not an ideal place based on the criteria mainly not wanting to build the detention centre near schools when there is one currently being built on Brighton Road not far from the proposed site.
Poor Decision-Making Process The Government is rushing a decision without looking for the best possible site. The Government is now only considering the two possible sites that are Government owned and already appropriately zoned. They are not looking at any further than these sites for what may be a better site with less impact upon local residents and enterprises. It was explained at the Brighton information session by the Department representative that the Government is doing this to meet their own self-imposed deadline. They want to get work on the Centre underway as soon as possible and any need to either purchase land and/or to get a zoning changed would delay the process. The Government want a quick decision, even if it not a good decision. Poor Consultation Process • The mail out zone was too limited, and the Government media campaign failed to make the majority of the people in the locality aware of the proposal. • Why has the Minister avoided public appearances on the issue? • The proposal's public consultation methodology adopted is one that by its very nature will be less effective in low socio-economic areas such as Brighton.

• The information provided in the consultation has clearly been designed to re-assure, but as they are not accompanied by any supporting evidence, these assurances leave many key questions basically unanswered such as design, visibility, perimeter barriers, lighting, traffic and recruitment. • The claim that house values will not be negatively impacted is false as experience shows that property values in such areas do not rise at the same rate as those in areas without such facilities. • Such facilities do negatively impact upon public perceptions of the areas identified with these facilities. Despite the Government's denial there is a stigma that goes with these facilities. The buildings, fences, lighting and perimeter security all reinforce the negative perception the public have of such facilities and their inmates. The Government has chosen to ignore their experience of the reaction to their Westbury prison proposal. Issues with the Mangalore Site • Choice of the Mangalore site would seriously undermine all the good and difficult work that has been by the Brighton Council and Brighton community organisations and members of the public to improve general public perceptions of their community. Ironically this is happening at the same time as their high school is being built. • The significant number of households as immediate neighbours will unfairly bear the greatest impact to both their property values and their personal amenity. • This site is located adjacent to two significant heritage areas and a detention centre would negatively impact these areas and all the tourism ventures in the area. The Government is even undermining their own Shene distillery investment in the promotion of the heritage values of the area. • The Q&A material also ignores the real possibility of an increase in hooning which is already frequent in the vicinity. The location would make it easy for the hooning associates of inmates to make their presence on the roads outside known to their friends inside. • The Q&A material is also silent on the possible impact upon traumatised inmates of the noise of gunshots from the neighbouring gun and pistol clubs. • The Q&A material is also silent on the impact upon addicted inmates and staff the aroma of cannabis from the medicinal cannabis facility which are frequent in the area. • The Q&A material also ignores the lack of public transport to this site even though such provision was one of their desired attributes of a site. This decision is being rushed. All the indications are that the Government is willing to ignore the justified concerns of local residents and enterprises in order to get a quick fix. Detention centres need to be located in areas more isolated from residents and from tourism and recreational facilities.
The site being considered on Brighton Road is ludicrous. The proposed site is part of a heritage and developing tourist region. A complete lack of understanding about the area has been evident within the proposal. There are some significant heritage buildings within the area. There are also residents with properties adjacent to the proposed site. There will be significant impact if the centre goes ahead, with their quality of life and value of properties both affected. Furthermore, the area is the start of a major whisky trail in Tasmania as well as having the largest medicinal cannabis producer in close proximity. Both these are important parts of the Tasmanian economy and should be carefully nurtured not possibly impacted by a juvenile detention centre in close proximity. Please reconsider using this site.
In my feedback just submitted I didn't actually say that my objection is to the Brighton proposed site.
We attended the information session on Saturday at Brighton Community Hall and perused the information that was available and spoke to the representatives for the proposal that were there. After weighing all the information up, we do not want this or need this in the Brighton community, at the moment there is many young families and people retiring in the area, there is no doubt this will slow down immensely if the detention centre is built at Pontville. One of the arguments for the centre is that being 30 minutes from Hobart would make it easier to attract staff, that is only one of many reasons in our opinion why Ashley could not attract enough staff, getting the staff is one thing, keeping them is another. We only found out about it the evening before as it was briefly mentioned on ABC news, I then got on the internet and found out about the information session on Saturday. This is very unsatisfactory as the people in Brighton and surrounds are all

part of the Brighton Community, it is very unfair the information only went out to within a 3 km radius, not everyone gets the Mercury or has social media and as we found out a lot of people were unaware of the proposal. If the politicians that be wanted us to vote for them, we know we would be inundated with flyers and letters, so why not be upfront with everyone in the area. We feel that it has already been decided that it will be at Pontville. To say the value of properties will not go down in the area if the proposal goes ahead here, we think is wrong and we would like to see the data that the government says they have from other areas that tells us otherwise, if this is true why not provide it? It will be detrimental to this community if it is built here, youth offenders are getting more and committing more serious crimes than previously. To say there will only be approximately 10 youth offenders at any one time in the detention centre, well that is 10 youth offenders we do not want here, that does not make us feel any more secure.

I strongly oppose the use of the site in Pontville/Mangalore. This is extremely close to both a gun club and also a cannabis farm. This is a very up and coming and developing area that would be tainted by having a prison clearly visible from the Main Road and highways in and out of Hobart.

It is clear that the Government is rushing this decision in order to get work started asap so that they can be seen to be doing something. At the information session the government representatives emphasised that the search for a site had been limited to Government owned and appropriately zoned land. If they need to purchase or rezone land it would take too long for their self-imposed deadline. Sadly, this decision is an ill-conceived strategy. It will be a quick fix rather than taking the time to thoroughly investigate the best long-term solution for the community and detainees. The government's aim should be to make this a win-win situation for all people involved.

The Government has also tried to limit public involvement in the consultation process by using mail outs to a very limit area, consequently many locals still know little on nothing about the proposal. Why have we not seen a Minister in the media on this specific proposal? Why have they not organised a meeting with local residents? In reality this reveals how little importance is placed on meaningful public consultation. Presumably Ministers know that this is not a good news story.

The information provided in the Q and A handout is inadequate. It has clearly been designed in an attempt to re-assure people by putting a positive spin the information. However, generalisations are not accompanied by current data or evidence and leave many key questions basically unanswered such as design, visibility, perimeter barriers, lighting, traffic, future development, and recruitment. The Government wants to ignore their experience of the reaction to their Westbury prison proposal. Have no lessons been learned?

Issues with the Mangalore site
Our quickly developing local community would be defined by the centre. Rison Vale is the obvious example. It continues to be stigmatised. Building a Centre at Mangalore will seriously undermine all the good and difficult work that has been undertaken by the Brighton Council and Brighton community organizations and members of the public to improve general public perceptions of their community. Such a decision would sacrifice the well-being of our community.

A centre located on the Midland Highway at the conjunction of two significant heritage areas would also undermine all tourism and other business ventures in the area by making a mockery of the "Heritage Highway" and the "Heartlands Route". The Government is even undermining their own Shene distillery investment in the promotion of the heritage values of the area. The close proximity to the pistol and gun clubs and marijuana factory is laughable if it were not so serious.

Pontville is a small beautiful nineteenth century village and to place a detention centre immediately on it outskirts beggars belief. Personally, I am currently developing a [redacted] at my historic property. It has been a significant investment which I am very excited about. However, I now feel if the centre proceeds it would significantly reduce my chances of it being successful.

The Q&A information provides little beyond reassurance on the traffic impacts of staff, service, and visitor vehicles. It also ignores the real possibility of an increase in hooning which is already frequent in the vicinity. The location between the highway and the main road would make it easy for the hooning associates of inmates to make their presence on the roads outside known to their friends inside.

The Q&A information provided is also silent on the possible impact upon traumatised inmates of the noise of gunshots from the neighbouring gun and pistol clubs. Similarly, the Q&A information is also silent on the impact upon addicted inmates and staff the aroma of cannabis from the medicinal cannabis facility which is frequent in the area. The Q&A information also ignores the lack of public transport to this site even though such provision was one of their desired attributes of a site. A centre in a rural environment would be a win- win for everyone.
I believe the site near Pontville is not suitable as it is disconnected from other support services, such as the hospital, psychology services and judicial facilities. It is too close to residential heritage and emerging new community areas, will be another source of light pollution (there is enough pollution from the cannabis facility) and not in keeping with the heritage area of Pontville and Mangalore. Transport for the families of detainees would be expensive and insufficient and accommodation for visitors is also insufficient. I believe the sight would be better used for mixed low-cost housing and additional facilities such as childcare etc for the growing Brighton area.
The site between Portville and Mangalore would not be a good choice unless a major change were made to the public transport system as it is very lacking a does not proceed past Brighton with the exception of Redline but they are a service to Launceston and rarely stop along the way.
Location for Pontville site is not appropriate. Next to a medical marijuana plant with high traffic, and right next to the Hobart Gun Club does not seem suitable!
I do not believe the proposed site at Brighton (between Pontville and Mangalore) is appropriate for the purpose of a youth detention centre. It is located right next to a heritage listed precinct, a rifle range and a new distillery which is marketed as a luxury venue. It would also be situated near the previous detention centre which has since been repurposed. To put another large facility in this area would be detrimental to the landscape and start to make it a built-up area. Please consider the impact on the heritage precinct directly up the road, the businesses and the local community who live here. I understand that each location will have its pros and cons but i firmly believe this is not the right choice. Thank you.
I agree there needs to be facilities for these kids. But not here in Pontville. The perfect place was stupidly sold by the government, Hay prison farm. This updated would have been perfect for these kids. Room for cows', pigs, chooks, sheds to teach them how to build, paint, mechanical work, farming, horticulture, cook. Make them into decent humans don't just lock them up with nothing to do. These kids need more than that. Maybe the Armed forces could also be an option, noting like boot camp. Pontville would be a paradise for them surrounded by the smell of dope one side, Lark distillery and pistol club, perfect recipe for disaster and disharmony in the camp. 😂😂 However, all jokes aside, [redacted] is one perfect sport for these kids, it teaches them so much, responsibility, respect, a purpose, concentration, attitude, work things out mentally, helps them to calm down, respect rules, teaches manners and sense of achievement and belonging. What else can do that? Thank you for allowing me to share my opinion.
I object to the detention centre being built at Pontville/ Brighton. I am concerned about numerous things: 1. The design of the building being contrary to the historical and rural nature of the area. 2. The reaction of any inmates to the smell of marijuana that permeates regularly of an evening, from the approved farm almost directly opposite the proposed site. 3. The unsightly look of any fences constructed to prevent escape, in an area where farm fencing dominates the landscape. 4. The likely impact of 12 hours of bright lighting of an evening in an area that lacks street lighting, something most of us like about being in a rural location. 5. The undesirable noise from outdoor activities in an area where traffic noise is the only background noise.

I am available to discuss further at any convenient time.
Brighton is a growing suburb for young families. There is no need to add a detention centre in a quiet rural residential area. Consider locating it near Risdon where similar facilities already exist.
After going to the information day and having time to think about my response I have 6 points: 1. If the centre is requiring 3 hectares of land to build on why is the government looking at a site over 20 hectares with neighbours right on the boundary (Pontville/Mangalore). Whereas the nearest neighbour at the Risdon Cove site is 200 hundred meters away from the boundary? With the shortage of housing in Tasmania wouldn't it better to rezone the 20-hectare site into rural living and subdivide the land into acre lots for private people to build a home. If the new centre only needs 3 hectares, the Risdon site is over 11 hectares; 3 times the size that is needed and could be expanded down the track if required. 2. The medical cannabis site is in the same area as the planned centre and there is a smell that comes from there. How will that affect youth that already have a drug addiction? The youths with an addiction already have cravings from drugs as they reform - in my eyes this is not going to help but create more problems. The smell can be detected about 5 kms from the cannabis site and as the crow flies between both sites it would only be about 2kms. 3. 3 Rifle and pistol ranges are used 1 to 2 times a week, 52 to weeks a year, with high powered rifles and pistols. I am a member of the 3 sites and live within 4 kms. I can hear them as clear a day so with the planned centre being so close what negative impact will that have on the youth? If the youth already have trauma through violence, hearing high powered rifles and pistols going off twice a week every week will not help. I know that some members have 44 magnums, 12 gauges riffles .303 and .308 calibre rifle - even the use of ear muffs the shots are loud. Some youths have never heard shots being fired so how is a troubled youth going to able to handle this noise? I thought justice reform was trying to help the participants not hinder them. 4. Costs of construction will be greater for the Mangalore centre due to the distance from the CBD. The Risdon site is only 11kms each way. The distance between Mangalore is 34kms. Mangalore delivery's will be charged at higher rate as it will not be in the 10kms radius from Hobart. When transportation of youth is required, again the cost increases with the distance. If a youth needs to be transported into Hobart for example, four times a week, the distance between Risdon and Hobart is 88kms return whereas from Mangalore it is 272kms. The cost will be far greater if the centre is built at Mangalore. My example is just the extra travel time this example doesn't consider staffing & cost of fuel. 5. Emergency response time for Glenorchy to Risdon is 4.5 kms 6 minutes travel time. All three-emergency service are 24/7 in Glenorchy. Bridgewater. To go to Mangalore, it is 15kms, 13 minutes. Bridgewater only has fire and ambulance 24/7 and the police service is only open from 6am to 5pm so the nearest police station will be Glenorchy 27kms away and 23 minutes. You all must know that in any emergency time is critical so I don't understand the governments reasoning why the proposed site if further afield then the closest site proposed. 6. The people I spoke to had stated things me that Ashley centre was being closed because of the distance the family of inmates had to travel for visitation of the youth from south to north now will the people live in the north and northwest have to travel to Hobart.
What is the government thinking about 466 Brighton Rd Pontville for a new detention centre? We are a very quiet community in Pontville. I am objecting to the building the centre in Pontville. It is going to decrease the value in the area let alone that you have a few rifle and pistol ranges close to the site the government is looking at and what does the government think the first buildings will be broken into when a youth escapes? It will be the rifle and pistol ranges. So, we will have armed criminals roaming the local area the Risdon prion is the closed to the other site why does the government need to spend more on transporting youth out to Pontville when the prison is so close it just doesn't make sense.
I am the [redacted] of Lark Distilling Co Ltd. Lark is an iconic Tasmanian brand, distilling, marketing and selling whisky and gin under the Lark and Forty Spotted Gin brands.

In December 2021, Lark announced the acquisition of the Shene Estate at Pontville (Shene Road, Pontville). The purpose of the acquisition was to build upon Lark's vision to become the world's most innovative distillery. The keystone of the project is a new 1ML/year distillery that will be a national and international tourist drawcard at the start of the whisky trail. The distillery is supported by a purpose-built disgorging facility, blending lab, bond stores and a brand-defining hospitality experience offering an insight into the world of Tasmanian Whisky.

The distillery is designed by the award-winning March Studio and built by Tasmanian- based manufacturers GLB Construction, Kolmark and Oculus Landscaping. The distillery equipment will be manufactured in Westbury, Tasmania. Process automation will support Lark's competitiveness on the global market, creating jobs of the future for skilled workers and showcasing Tasmania as an industry lead in whisky production.

On 12 April 2023, Lark received council approval for the construction of the new distillery.

An important component of the design were the considerations of the heritage values property and preserving the view lines from the property, particularly of kunyani. Preserving and elevating these views was a guiding consideration in the design of the new distillery and includes considerable investment in design and construction to achieve these outcomes.

To support the developments on site, Lark Distilling was awarded a Modern Manufacturing Grant ($4.5m) from the federal government and recently also received a Tourism Innovation Grant from the State government of $1m to support the ongoing site development and create a destination tourism space.

Overall, Lark will commit more than $15 million to the site and facilities.

We therefore strenuously object to the placement of the New Youth Detention Centre at 466 Brighton Road because:

• Lark is investing significantly (>$15m) in the area to enhance its tourism values in accordance with T21 Visitor Economy Action Plan. It is our view the placement of a Youth Detention Centre in close proximity is contrary to those values

• The proposed site will sit at the start of the Whisky Trail which is contrary to a youth detention facility at the same location

• The site itself will be in the view line to kunyani that we have focused on preserving and enhancing

• Consideration of the Heritage values of the area, not limited to Lark@Pontville, but other properties in the area

• Operating and safety considerations including the distillery, cellar door and cooperage

• Significant value of Bond stores (storing whisky) on site

We also note the proposed location sits within close distance to the gun club and Medical Marijuana facility.

We would welcome the opportunity to share the designs and our vision for Lark in the area. Please feel free to contact me at any time to discuss.

My husband and I live at [redacted] Pontville your proposed youth detention centre will be directly [redacted] we moved here for the peace and quiet of the area after living in [redacted], we had many social problems including countless thefts, break-ins, burnt cars and insulting language directed at us. With the facility you propose to build including numerous self-contained units for those on bail you are bringing most of those issues and problems right to our back door, it is very peaceful living here and that will be shattered completely with your proposed facility.

Why the hell do the Liberals think it would be a good idea to build a detention facility near a gun club and with a new school being built as you come into Brighton.

Why build in Brighton, a community that already has enough problems being close to low social economic suburbs with high crime rates just extend Risdon prison as most offenders end up there anyway.

I do not believe 466 Brighton Road Brighton is an appropriate place for a youth detention centre. It is only a short minute drive from a primary school, a day-care and soon to be a high school. It is too close to a residential area. This is going to negatively impact those who own homes in the area when the cost of living and rising interest rates has already done that to many. Please consider how close this is to many places where children attend. Including only two minutes from Pontville oval where many children and families attend for sports and events.
I live in Pontville and have grave concerns in the proposed site here. It border is so close to existing homes, and the Brighton community, in spaces such as our local parks, football ground, shops and schools. With the new high school and proposed shopping complex in Brighton I feel building a youth detention centre within minutes of these areas would be a major setback and make our children carry that stigma associated with living in a low socio-economic area already. We are trying to build this community to be a positive area and place for our children to grow up. My preference is for the detention centre to be built at the second site just past Otago Bay where it is more secluded and not close to any shopping centres or schools and where police station and where resources such as the prison are located closer by for any incidents that may occur.
I most strongly object to your proposal for a new Youth Detention Centre at 466 Brighton Rd Pontville. I am a [redacted] owner of the properties at [redacted] Pontville containing approximately [redacted] acres of prime land and have done extensive research and work on having this land [redacted] prime Residential. Pontville is a beautiful historic town with considerable beauty and history so the last thing the area needs is a Youth Detention Centre in this vicinity. I will fight this proposal with every means available to me!
The proposed site at Risdon makes the most sense. I am strongly against the centre being built at the proposed Mangalore site as it will heavily impact on the heritage status of the area, as well as working against tourism efforts along the Heritage Highway. Thank you for your consideration of this.
Hell no do I want a youth justice facility to be near or in, Brighton. It's a booming area, so it's a major residential area, and will continue to be one. There are many families with young children in the area. Find somewhere else to build this facility.
I do not want a prison in what was 30 years ago a nice quite country town. It's already too overgrown. Build a prison in Campbelltown or Ross, that's central logistically. Go to Tarraleah, there's an entire empty town and it's remote, that would be excellent for rehabilitation. Failing that why not look straight across the road from where the proposed site is? Look at the monumental waste of money that was the detention centre, it was built with our money then sold off cheap. But many of the core facilities are still there and would be an extremely viable option perhaps?
466 Brighton Road does not satisfy 2 out of 5 criteria and is therefore unsuitable.
I believe Pontville is not a good choice for the proposed detention centre. The location is too close to a tourist landmark (Lark Distillery) and also the gun range. Risdon makes more sense. Keep it closer to the Risdon Prison. The city of Brighton is booming, and I believe the centre is a poor addition to an area with so much positive growth in land sales.
Brighton site would be within 2 - 3 km of a primary school, high school, shopping zone and major residential area. I consider this to be well outside of the guidelines.
I do not believe that 466 Brighton Road is a suitable location for this facility. This would place the facility close to a main thoroughfare used my residents and tourists traveling between Launceston and Hobart. Not to mention that this location is also close to a major residential neighbourhood.
I moved to Mangalore with my [redacted] for a safe family lifestyle. But that will change if the Detention centre is built. It will lower our property value and make Mangalore a less desirable place to live. Please don't built it in Mangalore.

I am very concerned about the youth detention centre proposed to be built at Pontville, it is not between Pontville and Mangalore as there is no between where Pontville ends Mangalore starts. I live in Pontville [redacted] Road and you want to build this facility behind my property, it will detract from the safety and quality of our lives. The lighting alone will have an impact on our property as there is none at the moment so any lighting, noise, building activity, extra traffic and overall noise will have an impact on us, not to mention when we want to sell our property, we will have to drop the price drastically to get a sale so needless to say we are seriously unhappy with your proposed facility.
I completely oppose the Brighton/Pontville site. It's one of the fastest growing suburbs with many young families who have bought their houses for top dollar and by putting such a site in the area we will watch our house prices decline. I also feel there would be a much better position somewhere more in the central part of the state in order to not disadvantage those who come from the north of the state as their families will have a lot further to travel making it more difficult to stay in contact.
466 Brighton Road appears to fail the assessment criteria, in regard to its proximity to a school, considering the new Brighton High school is being built within easy walking distance. Less than 800 metres.
This site is inappropriate. All it is doing is moving a major problem at Ashley to Pontville. The problems associated with the current facility will still occur. Since the King's Orphan Schools were established in 1832 there have been problems with the way children and teenagers have been handled by those in authority. Better to convert Parliament House to a detention centre, it might give our politicians a proper insight into the poor management that they and previous governments have created and persevered with over almost two hundred years. The historic areas of Pontville and Mangalore do not need to have such a facility built in their area. As for stating that there is no stigma attached, one only has to look at the historic home of Wybra, every time a memory is raised of the abuse of the children placed there in the 1950s and earlier, the media puts up photos and very unwelcome publicity is given to the house owned by decent people who have done so much to preserve their home for future generations. No doubt security fencing and an inappropriate building(s) will be erected in a lovely rural area. I for one don't believe that this is appropriate for the area, or for the offenders who will be based there. As for employment, where are the staff going to find suitable housing in the area. I don't believe that this has been thought through appropriately and I am certainly not in favour of it.
First of all, we would like to draw attention to the extremely poor way we were advised of this proposal. The notification, a small card in our letterbox was received on 29/3/2023, a couple of days prior to a holiday period (Easter, school holidays and parliamentary recess). This not only gave us less than 3 weeks to make a submission but also a lot of local residents were (and still are) unaware of this proposal and subsequent public meetings. Some in fact (ourselves included) will miss those meetings as they (we) are away. This tactic seems to have been planned and intentional to reduce/inhibit public discussion. It also tends to reflect the culture within the Department, which at best comes across as arrogant and at worst bullying by excluding affected parties from engaging in meaningful dialogue., sadly not setting a good example for the wider community going forward. It is also inappropriate that the proposed site is in between the first significant heritage areas north of Hobart. Pontville Village and the Heritage Mile Precinct at Mangalore are recognised and gazetted as being some of the most significant heritage areas in Tasmania if not all of Australia with Georgian residences dating back to the 1820's sitting in their original landscapes. (not to mention the significant first nations people significance in the Jordan River region). You, yourselves have acknowledged this fact by using the term "Heritage Highway". It is called that for a reason. So the proposal to put a modern detention centre/juvenile jail in this area is ludicrous and shows lack of understanding of the importance of this area.

Contrary to your Q & A, the site is extremely visible from all directions. It is also very close to the Jordan River Farm School and Brighton Primary School. The proposed site is also adjacent to a very large marijuana production and processing plant, a rifle and pistol shooting range and also the significant heritage property "Shene" which is now a major tourist drawcard as one of Tasmania's largest whiskey and Gin distilleries. "Shene" stables are renowned for their significant architecture and are one of the earliest significant sandstone buildings in the area dating back nearly 200 years. They were a staging point for the colonial cavalry.

The Pontville, Brighton and Mangalore areas are all developing quickly as a place for young families. Thereby significant housing development is taking place.

Again contrary to your Q & A, property values in these areas will be affected, particularly those already existing closest to the facility will be severely adversely affected. To suggest otherwise shows a lack of understanding of real estate and your statement has no substance.

Regarding the statement about "stigma attached" and that "there wouldn't be any", [redacted] youth detention facility (Wybra Hall) [redacted] and can assure you that [redacted] the stigma still remains. [redacted] quoting "if you're bad you'll go to Wybra". [redacted]

Will the quote for the next 40 years be "if you're bad.... you'll go to Pontville/Mangalore"?

Just think of the word "Risdon" and what that conjures up for you!

We find it incomprehensible that Wybra Hall was closed in the mid 1980's for exactly the same reasons Ashley detention centre is now being closed.

Nothing has been learnt and history repeats. It is not the physical building that is the issue - it is the culture of cruelty and abuse by some in authority that is the problem. Moving to a new location will not fix this - it's just "moving the furniture".

Insufficient room for our feedback- see second part of this submission (separate document).

PART 2 of our submission as there was insufficient room for the remainder of our comments/feedback.

In regard to escapes - in your own inference, you acknowledge that escapes DO happen - however "Rare".

These escapes will be obviously opportunistic and more than likely happen at night whilst we are asleep in our beds. Escapees will be keen to ransack whatever they can from properties close by (including possible theft of vehicles) to enable their chance of escape.

(Let's just acknowledge the fact that the potential escapees are not in the facility for minor misdemeanors).

It is interesting that you claim "there is no danger to the public" however there is a plan to have boundary fences with "anti-climb features to ensure the safety of the staff, visitors and wider community". Also the reference to the fact that the facility "will require illumination at times for security and safety".

What are you worried about?
What should we be worried about?

As far as "an appropriate buffer" goes which "includes use of vegetation" what is the plan for the majority of it.... concrete walls? razor wire?

We do not understand the reasons given aforementioned, how this site was selected to be on the preferred site list as the only box it seems to tick is that you already own the land. The usual procedure, one would have thought, would be to list all the requirements for a site suitable for that particular project.

This seems to be the opposite of that (even though it's claimed otherwise). It also seems that whoever earmarked this site:
a) does not know the area
b) has no appreciation for the negative impact on the growing community or heritage and tourism

c) has underestimated how the current residents will respond
d) has possibly not even been onsite.

As this submission/discussion process is badly flawed due to notifications being given over not only a short time frame but also over a holiday period as stated previously in this submission, there also appears to have been a very small area of notification focused upon.

We therefore request that this whole process be restarted, or the time frame and area of notifications be extended to the greater area of Pontville, Brighton, Mangalore and surrounds so that a fair opportunity to make informed submissions can be had (taking into account those people who have already made a submission and acknowledging those submissions).

In summation, as you have probably already realised - we will be strongly opposing this proposal.

The Risdon site is the preference with public transport already in place. Also, close proximity to adult Prison to share resources.

Pontville site is near a major road, tourist route and would ruin the Heritage Highway area. Tasmania has so many historical sites, why ruin yet another treasure.

The proposed Brighton Road site is too close to the expanding township of Brighton and may stigmatise a growing area. The only available public transport options would require anyone visiting the facility and reliant on public transport to walk to and from Brighton, several kms. The East Derwent Highway site is better located for public transport, is not close nor likely to be close to a growing township and has closer proximity to the courts, other detention facilities and additional police resources if required.

Your assurances of no local property devaluation are not very assuring so to mitigate this would the government pay the residents in this area compensation for loss of value to their properties? As any future buyer will be put off, by the fact that there is a youth detention centre close by.

One of the other sites is far more suitable to build this detention centre, since it's in an industrial area, away from public living areas and is much more accessible by public transport.

There is enough crime in the area already, we've had a four-wheel bike stolen, a little while back a police car chase ended up in our horse paddock and more recently I had to call the fire brigade, since somebody lit a stolen car and it exploded. Then there are people doing doughnuts and driving like lunatics in broad daylight, while others letting go unauthorised fireworks and at night times regular incidences at the local bus stop occur.

I'm sure a lot of the youths in detention centres are good kids, who just made a bad decision, but I'm also sure, that a lot of these kids are coming from families, of which their parents already lived a life of crime and having people like that regularly traveling through this area, would add to the feel of not feeling safe, for the people of Pontville and surrounding area.

I would not feel safe anymore and worry about our animals and property. We live in [redacted] block around where we live, it would be the perfect place for escapees to try and hide from the police. I regularly [redacted] and would feel every day scared when doing so.

My husband's family had lived here for generations and when there was another correction centre close by, they had regular youths hiding in their outbuildings and at one point had even horses stolen, as the youths tried to escape on horseback. If I would have known, that something like these is planned to be built here, I would have never have moved here.

We used to live for a while up north, close to where the Ashley detention centre used to be and it very regularly happened, that youths would break out, in fact so regularly, that we didn't call it break out, but rather a walk out and we wondered what kind of security was in place.

Pontville is one of Tasmania's last picturesque villages, a bit like Richmond and it would be stained by having a detentions centre so close.

This detention would be close to a whiskey distillery, two gun clubs and a pharmaceutical marijuana plantation, hardly an ideal environment for something like that.
Even though I am only 27 years old I have great memories of growing up in this community of 7030, I'd like to start my own family here and persevere those memories, but I already foresee the effects that will result from this complex. It is shameful that Pontville a statutory historic neighbourhood was given consideration for this, it is up to my generation and future ones to safeguard Tasmania's history. An active shooting range and Tasmanian Botanics are just a few steps from the entrance of your proposed youth establishment are just the start of the concerns and I believe that the law abiding, tax paying citizens and property owners need to have their say in this abhorrent idea and we need to be heard as a community.
Personally, I think the Risdon site looks much more appropriate. The main reason being that the Prison is also here so resources would be nice and close to each other for these sites. It is also closer to Hobart. Mangalore site is located right next to a medical marijuana farm, and the main highway vein from one end of the state to the other. I'm surprised this site is even being considered.
I am not in favour of the centre being built at 466 Brighton Road; the land is currently used to rehabilitate off the track thoroughbreds and Standard breeds.
Brighton Road location is way too close to residential area and two schools. There are backing neighbourhoods onto the property, a primary school two minutes up the road, a high school also being built, and an industrial hemp site right behind it. It seems more ideal a location at East Derwent Highway being away from the road, no neighbouring residents and closer to the CBD and prison.
I have lived in Mangalore for [redacted]. I moved here for a quiet peaceful lifestyle. Building the detention centre will change our way of life living near youth detention centre is not what I want for [redacted] old son to grow with. Please don't build it here in Mangalore. The detainees that will be located at this facility need to be isolated away from the public eye this will also ruin the beauty and serenity of Mangalore.
Cannot understand why Pontville is being considered. Government state there is low housing in the area, but this is not true as the boundary joins onto multiple privately owned properties. Pontville is classed as an Historic Town with many cottages built in the 1830s - 1840s and the Pontville Bridge being built by convicts in the 1840s. When it comes to public transport it is non-existent as all Metro buses stop at Brighton and even then, it is a very limited service to Brighton. Brighton Primary School is roughly only 3klm from the proposed site which many residents deem this to be too close.
I don't agree with the 466 Brighton Road site, the Brighton area is already getting extra government housing sites built near the new Brighton High School site. How much more do we need in this community to lower living standards and house prices in this area. How about providing a multi-purpose regional health centre instead? this is what our fast-growing community needs the most at the moment.
The proposed site at 466 Brighton should not go ahead, because along with the new high school and government housing development on the corner of Brighton and Elderslie Road, this will only set Brighton up to become the new Bridgewater Slum of Tasmania. The houses in Brighton around Elderslie Road are already being sold because of the predicted lower home value prices due to this high school and government housing stage development. We don't even have a decent medical facility or integrated shopping complex plus sufficient transportation links out here let alone other diverse; sporting, recreational and entertainment facilities to keep kids off the streets and families happily integrated and/or occupied in this area.
I don't believe Pontville is a suitable area for a detention centre. 1. It has no public transport access; all public transport will need to access through private bus and transport. 2. Its location is directly linked to a high population area of Brighton, which was noted as a key indicator of something that was to be avoided. 3. All movement to the potential site means that residents of the facility will be close to retail shopping, primary and high schools, pubs, sporting clubs and wineries which go against the said requirements. 4. With a closer and denser population nearby, then the East Derwent site, if residents do leave the facilities

without permission. It places a higher population at risk. 5. With a youth population that is higher than that of the East Derwent Site, it could pose potential risks to this age group.
Brighton is not a good site for this! It is a family-oriented suburb with a good background! We do not need a detention centre near us! It is too close to suburban areas. Think again!
I do not see the appeal of the Pontville facility as the suburb of Brighton is only growing as will need to reach the point of spreading towards Pontville/Mangalore area, the Risdon zone on that side of the road has never functionally been used for anything and it's still in the right zone for the current inmates around the cove.
As a resident of Mangalore, we do not want this facility at Pontville. This will impact our community in a negative way. This is a quiet peaceful community, and we want to keep it for generations to enjoy.
If I wanted to walk out my front door every day and look at a prison, I would have brought a property at Risdon Vale and saved myself a lot of money. After reading all the information I feel like you are prioritising the inmates and their visitors need over the law-abiding property owners and residents in the area. I also have safety concerns with an active shooting range being only a few hundred meters away from proposed boundary and the Tasmanian Botanics a few hundred meters in the other direction. Is the smell of the marijuana going to set off triggers knowing they can smell it but can't get hold of it? I will be attending the information session on Saturday to voice the rest of my concerns. I look forward to hearing from you.
Brighton residents do not want this in the Brighton area.
I strongly object to a detention centre being built at Mangalore, people's homes are their dream that they work so hard for I do not want my property to be devalued because of a detention centre in the area. Risdon vale residents mostly have received their homes for nothing so if you are going to waste the money building a new one when we already have a youth detention centre that you're wanting to shut due to abuse, won't this happen anywhere they are? Why don't you build it at Risdon vale?
Don't believe Pontville is the best place for this detention centre. Grounds are being used for good now, there are plenty of land that is uninhabited. Has the old Claremont primary site been considered? It's an eyesore and the only activity there is vandalism and rats.
Pontville is a heritage site and full of heritage buildings. The community has young children, families, and elderly in the community. This will not make them feel safe. Cause people to move and reduce the value of housing. I don't want it on my doorstep. But you selfish humans don't care because it isn't on yours. I don't want it build in Pontville. It will be on my doorstep. I will not feel safe, and it will cause issues in the community. This will not fix the current issues with the youth. Use the facility that's already build and upgrade it. Bunch of selfish humans. You wouldn't like it on your doorstep but don't care if it's on someone else's.

In favour of Risdon site
It makes sense to have the centre in Risdon Vale and not in Brighton.
Preferred site - East Derwent Highway, Risdon.
It would make more sense to have the facility in the Risdon area. Due to already having the Risdon Prison in the area...
I'm of the opinion that the preferred site should be East Derwent Highway as its proximity to the other correction facility and the area has less houses around and custodial staff can work across both sites. cheers Ian

The proposed site at Risdon makes the most sense. I am strongly against the centre being built at the proposed Mangalore site as it will heavily impact on the heritage status of the area, as well as working against tourism efforts along the Heritage Highway. Thank you for your consideration of this.
I strongly believe a facility of this nature should not be impacting upon prime acreage, farming land and quiet communities who want a safe, quiet living lifestyle but should be kept in close proximity to the prison and existing facilities.
I think it should be built in Risdon Vale it is close to the prison where they could access facilities do work experience be re-educated so hopefully, they don't go back into society and do it again. I don't think building it next to a HTC farm is a good idea right near a highway.
I think the facility should be built in Risdon as it would be near Risdon gaol.
972 East Derwent Highway Risdon is a good spot for it.
I believe Risdon Vale would be the best fit for this centre.
The Risdon location would be more appropriate. The location would be less visible from roads, the Pontville location would be visible from the main highway in and out of Hobart, as well as being in close proximity to Tasmanian Botanics.
It would make perfect sense to have this facility on a Metro bus route, as well as in close proximity to the main Risdon prison. Being in such a central place like East Derwent Hwy Risdon would also help when transportation of youth from courts, for any medical emergencies as well as any specialist/youth case workers having easier access. So many offending youth come from disadvantaged families, so putting it 30kms out of the CBD will only add to visiting issues etc. These kids need to know family/friends can visit regularly give support etc, this all adds to better rehabilitation/outcomes for the youth.
The site at Risdon would better suited but also, I believe there should be local employees not mainland recruits and I honestly believe that there should be staff with lived experiences as well they have a lot of knowledge and experience within the industry.
I think the location at East Derwent Highway is much more suitable then at Brighton Road. There are many many houses surrounding this area and with Brighton still growing, we have a lot going on here and I imagine many more houses and subdivisions will go up. Personally I feel having a youth detention centre in this growing area is a bad idea. At least with where you're looking at near the East Derwent Highway there are not many surrounding properties at all.
Preferred site - East Derwent Highway, Risdon.
I think the East Derwent Highway site is a great option. It will be more accessible for staff. I know it isn't actually far out, but Brighton would put a lot of staff off working there, whereas East Derwent is quite central. Also, there are some bus services running past, important for maintaining connection with family and community. At this site the detention centre could partner with Risdon Prison pharmacy, which is what we currently do at [redacted] to manage our medications. There will no doubt be nursing care required for 20 young people - so logistics like this are important. If possible, with the design and fence, the young people could even have a water view, which is good for sensory modulation. At WLC there are at least views of surrounding trees and hills which is good for consumers. I imagine the Brighton site is flatter.
I think the East Derwent would be most suitable. The new proposed additions to assist youth is long overdue and I really hope it does help this vulnerable community in making better life choices. Having lived experience, I know how bad life currently is for these kids. I hope these changes are built and implemented quickly and don't take 5+ years to be opened.

I think the East Derwent Highway site would be best because it's located closer to the city. I feel will have less impact to local residence. It also would be easier for transport and closer to Risdon prison. I feel the residents in the area chose to live close by the current facility, whereas Brighton residents are already established and not knowing beforehand the impact a facility such as this will have on the local community.
The site near Risdon Vale seems the most appropriate, close to Risdon prison.
972 East Derwent Highway as the transport network is already in place, it's close to the city for both workers and visitors, and close to the correctional facility already established.
The detention facility would be better placed at Risdon, keeping the facilities in one area. Placing it at Brighton would drive property prices down. It would also make it more difficult for families to visit their youths as the public transport access isn't very good. If the aim of the detention facility is to rehabilitate these children, they need access to the love and support of their families. There is already quite a lot of infrastructure happening in the Brighton area without adding extra stress on the roads, which are terrible enough.
Risdon would be the best location being closer to the city and the very large growing populations in Kingston and Sorell. Brighton is too far for families to travel to see their loved ones.
Risdon would be my preference, closer to frequent public transport options for visitation, etc.
972 East Derwent Highway Risdon site, being close to the Risdon prison facility, where they should be able to offer support if ever needed. Risdon is closer to hospital and all other support facilities that may be needed.
I would prefer this to be at the East Derwent Highway, Risdon site.
Too close to gin and medical drug facilities at Brighton. Risdon area has public transport for families and is the preferred site for all.
The Risdon site is my preference for the new facility.
East Derwent Highway will be the best location. Public transport already drives past this location, it does not at Pontville and will require new services to be implemented. It is also close to the prison providing opportunities for those from northern parts of the state to visit both facilities in the day if the need to do so. Not many houses to affect in either EDH or Pontville locations, unlike Goodwood and providing a youth detention centre near one of the biggest cannabis facilities in the state at Pontville just doesn't look good from any point. Both Pontville and EDH areas will be of similar Aboriginal heritage issues to consider, and Goodwood just doesn't have a decent buffer zone from Army, Racetrack, or stadium with plans for expansion. So, in closing EDH really is the best location of the three proposed.
East Derwent Highway would seem a good site for the New Youth Detention site. Easy access to services that might be needed including hospital and public transport. Staffing will be a big issue and this site would be central for many people and maybe in the future an ability to utilise staff from Risdon Prison.
The new detention centre would be best situated on the Risdon sight because it is closer to a variety of supporting organisations and businesses.
East Derwent Highway would be the better option, as not close to a gun club nor the cannabis growing business. Also, the East Derwent Highway site is close to the Risdon Prison for coming-of-age inmates to be moved with less stress, and also could share resources if required.
The Risdon site is the standout best option. It is closer to the southern adult facility. Making it easier/closer for opportunities for staff to work between both facilities. Being close to each other resident transfers to and from court etc would be more time and cost efficient. Most importantly It is a lot more accessible with public transport, family support is vital for rehabilitation with youth, this reason alone makes Risdon the only choice.
I think the detention centre should be placed near the road on prison, then they can see where they would end up.

I support the site at East Derwent Hwy. This site has better access to public transport and closer to the CBD. Brighton municipality is a fast-growing suburb and the Brighton Council Plan shows further growth for the area. This site would be within approx 3 km of Brighton Primary with enrolments over 500 and the new Brighton High School. The Brighton site is also within close proximity to Tasmanian Botanics (medicinal cannabis company). The aroma that is emitted to the surrounding area would be detrimental to those going through rehabilitation for addiction. I support the East Derwent Hwy, Risdon site.

In favour of Pontville site
466 Brighton Road would be the best suited site
The site at Brighton would be preferable as whilst still within a short distance to the city it is further away from already established residential areas minimising potential risk, increased worry, anxiety and mental health concerns to nearby communities, a lot of whom are elderly, disabled and vulnerable people. Unfortunately, the youth of today, the minority of whom would be held in this detention facility, are not the same as children of previous generations, they lack a lot of very basic values and have no consideration for others right to be safe. If these children need to be held in detention facilities, then the community would prefer they were not in close proximity to established residential areas as some of these youth do present a significant risk to the general population and the safety of the law abiding community should be paramount.
I prefer the new youth detention to be located at 466 Brighton Road. Thank you very much for your time and considering.
I welcome the Tasmanian Government announcement of the closure to the Ashley Detention Centre and possible move to Pontville. My opinion is based on empirical and strength based initiatives to reduce the high recidivism and cost to the Tasmanian Government and community. We know that there is link between youth detention and adult imprisonment rates. Unfortunately Tasmanian compared with nation figures punches above its weight with recidivism rates at 66.5 % compare with the national rate of 59.5 %. These figures are obtained from the Justice Reform Initiative (JRI). The Tasmanian Government must address the causes of crime, contradicting the 'Tough on Crime ' rhetoric from Government. I propose that any facility function as a trauma informed rehabilitating model to address youth offending; for the purposes of retuning them to the community. The Tasmanian Government must address these issues, • Links between Child Protection and the Justice system (Parens Patriae). • The Tasmanian Government look into family group conferencing • De-incarceration of youth from entering the Justice system, through problem solving courts, such as Drug orders and mental health orders for less serious crime. • Suspended and non-custodial sentences. • Target intervention to reduce family violence. • Protect youth at risk of homelessness and invest in primary prevention programs to address the root cause of offending behaviour. • Raise the age of criminal responsibility from 10 to 14 years of age. • Decriminalise substance use and dependency. • Detention of youth as last resort.

• Youth receive treatment in small group therapy. • Youth that have been exposed to the Criminal Justice System by allocated with a case manager been responsible for their holistic needs. • More support with local community centres. • Engagement of families and community network modelled with desistance paradigm. And finally, • Any investment in infrastructure correlates with a through care model where the centre becomes a place of rehabilitation, case management and productive centre for up skilling youth, educational to target reintegration. Address their mental health. The centre must accord with a human rights framework. All detention infrastructure must accommodate a community bases system, such as dynamic security practises and reintegration guarantee, by linking community with the centre and vice versa. Pontville is an area which can offer safe and therapeutic environment. I thank you for your time.
I think Brighton would be a amazing spot for it. Away from the hustle of bigger towns and I like to think the Brighton community as a welcoming community.
Brighton site as preferred option.
I support the government's proposed site at Pontville for the new youth justice facility. The new facility will provide economic and community opportunities through employment, infrastructure and services. My only concerns are around security and community safety based on the current statistics from Ashley Youth Detention Centre with the number of youth escaping custody.
I believe Brighton would be a better location being further out of the main areas and thorough fares
I think the right site for this is the Pontville site. It's a wasted resource and it's that bit out so that the infrastructure of the bridge etc won't be affected by this decision
In deciding between the two sites, an important factor is that the new youth detention facility should be physically separate from adult correctional facilities. This is important to ensure that it retains a distinct approach that is specific and appropriate to the different needs and rights of the children and young people who will be held in the facility, including their rights/needs for access to education, trauma-informed/therapeutic approach, continuity of family relationships, etc. If the facility is close to the Risdon correctional complex, there will be temptation to share staffing, facilities and other resources in ways that could undermine the critical distinction between adult correctional services vs juvenile detention services. In particular, the use of corrective services staff would bring different (harsher) approaches and mentality into the youth justice facility, which would not be appropriate. Additionally, if the facilities are close together, Risdon may be seen as the place to which young people "graduate" from detention. This could undermine efforts to intervene in a young person's life to prevent them from continuing a trajectory towards adult offending and imprisonment. For these reasons I believe the Brighton site should be selected rather than the Risdon site.
I prefer the new youth detention to be located at 466 Brighton Road. Thank you very much for your time and considering.
I do believe the area on Brighton Road would suit better as I feel the other sites being so close to the prison would not help mentally of the youth.
After looking at the proposed sites it is my opinion that the Risdon site is not a good choice and that the Brighton site would offer better future development. I/We already have a prison in Risdon that is both unsightly and at times causes issues for the local

community(escapees) 2/ this site is too close to a major historical massacre site, which should be protected. 3/ the Risdon site is too close to the indigenous centre which already is dealing with a damaged past and does not need to see itself as a pathway to prison. 4/ the public transport system is not efficient once over the Bowen Bridge from any direction. 5/ the Risdon road from the Bowen bridge to the Derwent highway road about is already very difficult to navigate without further traffic entering and exiting. 6/ people do actually live in this area and are already dealing with the activities of disenfranchised youth and adults. Ashley detention didn't work because of systematic disruption, not because of where it was, are you just going to move the problem. The Brighton site is a much better site because: It is neutral historically. It has more land. It is away from built up areas It can be seen from all sides It is away from the prison It is away from cultural sites Public transport can be direct from Hobart or the midlands.

Neutral
Happy to see young people supported at either the Brighton or Risdon sites. No matter the site, please protect these children from further harm when they enter the facility.
1) I think the decision regarding where to establish these facilities needs to be contextualised by including the planned model of care that will be used at each facility. 2) It would be good to have a North-West site.
None of the sites are suitable, none have public transport, all will be seen and heard by neighbours, and the Risdon site will diminish the house prices of neighbouring Otago Bay. What about the old detention centre in Brighton?
Because most of the proposed sites are rural or semi-rural, they lend themselves to a gaol farm operation, which has the advantage, not only of being inherently productive but also of some training opportunities and the chance of a glimpse of a different lifestyle to that which detainees have previously experienced. If this idea does not find favour a well-resourced trade training operation which incorporates an employment placement service at the end of the sentence, would also be effective.
This is not a good spot for this development. This should be built in a more remote area.
I think that there is a need for rehabilitation centres rather than jails for young offenders. However, my concern is: are they to be secure or drop in and out on a daily basis? Both of the proffered sites are very close to young families and new residential areas. Surely the Dowsing Point site would have been a better choice as it is light industrial with very few residents. I assume it is the old army base. Clearly, many people will not want this facility close to their homes.
Both proposed sites are unsuitable in my opinion, particularly the site on the East Derwent Highway. They are close to residential areas and would produce several deleterious effects. The East Derwent site is flanked by two suburbs, one of which is in the high and the other in the low socioeconomic bracket. Neither group deserves this on their doorstep. A semi-rural site would be far more desirable.

The site between Portville and Mangalore would not be a good choice unless a major change was made to the public transport system as it is very lacking a does not proceed past Brighton with the exception of Redline, but they are a service to Launceston and rarely stop along the way.
I don't believe the Brighton site would be suitable as sits next to a highway which is accessed by tourists heading into Hobart. I'm sure that seeing a facility like this is not ideal for Hobart tourism. I also don't think being so close to vehicle pollution is ideal for those that would be residing there. The site would not have services such as sewerage and water so a lot of infrastructure would be required. I don't believe access is that ideal either as it is right next to a highway. Brighton is a growing community, and I don't think this type of facility will attract families to the area if anything it will detract as well as devalue our properties. I've invested a lot of time, money, and mental health to get my property. The reason I settled here was due to the quiet semi-rural life it offers. I certainly don't want to be living or exposing my son to this type of facility. And if it goes ahead, I would have to consider moving out of the area altogether. I will not risk my son's safety or mine by living near a correctional facility. It is also far too close to family-orientated sporting. It is hard enough to get people to come to participate and volunteers as it is without these types of facilities coming into the picture. There is a graveyard nearby at the Brighton site which in turn would be something the residents of this type of facility don't need to be exposed to either - we are talking about young people children who may or may not have mental issues. We need to be mindful of these things. The Risdon site I don't believe is right either. The government would be taking up valuable waterfront land - for what a gloried jail for young people! Yeah, I don't think they'd be keen to leave seeing they would have perfect views of the water. This is not a holiday camp/hotel seriously! Again, I wouldn't think there are any services for water or sewerage. It's beside a highway yet again. Not great for traffic flow as it is let alone having a facility like this. Maybe the Dowsing Point site is better. It's already established with buildings, fencing, and security so would think there wouldn't be too many costs involved to do a few adjustments to turn it into a proper correctional facility. The issues with all the current sites are they are far too close to things like bus transport, highways, houses, etc in the event they may try to leave you would be making it easier. I think the best option is to find acreage outside the major towns whereby the facility is set up as a hobby farm to help facilitate these people back into reality, learn life skills, etc. they need to be away from the hustle and bustle of life so they can't see or hear what is happening outside the compound. Risdon Prison is one ugly landscape that no one wants to see and get some of us to have to drive passed it on a daily basis. You can't visit Risdon Brook Dam without looking straight at the eye sore! And the government wants to add another one in close vicinity. Stop and think about it. You need to look at the cost of the infrastructure that needs to go in. What effects it has on the environment, what will it do to locals close by, will it devalue properties, and is the community family-based? Who is pushing the project to be in one of these suggested sites? What safety will be in place for the community? I'm probably wasting my time even writing this as I know the government didn't listen to locals when we made suggestions about where the Brighton high school should go. You will just do what you want and not consider our feelings and thoughts. Surely there is a land out towards Buckland/Woodsdale/Fingal. We've pulled down so many little towns like Poatina Village, Waddamana, Tarraleah. These places could easily have housed a correctional centre by using existing facilities. We sold the immigration camp at Brighton to now house the growing of Marijuana when you could have easily used it for a correctional facility. But just another waste of government money.
Yes, I'm all for this new centre, much needed
I feel the property near the Bowen Bridge would be most appropriate due to its proximity to suburban housing areas and businesses, secondary to that, Brighton for similar reasons.
I, my wife, and my mother do not agree with the Tasmanian Government's decision, which was made in haste and appeared to rely on people's opinions based on misinformation and woke ideas to close the Ashley Youth Detention Centre. Why not fix what you already have and not cave into the small minority of people that make "noise" about subjects like this? If parents and children were more responsible for their actions, they would not be put into these facilities - as you would already be aware Ashley Detention Centre only

houses children whose parent or parents are unable to deal with the situation they are faced with and is a last resort to attempt to cease self-harm to not only themselves but the family and community. We see this as only moving the problem elsewhere. I wonder how the people who are pushing for the closure of Ashley would feel if the decision was to put one of the new facilities next door to their property or better still move the problematic children into their own homes and see if they would feel comfortable sleeping at night. This is a very insidious problem which we feel the government relied on the wrong collection of people to deal with this situation. Typical of the government to throw money at these situations which never ever fixes the problem - it only creates more expense to the "real" taxpayers who are not public servants - but as usual, it is those already on public service salaries that make decisions such as this having no due care or reality of the whole picture which will unfold in the future.
We already have a Youth Detention Centre and moving it isn't going to solve the problems associated with the current one. Please spend the money and refurbish what we have and employ the correct professional people and monitor the care and rehabilitation process and listen to issues raised and correct them. Is today's Tasmanian Government going to make the same mistakes over and over like previous Governments and like the Catholic, Protestant Churches and move the problems elsewhere? Taxpayers cannot retire until we are nearly six feet under because the country can't afford it but the Government thinks we can afford frivolous spending and wasted facilities. Let's fix and improve what we have as millions have already been spent and if it is cheaper to move it then we have to ask the question "Why?".
This is a huge parcel of land that could be used for something historical and more in keeping with the area. Traffic increases is just one reason to say no to this Detention Centre.
A lot of your answers to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) seem to be based on where the location is now. I feel bringing it closer to areas like Bridgewater and Gagebrook is going to cause ongoing chaos. Which is limited at the moment due to Ashley's being located where it is. I also feel that to only accommodate 20 youths at a time is ridiculous, the youth crime rate is going up. I feel the money should include room or potential for a boot camp style program that youth could be sent to before they end up in the actual detention centre. You know prevention first.
The building is not the problem (apart from the revolving front door), it's the lack of training of the staff to contribute to a model that encourages participation by all the stakeholders. The culture of the administrators must also change. In saying that, I don't mean to treat the "transgressors" as holiday guests but to rule with a firm but fair hand without abuse. I recognise that some of the "guests" have no respect for authority so will need to be handled by suitably qualified staff. Respect should be taught at home, so some sessions that include the parents may be beneficial. Housing the same problem in a new building will not make the issue go away.
Stupid place to put it.
The Pontville site is located within 500 metres of Australia's largest producer of medicinal cannabis. It can be seen clearly, and the smell of cannabis is quite strong in this area. It would be a source of great interest from your residents I suspect.
We are against the facility being built in this location.
As a resident of Old Beach, I am interested in learning more about this development. I don't have a specific position on the project at this stage but would like to be kept informed. Thank you.
1. With the Bowen Bridge a main "artery" for Hobart traffic, building works, and a state government facility would greatly impact an increase of vehicles along a one-way highway. 2. The suburb of Risdon's image of a safe community has improved over the years despite the Correctional Facility existence. Could another correctional facility see a decline/detrimental effect on the housing prices around Risdon/Otago?
Waste of beautiful land that can be used for better projects.

This is an opportunity to include some much-needed systemic change. Place-based supports and evidence-based practise are vital in the development of this program. Earnest, respectful community connections. Ruling out early mental health and neurological issues that have been unsupported or exasperated by the lack of current system practices needs to be included in the framework. With diagnosis leading to ODD behaviours from comorbidity and a lack of community partnership led by qualified place-based services, the issue will only ever be a Band-Aid without meaningful change. Thank you, and I am happy to discuss further in process of collating data for our organisation in this matter in [redacted].
No, we don't want this!
As I'm a close resident to one of the nominated places being looked at there are a few things I'd like verified: Who is going to compensate me for the loss on the valuation of my property? Will I get compensated for my lifestyle change? (I moved out here to get away from infrastructure and I don't want to look at a revolting building I like hills and trees and animals to look at) Who is going to pay for new fences etc to be built? Are the residents that like nearby going to be contacted and have any say on the facility ? Is the facility going to be built near anyone who came up with where it is to be built ? Why is a new facility needed when there is the old one? What a huge waste of government's money. This government has a lot to answer for and I'm sure at the next election there will most certainly be a huge change. Why weren't the councils included in the initial and continuing consultation?
Absolutely astounded that you would consider building a detention centre so close to residential properties, not only would this be close to residents it will considerably devalue all homes in the area. The houses built in this area are high quality properties who is going to compensate all residents in the area for dramatically reducing their home values. We do not approve and object to this proposal proceeding any further.
Our small community being partly rural does not offer any area for a detention centre this area is centralised and have enough issues with neighbouring suburbs already causing chaos and damage.
Like everyone else in the community, we are concerned about having the new youth detention facility in our municipality, there are many reasons for me personally not wanting it near where I live. I'm not going to provide my reasons as I'm unsure as to who will get to see them but I'm sure you'd already be aware of them as all us locals seem to be saying we have the same worries about it!
Dowsing Point is definitely not a suitable site due to proximity of residential area as well as the young families residing in this area. The proposed site is also used for cadet training throughout the year and has also arsenal stores underground. Please find elsewhere more suitable.
How is just behind the MyState Arena away from schools? What about Montrose Bay High School? That would be within 2km? Not happy with it being in Dowsing Point/Glenorchy. This is very close to my house.

GET INVOLVED Email Box

Opposed to Risdon site
I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident in very close proximity, I do not want this facility to be built in our area. This is a local and family oriented residential only area. Key Rejections: • Stigma associated with perceived proximity to Risdon Vale Detention Facility is critically detrimental to the youth rehabilitation program. • Inappropriate location • Risdon Cove is a significantly important Tasmanian historic site.

- Proposed site of Risdon Cove Youth Detention Facility directly borders Risdon Cove Aboriginal land.
- Aboriginal Children's Centre in close proximity.
- Otago/Risdon is a family focused residential only community.

The proposed detention facility is an inappropriate and poorly considered use of scarcely available land that shows no respect for our community or its future direction and development. It will damagingly redefine our community. Otago was voted 1st in the "Top 20 Australian Suburbs for Families 2023" by The Property Tribune. Our community also has significant concerns surrounding the public consultation processes! In the interest of transparency, we request the public consultation report be publicly released for our review and comment.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available. I am unable to see any positives with the proposed being built in Otago Bay.

With the vast landscape of Tasmania I feel there are many more suitable locations. The construction of this facility should not proceed in this area. I feel it to be very disrespectful to our Tasmanian Aboriginals and the importance of their land which is within a stone throw of this facility. Otago Bay is a quiet family-oriented suburb where I spent the majority of my youth, and my parents still reside.

I respectfully ask you to not build the facility here and build it in a more appropriate location.

To whom it may concern. My issues with the proposed youth detention facilities at East Derwent Highway:

Concerns:

1. Nil transparency on how site was chosen.

2. Nil public consultation (found out by accident that there was any kind of proposal) which means there is very little time to investigate.

3. Impacts on traffic. We already have problems with getting out of [redacted] due to increased traffic. It's a game of Russian ruler some days to go right. (Needing to cross traffic).

4. We already have issues with the Bowen bridge congestion and God forbid when the Tasman Bridge goes down the Bowen bridge comes to a standstill.

5. Conditions of the current road around East Derwent Highway are already dangerous. With limited places emergency vehicles can safely pass.

6. The map of the centre backs onto the aboriginal centre. School groups visit often. Possibly seen as disrespectful to the aboriginal community. What are you suggesting that the centre is between the prison and a youth detention centre? Mm.

What does this say to a historically significant area. How does this pay homage to our ancestors?

Not to mention has this area been checked out for aboriginal artefacts, it was an area aboriginal communities would have lived in.

7. The information addressing concerns re question around crime rates, reducing property values, escapes, environmental impacts appear to be merely statements I cannot see any evidence of research or statistics that support what your statements are very much dumbed down. There is no detail, just statements.

8. Is the land for the detention site owned by state government or is it been acquired? Where is the

transparency?

9. Where are the environmental impact studies?

10. What is the model for the centre?? (The actual building) What is it going to look like? How is it going to "blend into the area so it is not an eye sore?

11. There may be up to 20 inmates. Yes, the idea is to keep them in. So, escapes are rare? What statistics do you have on their peers and families that come to "visit "and increased crime rates. I'm not trying to be a bigot, but I am concerned.

12. You speak of a new model of care for these troubled youth. Why do you need a new centre? Surely a model of care is not based on bricks and mortar. It should be about safe staffing, trained staff. Programs of excellence. Why not put your energies and money focusing on that rather than moving centres? I.e., Ashley, I do understand the issues attached to the name. Put resources into prevention and education.

13. Why have no government representatives been available to answer concerns? Not a good look.

Dear Clarence City Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed new youth detention facility at 972 East Derwent Highway. As a resident of the area, I have serious concerns about the impact that such a facility would have on our community.

Firstly, I believe that the construction of a youth detention facility in this location would have a negative impact on property values in the area. The presence of such a facility could make potential buyers hesitant to invest in properties in the area, which could ultimately result in a decline in property values.

Furthermore, I am concerned about the potential for escapes from the facility, which could put residents in the surrounding area at risk. Additionally, the bright lights and high-security fences that would be required for such a facility would create an environment that feels unsafe and uninviting for our community.

As a resident of [redacted] Otago, I strongly urge the Clarence City Council to not approve the proposed youth detention facility at 972 East Derwent Highway. I believe that there are other locations that would be more suitable for such a facility, and that the potential negative impacts on our community simply cannot be ignored.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Attention : [redacted] of Youth Justice Tasmania

Good morning [redacted] ,
I recall that you and I met on the 12th of April at Risdon Community Centre and I raised the above and shared with you the attached letter from the Premier to me of 8th March 2023 in reply to my request that the building of a possible 4 Lane Highway from Grass Tree Hill Roundabout to the Bowen Bridge for which the corridor was set aside in 1980 should be acted upon .

I draw your attention to paragraph 4 in which he says that "The DSG is currently investigating whether duplicating the East Derwent Highway to four lanes between Grasstree Hill Road roundabout and the Bowen Bridge would be feasible."

Having looked at the detailed site footprint for the proposed Youth Justice development Risdon, I am greatly concerned that if built there it would impinge greatly on what I understand is part of the provision for EDH

Corridor. I expect that your department will no doubt bear this in mind as it makes its deliberations. Thank you for time and interest with this issue.
We are joining forces here in our area of Otago and Otago Bay. We live in [redacted] and have done for over [redacted] years. We object vigorously to any Youth Detention Centre proposed now or in the future for anywhere in our community. We reside in a peaceful place here in Otago, and we object strongly to any development of any type being constructed. There is plenty of land out west, go look there. We do not have Crime in our area and want it to stay that way.
I have reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either youth in your justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As a local resident I do not want this facility to be built in our area.
The vast majority of the residents (and our members) that live in the community of the proposed Risdon Cove youth detention facility site (Otago, Risdon, etc), categorically reject and oppose building any version of this facility in our local family-oriented residential-only area. Key Points: • Stigma associated with perceived proximity to Risdon Vale detention facility is critically detrimental to the youth rehabilitation program. • Inappropriate location to maximise the flexibility of site for rehabilitation outcomes both present and emerging. • Risdon Cove is a significantly important Tasmanian historic site. • Proposed site of Risdon Cove Youth Detention Facility directly borders Risdon Cove Aboriginal land. • Aboriginal Children's Centre in close proximity. • Exposed, elevated and inclined land visible to: o Derwent river marine traffic, particularly high-volume tourism traffic services by the MONA ferries. o Hobart's main high-volume arterial Brooker highway o Bowen bridge high-volume arterial traffic o large parts of several western-shore suburbs • Critical traffic bottleneck area and already a site of frequent accidents. Potential risks: o Likelihood of motor vehicle deaths by increasing complexity of an already poorly designed point of intersection. o Impact to essential eastern-shore / western-shore primary connection. This alone will to some degree impact tens of thousands, increasing into the future and reducing opportunity for remediation. • Otago / Risdon is a family focused residential only community. The proposed detention facility is an inappropriate and poorly considered use of scarcely available land that shows no respect for our community or its future direction and development. It will damagingly redefine our community. Otago was voted 1st in the "Top 20 Australian Suburbs for Families 2023" by The Property Tribune. Our community also has significant concerns surrounding the public consultation processes including: • Modification to available documentation including deletion of previous information and lack of transparent version control • Scarce availability of information (e.g. no site plans or even concepts or information surrounding how sites are selected or assessed) • Poorly executed public consultation and notification • Timing and organisation of public consultation period (requiring the community to notify that the period was only 3.5 weeks instead of the notified 6 weeks). • General transparency In the interests of transparency, we request the public consultation report be publicly released for our review and comment.

The residents of the Otago and Risdon community are unable to identify any benefits for our local community and recommend the government conduct a new "desktop assessment" to include local community benefit as an additional assessment criterion.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident I do not want this facility to be built in our area.

According to the Tasmanian Planning Scheme a rural zoning should be applied to a lot of 40ha or more.

As such the zoning of the land for the proposed site in Otago seems to be incorrect as the land area at this location is only 11.2ha. Since the using rural land for a youth detention centre is discretionary, and the land in question does not meet the Tasmanian planning scheme requirements for rural zoning, I suggest this site is unsuitable and should be removed from consideration.

I & [redacted] Otago strongly object to a youth detention centre being located in Otago.

Below are some questions you may want to ask, and my answers. Are you happy to have the youth detention facility in your suburb?
No.

Do you want us to build a youth detention facility in your suburb?
No.

Is this the best place to build a youth detention facility? If not, why?
No. It's a family suburb with only houses. We had to drive out of our suburb, through another suburb, then into another suburb just to get to a community centre so we could even talk about this proposed facility. It's totally unreasonable to build it in a suburb that only has houses and no other facilities, it becomes defining. Further, [redacted] (your imported expert who will run the youth rehabilitation program) said at the public information session when asked why it couldn't be built on the Risdon Vale prison site that "it needs to be as far away as possible to avoid primary school to secondary school" stigma. Your own fact sheet about the site notes the Otago site as being close to the Risdon Vale Prison as an advantage! Those in law enforcement that I have spoken to have also commented that they believe the site is too close and will be perceived as being nearby the Risdon Vale Prison as ultimately an extension of that facility and will therefore be damaging to the intentions of the program.

Where should we build it if not in your local residential community?
I don't know, you're the government. It's your job to determine a location that is suitable and can be harmoniously integrated with a community. I've read that the guys in Deloraine are keen to keep Ashley and the jobs in their local area. Perhaps you could build one somewhere nearby up there so that you can still knock down Ashley to bury all the bad publicity from it. The assessment of the "one hundred" sites that was done should have had community integration and benefit as a significantly weighted selection criterion. If Deloraine wants it, there will be other places that do as they will see it as an advantage to their area - you just need to build that into your initial broad scope site assessment with heavy weighting. After full review of the scarce info, you have provided I do not believe it will be a good thing and I do not want it and I have not spoken to anyone else in the community that has said it will be a good thing and/or wants it.

Do you believe we have been concerned with community impact with this project?
No. The way the public consultation has been conducted has been significantly lacking. It was poorly advertised which ate up time at the start requiring the community to self-advertise to all residents then requiring the community to notify the government that their 6-week process was in fact only 3.5 weeks. The 3.5 weeks also had easter in the middle. Noetic's Youth Justice Options Paper (Oct 2016) really clarified for

me how the government views local community with respect to such a project. Of the 86 pages in the paper, only 3 references to local community were made when considering the options. They were all noted as "risks" (to the project) and used the same phrasing: "local communities may be resistant to a new secure facility in their area". I can't understand why the government feels the need to impose the project on a community that does not want it and just treats the community as "resistant". A place that wants it (that is on-balance suitable for the project) can be found if you look, you just need to ask first. If you are listening, this is the key take-away.

Do you believe it will create jobs in your area?
No. Of all the people I've spoken to, no one wants a job there. You will be taking away jobs from Deloraine so it's a zero-sum result anyway and if anything, it is robbing jobs from a regional area and concentrating them back into the capital city. You may say that it creates demolition and construction jobs, I say you could spend that money on the kids. $40mil additional budget can surely get you world-leading results with 10-12 recidivist youth. It's likely to attract a lot of specialised talent into the state and you may even be able to get some international attention from it for being world leading.

Do you believe property prices will remain unaffected?
N. This generalised claim is inapplicable to a suburb like Otago that will be changed overnight from being a spacious picturesque suburb to "the place with the youth prison". The closer the houses are (several within less than 500m) the more impact on housing prices and land value for our particular suburb in this instance. Your fact sheet for the site also mentioned that it wasn't really near houses, the guys living nearby strongly disagree.

Are you worried about your safety?
Of course. It's unreasonable for the government to downplay or trivialise people's sense of security and safety. Old people live alone in this community. There are women and children that are also home alone at times - my wife and daughters included while I'm away working. Probability wise, the risk to personal safety in one's own home will categorically increase, particularly those living closer to the youth detention facility. It's just a bad idea building this type of facility in suburbia only to impact the entire suburb's sense of personal safety. The people that feel least secure may be driven out of the community because you have changed its fabric overnight. Also, it's insulting to commission a report that only offers local community a fleeting mention to say they're a risk of being resistive. Yes, you have 10-12 kids that other programs can't accommodate, but you also need to balance the direct and felt impacts on a surrounding community of 1000.

Have you told us all your concerns?
No, there are more. The intersection and road are a problem. The access to the site is a problem. This site has historic significance and that is a problem - particularly to build this type of facility on. The wildlife is likely a problem. The visibility of the site because of its position, elevation and inclination is definitely a problem. A significant amount of eastern shore residents will get to have sustained contemplation of the incarceration of kids as they look at the facility slowly growing bigger in their view for the duration of 1.5kms as they cross the bridge. The tens of thousands of people living on the hills of Moonah, Glenorchy, Montrose, Rosetta, and Chigwell will be looking at a grass field turn into a kid's prison and be contemplating it.

A significant proportion of the 400,000 MONA tourists that arrive and leave by ferry will also be able to spend quite some time looking at and contemplating Tasmania's incarceration of children as they travel by. It's a bad look. Which brings me to that concern, it not only looks bad, it is bad. Spend $4mil on each of the kids instead of a building. I'm sure you can sufficiently divert them for that money.

We are long time, in fact forever Liberal voters. No more, as well as many others in this neighbourhood. Your lack of empathy with your voters, has shown its ugliest head with the decision you and your government made without any consultation with the residents of the area you are planning in building a Youth Detention Centre. What happened to democracy? What happened to open and honest communication with the public who put you and your colleagues in office? We are very much, totally against this project you arbitrarily decided should go here.

Hope this email and many others you will receive will have you consider other areas that are open to this project. Don't ruin our neighbourhood and our retirement peace and quiet. Would you consider building this centre near your neighbourhood?

Please stop this nonsense and wrong decision now!

From,
3 [redacted] at Otago (who speak for many others who want to retire in what is considered a nice, quiet neighbourhood)

Dear Premier Rockliff

We are writing to you with regard to the proposed sites for the new Youth Detention Facility, specifically the 'preferred site' identified at 972 East Derwent Highway, Risdon.

As long term residents of Otago (over [redacted] years), one of the closest residential communities to the 'preferred site' (East Risdon being the other), we have some serious concerns regarding the reasons your government has provided as to why this site has been identified as a preferred site.
We would also like to provide you with feedback as a resident of Otago as to what we see as the effect on our community during the building process (if this site was to be chosen) and once the facility has been established in the area (once again if this site was to be chosen).

Firstly, the information provided on your website under "considerations" states that the East Derwent Highway site is "close to an existing detention facility at Risdon". What is the need for this to be the case? It reads that you see this as a positive for this site. It is our opinion that this statement alone speaks volumes about what you see as the purpose of the youth detention facility and makes it sound like it will be a holding facility so that the residents can move smoothly to the 'big jail'. It also speaks volumes about what you think of the youth that will be detained there and their futures. We see no benefit to the youth and their wellbeing to be close to the existing Risdon Prison Complex.

Secondly, there is a consideration regarding public transport access. What is the need for the detention facility to be near public transport except to "provide greater access for workers and visitors" (in your words). This will not benefit the local community of Otago and East Risdon as you claim it will. Lack of public transport is not a major concern for our community. In an area where the local government/council has not provided us with footpaths or gutters or sewage, your claims of the benefits to residents from an increase in public transport means very little.

Thirdly, is your acknowledgement that there is a "low number of surrounding properties". Again, this reads like a 'positive' for the proposed site. While we are a small residential community that does not mean that our concerns regarding issues such as house values, visual appearances, and disruption to traffic in the area should be dismissed. If your intent was to find a place with less residents so that there would be less opposition during the 'consultation process', then I think you will be surprised at the lack of local community support for this site.

On the website, under FAQs, it is stated that "experience in other locations" shows that property values are not reduced. Perhaps rather than claiming 'experience' without producing actual evidence from studies etc, it would be more valuable to ask real estate agents and residents in Risdon Vale about the effect on the value of their properties when the Risdon Prison Complex was originally built. While you claim that studies have found that the presence of such a facility had not created a stigma for the local area and in fact leads to a more positive image of that area, I'm sure that despite said studies people in the local area of Risdon Vale for example can provide you with an opinion as to the stigma associated with living near such a facility. You may claim that there is no stigma for the local area surrounding a detention facility, but in my experience public opinion would say and show otherwise.

There is also a statement that the design of the facility will explore options to reduce any visual impacts from lighting etc. From my own personal experience using vegetation as a screen (as you suggest, to provide a buffer) will be a long term 'solution' and that for a significant number of years while that vegetation grows, the visual impact will be very clear not just for nearby residents but for anyone in the local area. This is ironic as

one of the 'considerations' listed against using the Dowsing Point site was that the facility would be "Highly visible from Derwent River and Eastern Shore". The only area on the Eastern Shore that a facility at Dowsing Point would have been visible from would have been Otago. The East Derwent Highway preferred site would be visible also from the Derwent River as well as any person coming across the Bowen Bridge and residents of the Western Shore, in particular Goodwood and Dowsing Point.

Lastly, it has been acknowledged that there "requires some access/road corridor changes." This would absolutely be the case and there would need to be some very carefully planned 'changes' to assist with traffic flow and access in this area. There would also be some serious and significant issues with access and traffic flow during any building phase as this area is currently experiencing major problems with traffic heavily backed up on the Bowen Bridge, particularly during the hours of 3.00pm-6.00pm. There have been regular accidents on the Bowen Bridge itself particularly at the Eastern end. In the mornings between 7.30am and 8.30am residents of Otago on both sides of the highway experience significant issues with turning out from their streets onto the East Derwent Highway as traffic flow coming south in particular is heavy. There have also been a number of minor as well as serious accidents and even fatalities in the area around the Bowen Bridge turn off onto the East Derwent highway as well as on the East Derwent Highway near Risdon Cove.

Currently, there appears to be no consideration in your information regarding the environmental impact of building a detention facility on this site. As a long-term resident of Otago and regular birdwatchers, we can confirm that there is a resident White bellied Sea Eagle and a breeding pair of Wedge Tailed Eagles for whom this site forms a part of their territory. The Risdon Cove waterways are home to many species of waterfowl. Information regarding the possible impact on these animals during the building process needs to be established and provided to the local community and most definitely must be taken into consideration when decisions are made regarding the suitability of East Derwent Highway site. It seems to us that there is a definite attempt by the relevant department to tout the benefits to the local community in terms of employment, increased public transport, economic, etc during the building of the facility and once the facility has been established. As a resident of the local area of Otago where there are no businesses, not even a local shop, we fail to see how this facility would benefit our Otago/East Risdon community and its residents. Perhaps it may benefit communities further afield, but our concern is for our community of Otago and East Risdon as we are the residents and community that are going to be most impacted if a detention facility is built on the proposed site.

We are also particularly disappointed at the timing of this announcement (23rd March) being that most of the public consultation period for feedback is during the Easter Break, school holidays and your own parliamentary sitting break. The deadline of 17th April for public feedback is only just over 3 weeks from the announcement. With regards to the actual announcement there has been very little publicity regarding the preferred sites. In fact, Minister for the Department for Education, Children and Young People, Roger Jaensch, did not post anything with regard to the announcement on his Facebook page. Residents of Otago such as ourselves were unaware that the announcement had taken place and were only alerted by a concerned resident's letterbox drop.

When proposing to build a detention facility on a site close to a residential area, even if as you say there is a low number of surrounding properties, it is of utmost importance to those local residents that there will be no negative impact on their lives and that there will be, in fact, some benefit to the residents and their community. As a resident of Otago, I see no benefits to us or our small community, and it is our opinion that it will, in fact, negatively impact our local area. We ask that you take the opinions and feedback of the local community and residents as your primary consideration when making a decision on the site for a new Youth Detention Facility.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident I do not want this facility to be built in our area. I'd also like to add I have been extremely frustrated back the lack of transparency on this matter and how short and rushed the consultation period has been.

I have reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon.

As such and as a local resident I do not want this facility to be built in our area. Due to lack of information, community support and discussions, this proposal is detrimental to the community and landscape of our beautiful state. Not to mention desecrating sacred aboriginal land, it is a clear lack of understanding and respecting the traditional owners of this land. Tasmania has many other areas in which a detention centre would be more suitable and acceptable. Please listen the people who love and live in this area. I suggest you engage with current residents in this area to listen to their concerns and reconsider this rushed and thoughtless plan.

Hello. I have lived in Otago Bay [redacted] for almost [redacted] years. We have [redacted] in this lovely rural suburb & are totally against the idea of a youth detention centre to be located on the shores of the Derwent on the East Derwent Highway. The parcel of land in question is prime real estate & not for the purpose you are proposing. This proposal obviously has been put forward by people that are out of touch with the people & community.

It will be a total eye sore as you come over the Bowen Bridge, not only that the tourists including the international tourists that are on their way to MONA by ferry will be wondering what government in their right mind would do such a thing to the visual impact on the scenery & to the people of this area.

Around the corner & a bit more out of the way is the Risdon Prison, that would surely be the preferred place for this detention centre or further out of the city at the site at Brighton.
Hope you will listen to the people of Otago Bay & scrap this site.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley Detention Centre in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident I do not want this facility to be built in our area.

I'm a writing as a concerned citizen and local resident in the Otago area.

Whilst I recognise the increase in crime and share the feeling that many youths and some gangs would benefit from a youth reform system, I see the benefit of a system that offers support and guidance to change the direction of youth in need.

Some concerns I have with the Otago/Risdon location is the proximity to the adult Risdon prison. My concern that youth will see the new youth detention centre as a steppingstone to going to Risdon and a path already paved. Obviously, the close proximity will allow staff to travel and be shared between the facilities however I'm concerned that it will make a familiarity. This isn't a desired outcome.

The aboriginal site next door with correction facilities either side isn't ideal. It creates a negative mind set towards the area which is aboriginal heritage.

As a resident in the area traffic coming off the Bowen Bridge can be difficult and slow. The building process, road work and traffic associated with the build would create traffic congestion in an already poorly flowing area.

Thank you for reading my concerns, I feel this facility would be suited to a more private area away for other correctional facilities and the aboriginal heritage centre.

I, a resident of Otago disagrees with the proposed Youth Detention Centre planned for my neighbouring suburb.

Firstly, the limited information made available as well as the timeframe put forward to oppose such a proposal

seems to have been misleading to the entire community. Not to mention several facts! Building a Detention Centre within close proximity to an Aboriginal Children's Centre which allows daily tours from junior schools! Is this not placing an immense risk to those school children in the event of an escape. And do we begin on the neighbouring property being an important historic site in Tasmania?

There is the Bowen Bridge to consider and the fact that this is a potential risk for mentally unstable children to attempt to end their lives should they escape, either in the traffic or by jumping! This also causing a major risk to motorists. The roadway, that in no means fit for such an intersection to the proposed Centre. And the mere fact that this puts our own children, our belongings, cars, houses etc at risk. This in turn increasing OUR cost of living through insurance premiums rising due to the close proximity of this Centre should it go ahead. How is this deemed fair for us taxpayers when the cost of living is already placing so much pressure on families.

I also feel that the budget for this is absolutely absurd when we have an existing Detention Centre that is to be closed and left to rot.

As a resident of Otago, I am against any proposal for East Derwent Highway for a youth justice facility. I strongly oppose.

I hope this letter finds you well. As a member of the Otago community, I am writing to kindly request that you re-evaluate the plan to construct a new youth detention facility in our neighbourhood. I believe there are some potential challenges related to this project that may have unintended consequences for our community.

First, I would like to address the potential safety concerns that may arise due to the presence of a detention facility within a residential area. Our neighbourhood is a place where families and children reside, and their sense of safety and well-being is of paramount importance. Introducing a facility that houses young offenders could inadvertently affect the community's overall sense of security and might lead to an increase in crime-related incidents.

Additionally, the establishment of a youth detention facility may inadvertently impact property values in our neighbourhood. Prospective homebuyers could be dissuaded from purchasing property near such a facility, causing demand to decrease and potentially affecting property values. This could be particularly disheartening for current homeowners who have invested time and resources into their homes.

Moreover, I would like to suggest that the funds allocated for this facility might be more effectively employed by investing in alternative programs that address the root causes of juvenile delinquency. Studies have demonstrated that community-based interventions, such as educational support, mental health services, and vocational training, are more successful in rehabilitating young offenders than detention facilities. By directing resources towards these programs, we can develop a more sustainable approach to youth crime and create a safer, more nurturing community for all residents.

With these considerations in mind, I humbly ask that DECYP re-examine the proposal to construct a youth detention facility in Otago. I believe that our community's best interests lie in exploring alternative solutions that promote rehabilitation and address the root causes of youth crime, rather than introducing a facility that may have lasting negative impacts on our neighbourhood.

Thank you for taking the time to review my concerns, and I am confident that you will consider the well-being of the Otago residents when making your decision.

Mt Direction is a Hobart landmark which can be seen far and wide, this proposed development will be on its foreground foothills, not far from neighbouring houses. I notice that the Goodwood site was negatively noted as being "highly visible from the river and Eastern Shore" yet the Risdon site is equally if not more so, as it is not only highly visible from the water, including from the MONA boat which passes by multiple times a day, but it is also fronted by a busy main highway.

Currently the site is a beautiful open paddock at the foot of Mt Direction being enjoyed by thousands daily especially eastbound traffic on the Bowen Bridge- should this development be chosen; the new view will be at the very least barbed wire fencing and security lighting. This is a highly visible site viewed by many every day. Also, the Aboriginal heritage site shares a boundary and also houses a school which seems to have been overlooked as a possible negative. These young offenders need to be rehabilitated in a peaceful environment in the country, not by a noisy highway.

My wife & I wish to oppose the proposed Otago site for this facility. We live in [redacted] Otago. We purchased here for the quiet semi-rural lifestyle & feel that this proposal will not support this. We already have the gaol in close proximity. Our house values will be affected by this facility. Share the spread of detention/gaol facilities & locate in another area.

I've reviewed the limited information you have provided and we as a family living in Otago do not see a great outcome for the youth justice program or our community if you build the new Ashley detention centre in Otago/Risdon. As a local resident I do not wish to have this type of facility built in our area.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see any good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident I do not want this facility in our area.

I live at [redacted], Geilston Bay and [redacted] on the proposed site at Risdon for the youth detention centre. I thought you advertised the site would not be visible from the surrounding properties. There is no way you could screen it [redacted]. I also believe it would be visible from the Bowen bridge traffic and any other direction travellers come from.

It has been proven that Youth Detention Centres do not work and is an outdated model. As you are no doubt aware, like adult prisons they are education centres for crime. Regardless, if you are going to go ahead and build a detention centre it has to go somewhere. Can you tell me who decided it would be appropriate to build a youth detention centre in the middle of a built-up area on prime real estate with a beautiful view of the Derwent Driver?

Could it not be built on the Risdon prison land or somewhere else out of sight of the general public? Would not a farm be a better option where they could possibly learn some skills? I would not oppose it if it was not in my face. If you are not concerned about it being visible to residents, a suggestion for a site is the Sandy Bay university campus. You could possibly save money by using some of the existing buildings. Sandy Bay has lots of transport, is close to the city and probably close to the specialists that won't travel to outer areas.

This has just been brought to my attention by a local person in my community and I must say I strongly oppose the decision to put this here. It is a shocking location for this site. The visual aspect coming off the Bowen and congestion of traffic is already an issue in the area not to mention having this near such a lovely suburb/community of people. Also, to only have had notification on their website since the 23rd of March and to be told consultation closes on the 17th of April, doesn't give much time for discussions does it.

This will affect residential prices in the area and I'm sure the people who live in Direction Drive will not want to look at this. There are often escapees from Risdon vale prison which we have to deal with let alone have more on our back doorstep. This sort of facility should be out at Brighton, in a more rural area with less housing surrounding it, I don't know who in their right mind would think that putting it at the end of the Bowen Bridge is a good spot. I bet if the decision makers lived next door to this site, it wouldn't even be a suggestion.

Honestly just change the laws and actually get tough with the little sods to start with so they know there will be consequences to their actions. They don't care about a detention facility where they get a warm bed, fed and tv, probably better than living at home for most. How about bringing back the old way and send them off

to the army to teach them something, not because they want to but because they have too. If we didn't live in a society that now breeds from generation to generation of no hopers we wouldn't be in this mess. Someone needs to [redacted] start enforcing rules and laws for these kids, old enough to commit a crime old enough to go do corporal training like it or lump it. Anyone leaving school with no job should be made to do this. We might then have a better community to live in.

No one is prepared to bring this in or suggest it as they wouldn't be popular, but this is what is needed. Actually, here's an idea for a good site – How about Bridgewater, or clarendon vale, no need for me to explain why I bet everyone can guess.

Due to the close proximity of our home to the proposed Otago site for a new Youth Detention Facility in Southern Tasmania, we have been identified by your department as a key stakeholder. We hereby formally lodge our strong opposition to the proposed site at Otago.

We confirm that we:
- received your undated letter in the final week of March 2023;
- attended one of the "information sessions" in the Risdon Hall on Wednesday, 12 April 2023; and
- reviewed the information available on through the website link included on the undated letter
all of which contained the same, extremely limited information but which did invite feedback during the "public consultation" period.

The first point that we wish to make is that we do not feel that there is honest intent for true consultation but instead this activity seems to be a token attempt to show a process has been followed. This opinion is based on:
- the timing of the public consultation period (announced just before public holidays and in a time when people are often away from their homes, i.e. Easter and school holidays);
- the minimal information and detail that has been provided by the government; and
- the inability to have questions answered by government representatives that may enable meaningful exchange of information and opinions to reach a better understanding of what is proposed. The timing and timeframe suggest that the government is concerned that if the public was allowed sufficient time to properly research and understand the proposal, the specific details of the government's failures in a poorly thought-out proposal would be brought to light.

As an opening comment, we think it is incredibly insensitive and disrespectful to propose a Detention Centre neighbouring the Risdon Cove Aboriginal Site, with seemingly little or no consideration given to the tragic history of the Risdon Cove area. We sincerely hope that direct and sensitive consultation has been facilitated with the Aboriginal Community with consideration given to the very likely existence of historic artifacts on the land.

Before responding to the information that has been shared with us, we question the need for a new facility to be built at all. It is well known that a significant number of issues existed, and horrific experiences occurred at the current detention centre (Ashley Detention Centre) in Deloraine, and that a new "therapeutic" approach is to be implemented, however, the problems identified at the existing facility were not fundamentally caused by the physical infrastructure. The current government made (and delivered on) election promises investing millions of dollars into improvements at the Ashley Detention Centre facility, and in 2022 appointed appropriately trained youth workers to align with the new approach. While it is acknowledged that there is subsequently a bad stigma associated with the existing site, it should not be forgotten that a detention centre will always have a negative stigma by the nature of the individuals that it is required to support. A change in location does not change this.

In response to the shared selection criteria for the proposed site/s:
• Size greater than two hectares
The three sites that were presented to the community are all well over two hectares. If the facility requires a minimum of two hectares, then it would seem feasible that a significant number of other sites may be equally

or better suited locations and should also be presented to the community. It has been stated that the larger sites are said to offer "opportunity to create a substantial buffer from surrounding properties". If this is necessary, then the original requirement should always have been greater than two hectares. If a larger site is required or preferred, then the government should be transparent about this, and specify what the true future intent is for the property.

• Separation from major residential areas and schools

No justification is provided as to why this is required. If the facility is secure, then this should not necessarily be a factor. If the concern is people breaking in or out, then that concern exists whether the property is near major residential areas and schools or not. If the concerns is that residential property owners (like us) will oppose the development, then it is unfair that the impact on our lifestyle is any less valued simply because there are fewer of us to speak out or be impacted by the development.

• Site not visible (or with capacity for screening/buffering) from surrounding properties

The proposed site at Otago does not meet this criteria. The majority of the proposed land is visible when driving across the Bowen Bridge and from homes on the western shore. We expect it would also be visible from the Technopark on the western shore. The proposed land is certainly visible from our property. While we have not recently travelled on the Derwent River, we expect that much of the land would also be visible to those on boats/ferries using this waterway and do not think it is desirable having a detention centre on the banks of the Derwent River that is either an identifiable location or seen in any way or by locals and tourists alike.

We believe it would not be possible to develop a facility with the required security features including "anti-climb fences" and lighting, buildings and parking spaces that will not be visible. Located in the greater Hobart region, within reasonable driving distance from the Hobart CBD. Other government departments have published documents showing the "greater Hobart region" as per
this map. The information provided does not establish what you consider "reasonable driving distance" from Hobart CBD.

It also does not explain why proximity to Hobart is necessary at all and why the Detention facility is to be located in the southern region of the State, other than to say (in the undated letter) that it will provide "better access to services and supports". What is "better" and what are the "services and supports" that will need to be utilised in greater Hobart outside of the Detention Facility?

Given the amount of land that falls within the "greater Hobart region", we are astounded that only 2 preferred sites have been identified, as there must be many more equally feasible options available.
At the information session we attended, we were advised that a number of other sites had been identified but were discounted after a desktop assessment with no explanation as to what the deciding factors were for their exclusion or any information about where these sites were.

Government owned

At the information session it was explained that the Dowsing Point site has been discounted as this is not State government owned. With that known, that site should never have been one of the final three proposed sites shortlisted, or even a site identified in the initial round as a potential consideration. In addition to this, we question ownership of the residential property on the Otago land proposed, and query if/when that was acquired by the government.

- If this land has not yet been acquired by the government, then private ownership should have excluded this site
- If this land was recently acquired by the government, then this raises very serious concerns about the transparency of this project.
- If the land has been owned by the government for some time (as the representative at the information evening suggested was possible), then consideration is required as to what the original purpose or intent was when the government originally acquiring the property. It was suggested that this may have been purchased when the Bowen Bridge was being constructed for future highway development. Given the parallel challenges that the Tasmanian government has been tasked to consider with traffic management in greater Hobart, then any plan/opportunity for developing /extending the Highway in this space needs to be

considered and also should form part of the overall proposal.

Appropriately zoned under the relevant Tasmanian Planning Scheme as a permitted or discretionary use
Information should be shared about what specifically the "relevant Tasmanian Planning Scheme" is and what is "permitted or discretionary use" to provide clarity about how this proposal meets those definitions, and what potential future development may include. We think it is unreasonable to expect that general members of the public (including us) would have this knowledge and therefore understand how this applies to the proposed site and be able to respond in a meaningful way to the government proposals.

We are very concerned that the initial detention facility is only the initial phase of something that over time becomes a much larger facility, as the Question and Answers sheet suggests with the comment "allows for flexible future use". Full disclosure should be made now of what potential future plans may entail not after the/a decision has been made to proceed and development of the site is approved. (e.g. Are there considerations that this site may then be used address issues with overpopulation in the Risdon Prison?) Planning process may be according to "rural zoning" now, but in past cases, government has extended or restricted the predetermined plans during or after construction. What is to say this does not occur again, and what is to stop a change of zoning or land use now or after the initial project of 2024? Asking this question shows a lack of faith in the transparency of the government, and in this case is exacerbated by the lack of information that has been provided to date.

In relation to existing zoning, Google maps shows a section of land shaded in green which is either on/or bordering the proposed Otago site. We are not certain if this parcel is included in the proposed site. Other areas similarly shaded represent Conservation Areas or State Reserves. Unless this is inaccurate, we expect that this parcel would not be considered appropriately zoned and therefore should not be part of the proposed Otago site.

For clarity and transparency, it would be beneficial to show the boundaries of what is state owned land, Aboriginal land, Crown land and privately owned land, and overlayed with current zones.

In relation to "Question and Answers" sheet
How can I provide feedback? states that "all feedback received through the consultation process will be considered before a final decision on the proposed site is made.

No information has been provided about what the deciding factors will be. Clearly, some of this will be driven by what is included in submissions received, but it is not clear if the decision will be then be made based on the number of responses for/against each site or if there are other factors that you are already aware of that will form part of that decision making process (such as proper consideration of road access, public transport, design of the facility and supporting infrastructure).

To obtain valuable feedback the government needs to be more detailed in the information provided so that the key stakeholders and the general public are aware of all elements of current and future plans. Doing so would develop a higher degree of trust in the authorities and a sense of confidence in their knowledge of what is actually being planned.

▪ How big will the facility be?
Information accessed through the website somewhat describes the "physical attributes" of the detention facility, but the detail is far from sufficient for stakeholders and the community to give proper consideration to the proposals.
The government must have some knowledge of the expected size of the facility. I.e.. What is the total square meterage required of the building and of the parking required to house this many people and the estimated 100 employees - considering not just the residential rooms but also the known supporting facilities on site (recreational space, education, and health facilities, visiting areas, support and administrative facilities, meeting rooms, parking, delivery areas). This information should be made have been made available to the public as

part of this consultation.

It is constantly being announced on news broadcasts that the number of people being detained of all ages is increasing, and seemingly the ration of youth is growing rapidly. A facility to accommodate 20 people, with an expected occupancy of half this number would therefore appear to be unrealistic. Suggesting otherwise appears to be an attempt to create false impressions. No consideration has been given/shared to increasing numbers that will unavoidably occur with population growth, and so it is questionable as to how long a facility of this size will meet the true needs of a facility.

▪ Will the facility be built close to my property?
The information provided does not actually answer the question posed. Specifically, how close to the boundaries will buildings/fencing be built? What is the "buffer zone" and what does "buffer" even mean?

▪ What will the facility look like?
"A softer approach to aesthetics" explains nothing. It is just a fancy, trendy description. It is a detention centre with special purposes and needs to be considered as such, not portrayed as a happy holiday camp or spa like retreat (as the artistic impression on the posters at the information night portrayed). It should not be a desired location to attend, and the design should reflect the severity of the facility's purpose.

▪ Should I be worried about escapes?
Unfortunately, escapes do happen, and so as someone living in very close proximity to the proposed site, we am very fearful about what this represents to the personal safety of members of our household, and also to our property/possessions.

▪ Will there be a lot of traffic in and out of the new facility?
This area of road already experiences traffic congestion, particularly at peak hours in the afternoon. With increasing housing developments in surrounding areas this is only going to worsen in coming years. While this may not be the responsibility of the new detention centre project team, the long term planning and design of the areas must be a factor that is addressed as part of any development proposal (over and above just the entry/exit points of the facility).

There are a range of traffic factors that need to be addressed and should be a major consideration in selection of the site, and should have been part of the proposals communicated during this consultation period, including, but not limited to:
- Where is the proposed entrance and exit for this facility to be located? Is there only one or are multiple entry/exits required?
- Where would the public transport pickup/drop-off points be and what services timetable is proposed?
- What consideration has been given to the current and growing traffic congestion in this area, particularly at peak hours in the afternoon/evening?
- How will further increases to traffic associated with the facility be safely managed?
- What is the overall planning scheme for the East Derwent Highway. Will the facility effect any existing long term planned concepts?

▪ What will the new facility be called?
We agree that (irrespective of the location) the detention centre should name should not reference the location.

Regardless of the name of the facility it will, however, always be seen and recognized for what it is, a detention centre in a specific location/suburb and (contrary to what is stated on government documentation) this does come with a negative stigma for the surrounding suburb/s.

Family members (in their 70s and 80s) recall that from the time the gaol was constructed, if looking for a cheaper house to purchase one of the main places to look was at "Risdon Vale near the gaol" and children were also stigmatized as "from Risdon Vale near the gaol."

Does having a detention facility in a community reduce property values?
We strongly disagree with the Detention Centre would not adversely affect property prices in the area and would be keen to see evidence of this applying in a like setting (applying consideration to all the factors listed in your response to this question). We would also like to see where "research has indicated that facilities may have in fact led to a more positive image of the area for residents due to development".

We actually believe that the Government even making the proposal for potential use of the land in Otago for this purpose has already had a negative impact on real estate and people that would consider purchasing in the area.

Every single person that we have discussed the proposed site with has commented that they would not look to buy in an area so close to a detention centre and would fully expect that if they did, the property would be significantly less expensive. Some people have suggested that we should sell now and hope that an interstate buyer purchases it as they may not be aware of the current proposal!

Ever since the gaol was construction at Risdon Vale it has always been recognized as such an institution and nearby housing area was and still is regarded as the housing area near the gaol. Say what you like to make things sound rosy, that is the truth of the matter and housing prices have reflected that. Building a detention centre in Otago would be no different. Really, it comes to basic principles of economics. If the demand is low, then the price decreases. Less people interested in properties in the area will decrease property prices. Who seriously wants to live this close to a detention centre? No one. And that is why the criteria for site selection includes areas that are not currently heavily populated.

The quality of housing stock will not improve by a detention facility being constructed in Otago. The style of housing has already been predetermined by planning regulations, established, adhered to and accepted, and new housing developments will be subject to the planning process that are completely independent of the detention facility. To suggest demand will increase because people will be keen to move to the area to staff the facility is false and misleading and cannot be substantiated, especially given the proximity to housing across greater Hobart. It could equally be said that people try to get away from their worksite so prefer to live some distance away, allowing them to "turn off" and relax after hours to decrease the present experiences of "mental burnt out".

People who have invested in properties in the Otago/Otago Bay area did not do so in order to work close to a detention centre, to improve employment or greater economic development of the area. That's not what they're after. They chose a quiet, non-crowded environment away from busy enterprises. They chose an area where every available metre of land is not able to be used for a house, unit, or commercial enterprise. This proposed facility will certainly detract from the established beauty and established value of this area, even with a "therapeutic design" with plants around its boundary!

How will local businesses benefit from the new facility?
There are not a significant number of local businesses that would benefit from the new facility. There are no retail or hospitality businesses in close proximity to the site and existing businesses (over 5km to Risdon Vale or across the river, 1.5 km to Goodwood, or over 5km to Glenorchy). Businesses in Risdon Vale are primarily supported by local residents, not the employees of the gaol. Travelling to Glenorchy and crossing the Brooker Highway is not a quick journey and is not a retail hub visited during lunch breaks for people working on the eastern shore. It is extremely unlikely that employees of the detention facility would be any different.

It should also be noted that while a new centre may bring jobs into the greater Hobart area, job losses and adverse economic impact will be experienced for those individuals employed and businesses supporting the existing centre at Deloraine. Similarly, if increases were experienced in Risdon Vale, Glenorchy, or Lindisfarne retail outlets it is not added income to the economy rather a change in the location of spending.

This project also needs to give real consideration to the number of other major projects underway across the

State, and the existing shortage of skilled trades. While it is hoped that contracts associated with the construction/establishment of the facility is given to local Tasmanian businesses, the government needs to acknowledge that finding suitable local workers poses challenges to the principal contractor and has a flow on impact to other local businesses who are also trying to attract and retain employees (which, from personal experience, is a real problem). Outsourcing to interstate workers adds pressure to the existing housing crisis and also does not economically benefit Tasmania. What is the planning process for this development? We understand that the public will have opportunity to review and make representations on the planning proposal submitted to the relevant local government, but I request that more proactive and collaborative engagement occur with the local community before plans are started and before plans are submitted to ensure that concerns and issues are identified and mitigated early in the process.

I've reviewed the limited information you have available and do not see good outcomes for either your youth justice program or our community if you rebuild Ashley in Otago/Risdon. As such and as a local resident in very close proximity, I do not want this facility to be built in our area. This is a local and family oriented residential only area.

Key Rejections:
• Stigma associated with perceived proximity to Risdon Vale Detention Facility is critically detrimental to the youth rehabilitation program
• Inappropriate location
• Risdon Cove is a significantly important Tasmanian historic site
• Proposed site of Risdon Cove Youth Detention Facility directly borders Risdon Cove Aboriginal land.
• Aboriginal Children's Centre in close proximity
• Otago / Risdon is a family focused residential only community. The proposed detention facility is an inappropriate and poorly considered use of scarcely available land that shows no respect for our community or its future direction and development. It will damagingly redefine our community, Otago was voted 1st in the "Top 20 Australian Suburbs for Families 2023" by The Property Tribune.

Our community also has significant concerns surrounding the public consultation processes!
In the interests of transparency we request the public consultation report be publicly released for our review and comment.

Opposed to Pontville site

Good morning,

I recently became aware of the proposed site for the new Youth detention facility at Pontville.

The preferred location of this facility comes as somewhat of a surprise given both the nature of [redacted] and the closeness of the proposed facility. You may not be aware but Tasmanian Botanics operates one of the largest commercial Cannabis Cultivation and Production facilities in Australia from [redacted], which is approximately 500m from the indicated location for the new facility.

While I appreciate that both our facility and the proposed facility will have appropriate security measures in place, I believe it is a fair assessment that the construction and location of the new facility would add some potential risks for both our operations that may not have been considered as yet.

I would like the opportunity to discuss this matter further with an appropriate officer.

In favour of Risdon site

My wife and I are responding in respect to a Q and A on the proposed new youth detention facility. We have taken a number of weeks to talk with other members in our community and give consideration to all the pros and cons but what is very disturbing is the lack of response from our Parliamentary representatives who refuse to respond to the many phone calls etc from our community seeking input and answers from them. Do we assume that the decision has already been made prior to all this posturing of getting the community's input and views.

That certainly seems from past experience (true to form).

Our objections are as follows:
In our opinion the Pontville location is highly inappropriate due to:
A. Close proximity to gun club/rifle range.
B. Close proximity to Shene/Lark distillery which has recently announced a substantial expansion and development of their site to attract visitors and tourists.
C. Directly opposite a large marijuana production and processing manufacturer, the aromas from which will be very disturbing for these young inmates, a number of which may have experienced or be recovering from addiction.
D. Schools in reasonably close proximity with a major new high school being constructed supported by one of the state's fastest growing urban development for young families, bearing in mind that the occupants of this facility are the worst of the worst. (What could go wrong!).
E. This location is centred in the middle of a significant and recognised "Heritage" area. Not appropriate for a modern juvenile jail.
F. Contrary to your Q and A advice the site is highly visible.

One wonders if the location being promoted has even been seriously considered (boots on the ground) on reflection of the above. We reside approx. [redacted] from the Marijuana Production and Processing Plant, and the smell generated during the processing is quite unpleasant and culminates in my wife and I suffering headaches. The detention centre site in question is considerably closer (in fact just across the highway).

By comparison, the Risdon Site alternative has none of the above impediments and actually provides a number of additional benefits i.e.:
- Has water views for the benefit of inmates and staff. (very therapeutic)
- Enjoys a better climate with potential reduction in running costs as a result
- Has closer support facilities
- Does not have surrounding potential hazardous businesses

The detention facility is supposedly designed for the more serious offenders but without major changes to the training of management and staff we are just repeating the Ashley experience.

In favour of Pontville site

In deciding between the two sites, an important factor is that the new youth detention facility should be physically separate from adult correctional facilities. This is important to ensure that it retains a distinct approach that is specific and appropriate to the different needs and rights of the children and young people who will be held in the facility, including their rights/needs for access to education, trauma-informed/therapeutic approach, continuity of family relationships, etc.

If the facility is close to the Risdon correctional complex, there will be temptation to share staffing, facilities and other resources in ways that could undermine the critical distinction between adult correctional services

vs juvenile detention services. In particular, the use of corrective services staff would bring different (harsher) approaches and mentality into the youth justice facility, which would not be appropriate.

Additionally, if the facilities are close together, Risdon may be seen as the place to which young people "graduate" from detention. This could undermine efforts to intervene in a young person's life to prevent them from continuing a trajectory towards adult offending and imprisonment.

For these reasons I believe the Brighton site should be selected rather than the Risdon site.

New Youth Detention Facility
Site criteria include:
1. Greater Hobart Area
2. Site size greater than two hectares
3. Separation from major residential areas and schools
4. Site not visible (or with capacity for screening/buffering) from surrounding properties
5. Government owned – State or Commonwealth
6. Appropriate zoning under Tasmanian Planning Scheme for discretionary use

Two sites:
A. 466 Brighton Road, Mangalore: 20.48 Hectares
B. 972 East Derwent Highway Risdon: 11.78 Hectares

Issues to consider:
a) Period of building – road access, traffic congestion & noise pollution, environmental impact including native vegetation and natural fauna loss of habitat causing road hazards.
b) 24 hour Youth Detention Facility – road access, public transport feasibility in site location, additional traffic burden in site location, noise and light pollution for 24 hour operations in residential areas
c) Rehabilitation process – education, well-being, self-empowerment for independence in activities of daily living involves easy access to shops, banking, healthcare, entertainment, personal growth

Comparison of two site locations for a Youth Detention Facility
Site size: Both sites are greater than two hectares. Brighton road site is larger allowing further set-back from the road and potential for existing vegetation to provide noise and light buffering.

Road access during development: Brighton Road site is situated in a low traffic lane, 300 metres off National Highway 1, a four-lane highway. East Derwent Highway site is located on a high traffic 2 lane highway with existing traffic congestion problems. Building development would cause chaos for all Eastern Shore traffic crossing the Bowen Bridge, and for residents of Old Beach, Otago, and Risdon.

Traffic hazards during development: Brighton Road site is located on a quiet low traffic lane with plenty of vegetation for disturbed fauna. East Derwent Highway site is a busy traffic area with daily fauna fatalities. Building development on this smaller site would cause traffic hazards and high mortality of natural fauna.

Road access and public transport feasibility on completion: Brighton Road site has existing potential for public transport from the National Highway going north and south. It is within easy reach of Brighton shopping centres on quiet roads, promoting independence for activities of daily living and self-reliance. East Derwent Highway is narrow and has no opportunity for expansion bordered by water and hills, and the First Nation Cultural Centre, school, and land. East Derwent Highway is not safe for pedestrians to walk to bus-stops and there are no pull-over spots for busses resulting in further traffic congestion on an already congested road. There is no easy access to shopping centres and detainees would need to rely on driver transport during the rehabilitation process.

Effect on residential communities: Brighton Road site has two residences nearby with vacant land in front and

behind it. It is a quiet lane with no existing noise or light pollution. This larger site has existing vegetation to buffer noise and light pollution and to provide privacy and well-being for the residents of the Youth Detention Facility. The East Derwent Highway site has two community suburbs of Risdon and Otago with hundreds of residences. Both communities are already impacted by 24 hours noise and light pollution from the Zinc Factory, and difficulty with access and exit of the busy highway. The Youth Detention Facility would be visible for many decades until vegetation had grown around it.

Please consider the site for the new Youth Detention Facility with careful consideration of the above.

Neutral

I have been utilising and caretaking of the property at 466 Brighton Road, Pontville since around 2004. At that time, I had access to much more land as I had taken over the adjoining lease prior to the construction of the Brighton Bypass. During that time aside from the horse activities, I had sown paddocks of Lucerne to cut for hay, re-seeded other paddocks and maintained the fencing on the property. Unfortunately, due to the beginning of the work on the bypass the property was divided losing the best parts of useable land for farming activities to help support my endeavours of which I will now explain.

During my late teens, I became involved in working and riding thoroughbred racehorses as a vocation. Having had a childhood full of horses, riding, pony club, competing and a great love of animals it was always going to be the next step in my life. I gained experience and a huge love and passion for Thoroughbreds and the Racing Industry.

It was in that time that I started to see and realise the issues and problems arising from the Racing Industry such as that a huge majority of these horses once retired were ending up being slaughtered for pet food. This was/is not only happening in the galloping sector but also to Standardbreds in the Harness Racing Industry. Having a love of all animals and horses in general led to me taking on countless Thoroughbreds and Standardbreds when retired from racing helping them find new homes with suitable owners giving them a future.

Having lived and worked locally in the Brighton area for most of my life led me to secure the use of the land at Pontville enabling me to continue using the land for not only my own menagerie of horses but being able to take on extra horses and rescue cases.

I have taken on many TBs and STBs during the time of possession of the land at Pontville. These horses have mostly been able to be re-educated and re-homed. A minority have just been retired for reasons such as injury or being not suitable to re-home due to learnt bad behaviour or temperament issues (which is rare) and lived their lives out with us caring for them until their end of life.

A high percentage of these horses have come from the horses' new owners as well when coming off the track as they were unable to cope with them for various reasons such as lack of experience and awareness of the rehabilitating of these ex-racehorses and also not realising the length of time and work which is needed to make them a suitable riding horse especially for teenagers and the less experienced horse person.

I have also had horses straight from trainers themselves upon the horse retiring as they have had no luck in re-homing them or under pressure etc from their owners, financial reasons or simply having nowhere for them to go from their stables. They also may have had injuries sustained from racing that the owner or trainer couldn't be bothered or afford to wait for the time to recover etc. I have held a Thoroughbred Trainers Permit in the past so have had hands on experience in the Racing Industry from not only a track riding vocation but also the training involvement.

I work with these horses that we end up with in our care to educate and socialise them so they are able to be re-homed to new owners. A lot of people are not experienced, confident enough or simply don't have the

time that it takes to educate them, or they just want a horse with the 'hard yards' already done.

My two daughters also have a huge involvement in this process sharing my love and passion for horses and the rehabilitation of racehorses. It is a huge amount of physical work and also of a great financial undertaking. Without their support and help I couldn't re-home or take on as many horses as we have done.

Training and Transitioning Process

The rehab and transitioning process of these horses can be extensive and time consuming. Firstly, it usually involves a lengthy time of turning out and spelling of the horse to allow it to recover from the stresses of racing being physical and psychological. This can take anywhere from a few months to a more lengthy period such as twelve months or more depending on the individual's needs and racing history. The next step is the re-training and education of them for any previous learned bad behaviours and to help them become a safer riding horse. This can also become lengthy depending on the horse. This basic education is needed for their future benefit and also helps identify the possible future direction of the horse in its next phase of life such as which career path it may follow if being used as a competition horse or maybe it may have a less demanding future as just a general pleasure horse or companion. This work is undertaken from 'ground level' as well as ridden.

The training and education stage can take anywhere from a few months to a few years depending again on the horse, its talent, it's career path and future direction. From a rider/handler perspective this can be very time consuming, physically and mentally challenging not to mention dangerous. Quite often these horses can be unpredictable, fractious, misunderstood mentally and their behaviour can be dangerous on the ground as well as under saddle. Not knowing the horse's previous ridden habits, quirks and behaviours can lead to putting yourself in a less than ideal safe and vulnerable situation.

Part of the rehabilitation process also includes the socialising of the horse to adapt it to the many different environments it may face in the future with their new owners. This in itself requires a lot of work, skill, experience and has its own set of challenges. This probably requires as much work, time and financial expense as the retraining of the racehorse itself.

Retraining the harness horse can also prove to be very challenging in teaching the horse to transition from a 'pace' that they have solidly learnt to race with to the correct gait of 'trotting' which of course is the natural gait of the horse. This can take anywhere from a few days to months and sometimes unfortunately never.

Re-homing Process

The re-homing of the Off the Track horses after they have reached a suitable stage of education and socialisation is a critical process for both the benefit of the horse and future owner. They need to be suitably matched, suiting the horses' education and the rider's experience to ensure a good and long-lasting partnership, ultimately leading the horse to find its 'forever' home.

Financial costs

The rehabilitation of the OTT racehorse is an extensive one and comes at a substantial cost. The feeding and upkeep of these horses is probably the biggest outlay as most recently retired racehorses need extra feeding to get them back to a healthy weight which can take around 6 - 12 months upwards depending on the horse's health. Issues such as gastric ulcers which are very common in racing horses need to be addressed and medically treated involving the use of costly drugs. Injuries sustained from racing may also require veterinary care etc.

Unfortunately the property at Pontville is not really the ideal ground suited for running livestock. It is very sandy and extremely rocky in parts so the grass exists for only about half of the year in a typical season. We have suffered huge drought in the South of the State for quite a few years until recently, affecting the production of decent grass growth. Obviously then the horse's feed needs to be supplemented with hay

brought in from other properties which is costly. The use of grain and pellets are also needed to ensure subsequent weight gain and health of the OTT.

The remaining property left after the highway had been constructed is no longer viable to farm for hay or grain production due to its rocky nature.

The other financial expenses are generally the costs of getting the horses socialised ie travel costs, entries to horse venues, memberships to utilise those facilities and competitions to further their education and experience as that can be a very daunting and tough process for both the rider and the horse. The costs to supply rugs, saddlery and the varied gear that is needed to suit the many different horses that we have at times can also be substantial.

The maintaining of fencing requires a fair amount of work and expense due to the age and condition of the current fences. Luckily, I am capable of doing most of the work but materials are a constant cost. I have erected many internal fences over the years to allow for the care of the horses individually as that can help eliminate the risk of injury being able it house the horse in its own paddock and also be able to monitor it's individual feeding requirements.

Rescues

In addition to taking on OTT horses, we have also secured countless horses and ponies over the years. They have come from varied situations such as abandonment, neglect, abuse, starvation and sometimes unfortunately inexperienced horse homes. It can take a long time for the horse to get back to a level of acceptable health which is very costly. We quite often don't re-home some of these horses due to their 'history' so they have lived/living their lives out with us.

Infrastructure

The infrastructure we have at the property at Pontville is not fancy but is extensive and gives us the ability to manage and train the horses that come and go. It's been a long and costly process having done this ourselves. We have erected a huge amount of fencing both electric and plain wire to accommodate the OTT horses in their own paddocks enabling us to supervise their feeding and reducing the risk of being injured when paddocked with others.

Also, we have a huge network of pipelines to deliver water to each paddock via a ballcock and tubs to supply constant water. Up until the opening of the Bypass we had access to mains water which was paid for by the owning government body of the property. Since then, we have been carting water to the property by a tank setup on a trailer almost every day. This is time consuming and frustrating as there is a water connection for this property near the main gate which we have been unable to access evidentially as we are not the owner.

We have an arena which I have brought countless truckloads of sand for as a riding service over the years which eventually blows away due to not being able to keep it watered, so it is a continued cycle. This sand has always been spread via shovel which is very tedious but builds muscles.

We use shipping containers to store the extensive amount of horse tack, rugs, saddlery, and feeds that we also need plus a smaller shed to house fencing tools etc for maintenance. We also have had a roof constructed between two of the shipping containers providing shelter from the wind, sandy storms, and rain which we have been very grateful for.

I also purchased a removable 18m steel round yard which is used for training purposes in a secure environment and also doubles as a temporary holding yard at times.

When the Bypass was opened, we had to change the access from the property to where it is now so that was another big expense to employ a grader to clear the drive and purchase some gravel as it was only accessible by a 4WD. Including in the work in making another access was the construction of a solid fence and gate to

create security for the property and horses. We also had to construct new openings and gateways to quite a few paddocks as all the accesses to the paddocks had changed due to having a new boundary fence to the highway. With the opening of the Bypass and a new boundary and drive we also had to then move our shipping containers and sheds from one side of the property to the other as we could not gain access to them due to losing the original driveway.

Photos and Stories
There are a few photos of some of the horses we have rescued over the years. Some of the horses were so bad in health that we were advised by equine vets to euthanise them but we persevered with them all apart from one which unfortunately turned out to have a fractured pelvis. Also pictured are some of the OTT horses that we have re-homed. I have had to send these to you in a separate email as I cannot attach them for some reason via this email.

I am also happy to supply references from equestrian coaches, happy new owners and Equine vets in show of support for what we have been doing. I realise that it is by our own choice that we have taken on and work with these horses but it is a passionate journey that we are in with our equine friends. I will also forward you copies of 2 emails that I had sent to [redacted] asking for support that I thought you may be interested in reading. Hoping that this is the type of information you require.

Introduction-
The State Government has announced the closure of the Deloraine Ashley Youth Detention Centre within 3 years. This announcement was September 2021, and with this announcement, there has been an opportunity for Government to put forward a proposal for new Youth Detention Facilities to be constructed near Hobart.
The Government has been met with strong opposition for a new facility being constructed in the south of the State as detested by the reaction of the residents of the Bowen Bridge site.
The Government has got the process of community consultation wrong again. As they fail to understand the concerns of the community and especially those whom do not have experience with a youth custodial facility in their community:
The Deloraine community and near neighbours of Ashley centre understand the frustration and angst that is being caused by the Government's proposal to construct a Youth Detention Facility in their community.
Therefore, we the Deloraine community and those of this joint submission do not support the proposed construction of Youth Detention Facilities in the South of the State. There is a perfectly good facility for Youth Detention existing and located at Deloraine (Ashley).

Ashley YDC -
Ashley has a long history from its construction post the First World War for a Soldier Settlement program, to caring for Wards of the State through the 1960's and being known as 'Ashley Boys Home', to finally morphing into a centre for detention of juvenile offenders. Late in the 1990's Ashley escapes were almost an everyday event with media reports announcing the events, and law enforcement agencies, both on ground and air called to bring the situation under control.

To this end a group of concerned Neighbours and community members banded together to pressure the then Labor State Government and Minister Judy Jackson, enough is enough.
The 'Neighbours of Ashley' and surrounding families worked with the State Government and the Architects to enable a redevelopment to be achieved that was acceptable to those who were in close proximity, and the community in general. The redevelopment further provided and achieved the Government's objective of Youth Detention facilities being then best practice. This redevelopment of Ashley occurred more than 20 years ago at a cost of approximately five to seven million dollars.

Neighbours of Ashley and Deloraine Community Joint Submission Proposal -
As part of this joint submission the redevelopment of the Deloraine site (Ashley) to fit for purpose Youth Detention is supported by the following points:
1- Ashley is to undergo further redevelopment to ensure current best practice and care of Youth during rehabilitation;

2- The Management and staffing requirements are met with some rigor with suitably experienced and trained staff providing best practice services to residents;
3- The current seven million dollars already expended will be further augmented enabling a contemporary and therapeutic model to be achieved;
4- Ashley should be retained, redeveloped, provide best practice and care to remain as a Youth Custodial Correctional facility.
We, as the community, have learned to live with the Deloraine Ashley site, similarly, the Meander Valley residents have done the same. Any short comings of the facility is not the fault of bricks and mortar. The Deloraine Ashley site has a place in the system, ideal setting in a rural landscape, a farm at its disposal, and central location, to blindly bulldoze the current site and start again is bullish and serves no real purpose other than irresponsible waste. The tools are already there, they just need refinement with the right people to use them.
Summary
We, the aforementioned support the Deloraine Ashley site redevelopment for Youth Detention within Tasmania. We do not support the Deloraine Ashley site for closure.
We do not support the construction of new Southern Youth facilities that will bring a whole raft of unfavourable conditions that will significantly impact on Southern residents and their communities.

I recall that you and I met on the 12th of April at Risdon Community Centre and I raised the above and shared with you the attached letter from the Premier to me [redacted] in reply to my request that the building of a possible four lane highway from Grass Tree Hill Roundabout to the Bowen Bridge for which the corridor was set aside in 1980 should be acted upon.

I draw your attention to his paragraph four in which he says that: "The DSG is currently investigating whether duplicating the East Derwent Highway to four lanes between Grasstree Hill Road roundabout and the Bowen Bridge would be feasible."

Having looked at the detailed site footprint for the proposed Youth Justice development Risdon ,I am greatly concerned that if built there it would impinge greatly on what I understand is part of the provision for East Derwent Highway Corridor.
I expect that your Department will no doubt bear this in mind as its makes its deliberations.

Thank you for time and interest with this issue.

I am [redacted]. I have recently been contacted by one of our licence holders Tasmanian Botanics, who raised concerns about a future development of a youth detention centre at Pontville which is near their medicinal cannabis facility. I was just reaching out to provide my details as a point of contact if you required information about [redacted] and how we operate.

Feedback - New Youth Detention Facility – Function, Flexibility and Locations

This response is to the information provided by the DECYP about the progress of implementation of a new Youth Justice model and the development of new facilities. To make a reasonable assessment of the proposed sites requires an understanding of the purposes of the proposed facilities and the model of intervention and care proposed, as well as numbers of young people and length of stays, age ranges and want adaptability is required to meet the range of presenting needs across the Youth Justice Service's 'customers'. This information has predominantly not been made available.

The "Youth Justice Blueprint 2022 - Building a connected and responsive youth justice system - Final Draft November 2022" does not sufficiently detail how practice might inform the design and location of the required facilities. The best it can offer is advice as opposed to a clearly stated policy direction on how these sites will need to operate. The blueprint states:

"Evidence demonstrates that small scale facilities, located close to a young person's home and community,

have the capacity for adaptable and relational security measures and provides a therapeutic environment, promotes rehabilitation, and reduces recidivism."

The physical environment greatly impacts the procedures within a youth justice environment, the relationships between staff and children and young people, and ultimately a young person's prospects of rehabilitation and community safety. The importance of moving to this type of custodial setting was highlighted by a number of stakeholders during the consultation.

It is equally important to provide step down accommodation for children and young people who are exiting a secure facility, as part of a program of planned transitional support.

It is also necessary for any real consultation process to release relevant data. A data set covering at least the last 5 to 10 years per year is advised, giving detailing such as:
• Number of youth offences by type by region and ideally sex and age
• Numbers by type of orders and sentences handed down by the Courts by region, ideally by sex and age
• The number of young people on orders that require supervision by region and ideally sex and age
• The average numbers on active orders per month over last 12 months (or last year) by region and ideally sex and age
• Numbers in detention per month for the last 12 months (or last year) by region and ideally sex and age

The first thing to ask

What is the purpose of these inter-connected facilities? The description of the Detention Facility can be read as that of a prison – and from a young person's perspective it probably will be seen as a prison.

For the majority of young people, the facilities will need to facilitate sound therapeutic practices around integration and re-introduction to society outside of the Facility. So, what is the sense of building one detention centre located a significant distance from ½ the population? Why divert from your own blueprint's best advice.

The State did not always detain young offenders in a prison environment. Prior to Ashley becoming a Youth Detention Centre under the Youth Justice Act it was Ashley Home managed under the Child Welfare Act. Ashley in the 80's and 90's operated from a therapeutic perspective with 'customers' known as residents and staff known as officers. Ashley was rated by many as the best facility of its type in all of Australia. Should we not therefore ask what we lost when transitioning to a youth justice model and to seek to recover past practices that worked.

The blueprint talks about a health approach being taken but not much on actual service design. A new approach or model of care is likely to require changes to the Youth Justice Act. Designing a new approach needs to be undertaken alongside of and before final decisions are made about facilities.

There is insufficient detail and what details there are raises concerns about the extent a new therapeutic model is being adopted or are we window dressing what still will be a system of incarceration.

The second thing to ask

How did we end up going from one facility to five? One could argue that this is overkill for a State of our size and if we have struggled to operate an effective facility on one site how will we manage to effectively operate five. If we retain a five facility model it is likely that:
• The flow of young people into the system will NOT always fit the facilities available – what happens when the bail facility is full
• The capacity to move staff around at short notice to meet service requirements is exacerbated the more facilities you have and the more spread apart they are
• Ensuring expertise to manage facilities properly is much harder the more sites you have

• The Detention the Support Centre facilities appear to be performing the same service and are just different parts of a continuum of intervention – so is separating them operationally will be difficult
• We will spend excessively more per detainee to operate the new system – there are few if any economies of scale – there will be times when there will be no or a small number of residents at many of these facilities – yet fully staffed. In the long run this is unstainable.
• How do you move residents between facilities? It is likely that a young person might start in a Bail Facility but mis-behave and end up at the Detention Facility. This is common. The big question is how do you get them back – will the stand-alone Detention Facility want to give him back (after all they are low on numbers). This process of managing behavioural consequences and progress with the young person is made more difficult by having multiple centres.

The proposed facilities ignore the Northwest coast – what percentage of youth justice 'customers' come from the North West? Hardly a state-wide fit-for-purpose response.

It is also worth considering that the overall numbers of young offenders requiring detention should fall if the government's objectives are realised. Early intervention, better school engagement, and diversional programs may make it unsustainable to operate all five facilities full-time in the very near future.

Rethink the Assisted Bail Facilities
As your own blueprint points out a young person on bail has not yet been found guilty, is considered safe to be in the community, and is more than likely not to face a custodial sentence. So why build a facility that serves as an introduction to the justice system.

In one sense why are services to young people on bail being considered as part of the youth justice system? Should not this be a government response to young people who are too impoverished to fend for themselves and have no place to stay?

The reality is that our current system of Youth Shelters provides accommodation and services to many of the same young people that might use an Assisted Bail Facility. In fact, the Youth Shelters are one of Youth Justice's 'frontlines' – even if this is not appreciated or even realised. Many young people consort, develop criminal inclinations, and skills through ending up in a youth shelter. This is a big concern to youth shelters and the public and has always been a 'sore' on the service. The new Youth Justice Model should include how you work with Youth Shelters to support young people and to break and prevent criminalisation of residents by better equipping and resourcing youth shelters.

The reality is that shelters have been acting as underfunded and resourced bail centres already and for some time – so save lots of money by exploring expanding a number of Youth Shelters to be used as Bail Centres.

Rather than introducing a young person to the Youth Justice system at the early stages of offending it might be better to have them in a community facility. By using community connections and effectively keeping them out of the youth justice system they have a much reduce risk of recidivism. Therefore, an expansion of the role of Youth Shelters should be considered before anything new is built.

Using the Youth Shelter network would:
• Be of considerably less public hassle to implement
• Would cost less
• Would happen quickly
• Would give you better coverage of the State
• Would lead to improved Youth Shelter facilities – as you would bolster their capacity. Consideration should also be given to providing shelters with medium term accommodation capacity to support young people on orders post court as a stepping stone to more self-sufficiency
• Would give the Youth Shelters more resources – assuming you fund additional staff, services, and activities that bolsters improvement and growth in the young person. Station Youth Justice Officers in Shelters.
• Would expand the work of the Youth Shelters to better assist their residents to begin making sustainable

changes – e.g. getting back into education or to secure a job. This before court and assisting the young person to plan a way out of the mess they are in
• And all of this done within the community – not within an institution.
• Would be preventative in nature as other residents of the Shelter also gain and do not themselves end up offenders
• Provide links to 'known' place the young offender can go to after release if there are no other options.

Support Centre Facilities

I believe there is considerable disadvantage in having stand-alone Support Centre Facilities as described by the information provided. It is highly likely that the majority of the customers for this service will be young people placed there by court order. For all practical purposes and from a young person's perspective these are detention centres.

Issues with these separate facilities include:
• The diversional role and function provided by this service would be better provided outside of the youth justice system. The more mainstream the greater the benefits to the young person. Get them engaged outside of the youth justice system, get them back to school.
• Many of these young people will 'flow' between these facilities and the detention facility – and given their respective proposed locations will cause further social dislocations for the young person. Further you do not have the continuity of staffing that can build relationships over time that are more familiar and therefore likely to ultimately succeed.
• The centres design seems to be designed to operate along a medical model of individualised therapy and intervention. Yet the most effective form of intervention involves working with the young person within the context of a functioning community, a peer group, and family. So, you want to have facilities that allow for group activities and interactions – not what you have proposed with self-contained units and few other usable facilities
• Much of what you hope to achieve in the centres seem to be duplicated in the Detention Facility. So potentially if you have spread the cohort across 5 centres there will not be the numbers to undertake the group work you need to do to cause growth and change
• These facilities may not be viable and send considerable periods with few customers – so a waste of resources.

Is it assumed a young person aged 9 to 13 could end up in one of these facilities – in a self-contained unit. How can this be called 'care' when the young person is under 14? What child lives alone in a self-contained unit?

If your model of intervention is inadequate then so will the design of the facility.

The facilities also sound really boring, they appear more designed to contain than they are to intervene. What does not seem to be appreciated is what is going on in these young people's lives when they suddenly find themselves in detention, commonly:
• School has broken down and they have not been attending – often since Year 8 – and the Education Department does not want them.
• Their family situation is broken down – or is such that they cannot safely be left in the care of their parents
• They have taken up criminal activities to survive
• Often they are dealing with their own trauma and the resultant lack of control
Therefore these facilities need to engage the young person 24/7 and therefore need a range of capacities to make this as interesting, developmental, and therapeutic experience as possible. This does not seem to have been taken into consideration.

Detention Facility

As stated earlier the Detention Facility description could just as easily be describing a brief for the design of a

youth prison. So how much flexibility is available per site to allow more than a prison to be built? It is as much that is left out as what has been included.

What are the likely numbers and age profiles of the 'customers' that these facilities will need to manage over a given year? What is likely to be the average length of stay in each facility? Without this info then what is required is harder to answer.

If one Southern facility prevails then your plans will need to consider:
• Developing remand and transfer facilities at Remand Centres in Launceston and Burnie that are suitable for Children held under the YJ Act. A young person should not be remanded into custody and due to their crime into detention then transferred from Burnie to Hobart only to have to return the next day to Burnie to face court
• Facilities on site that allow family to come and stay with the inmate
• Individual living facilities that allow greater independence and preparation for exit that the inmate can graduate to
• A proper school – especially given the potential age range
• Sufficient space and buildings to learn how to drive a car, grow some veggies, ride a bike, make things

Of the three proposed sites the one at Brighton is the best. Ideally you do not want to know that Hobart is just over the hill (as it will motivate excursions and intrusions into the facility) and the other sites make this obvious. Further it needs to be accessible as far as possible for people coming from the North and Northwest.

An Alternative Approach
Instead of the current plan build three Youth Transition and Detention Centres, South, North, and Northwest. These would perform the role the Support Centre and Detention Facility.

It meets the blueprint's encouragement for small local facilities.

At different times with the same young person (and often with little or no notice) you need the facilities and resources of a support centre and a detention centre in the same day. Judging what is best going forward for a young person and assessing their risk is challenging at its best and you should not limit your response capacity due to a lack of resources or the design of the facility. Separating your services into two distinct programs based on undertaking an inmate risk assessment is likely to cause issues – as you cannot accurately undertake such an assessment in many cases. So you need the capacity to:
• Receive a young person at short to no notice – they do not generally book in weeks in advance
• Receive a young person no one knows much about – maybe even their parents
• Receive a young person in a highly agitated and destressed state

To effectively, safely, and with care deal with these scenarios you might see a young person that requires secure solo accommodation and scrutiny for the first few days before moving into the open detention centre and their own room. By the end of their stay, they might require a self-contained flat and the capacity to be coming and going from the facilities. So this range of service flexibility needs to be built in a detention centre and a support centre and why separating them into two centres does not seem a wise thing to do.

Therefore in this proposed service model there is the capacity to transition a young person from observation and assessing; to action and development; to preparing to re-enter society, and even getting support after leaving.

This proposal:
• Better fits the blueprint and takes services into the regions – to be locally engaged
• Allows you to move a young person with no strong regional societal links but too many destructive ones locally to be transferred to another region
• Similarly when things go wrong you can move inmates between facilities

• Have different capacities – so one facility might be more able to handle younger children or another more pathological cases
• Allow specialist staff to work across the three centres which all work to the same processes and practices – so maximising efficiencies and avoiding the challenge of getting specialist staff to work regionally
• Would benefit from each of the centres having different additional role. So each of the facilities might have different roles and functions that also support the other centres, so one centre would:
§ Have staff developing resources and training, another
§ Have staff focusing on connections – keeping everyone up to date with opportunities and services, and another
§ Staff with specialist skills for the most challenging of clients
• If financial more sustainable over the long run and less complex to manage.

This blended service model will also lessen the chance that the Detention element becoming purely custodial and or punitive only.
If new facilities are to be built, then the Government should consider building them on Senior Secondary College sites. Many of our Senior Secondary Colleges have considerable vacant ground around them that could accommodate a facility. This then allows access – particularly after hours – to sporting and other facilities of the College. Importantly it allows stronger links to education.

Recommendations:

Based on the feedback below a number of recommendations seem appropriate including:

Recommendation 1: That the department release a data set of information covering the inputs and outputs of the youth justice system covering at least the last 5 years.

Recommendation 2: That a Tasmanian Young offenders therapeutic model of care be first developed, through evidence based research of alternative options, public consultation, and adopted before finalising the design and locations of the facilities. Follow the blueprint.

Recommendation 3: That the basis of the assumed need for five facilities be reconsidered and that a more rational flexible and cheaper approach based on better being able to service the whole state be considered.

Recommendation 4: That selected Youth Shelters we equipped and expanded to act as Bail Centres and that Youth Justice spend more time and funding working within the shelters to reduce criminality.

Recommendation 5: If the Support Centres are to go ahead they need much more thought about how to accommodate and develop a much broader age range and much more inter-activity and opportunities for learning and enjoyment.

Recommendation 6: That there be three facilities – North, Northwest, South only that would combine the role of Support Centre and Detention facility. Each might develop a speciality, but all would work along similar lines and share expert staff and resources.

Recommendation 7: That these new centres be called something like 'Youth Transition Centres' to highlight the main role of assisting young people to transition to maturation in a safe and developmental way (as opposed to incarceration by way of a punishment). That sometimes for some young people this means that the best option for the young person is secure detention, but it is not the only option.

Recommendation 8: Loose the word 'detention' all together – as it is not a state of being or an achievement to be sought after but the consequence of their circumstances. What you are really trying to make happen is a process that will help the young person to grow up to be the best person they can be – a transition to a better existence.

The government is to be commended on seeking to improve the experience of young people in detention. I do not wish to comment on the preferred sites of either Risdon Vale or Brighton . However, it would be remiss of me not to make the point, that the very definite impression I got from watching/reading the media reports of the dreadful things that were alleged to have happened at Ashley, and in the Education and Health systems, I don't believe at any time anyone ever said that the cause of the problem was the physical nature of the particular facility. In other words, whilst no one would admit to it, the problem was a result of poor or negligent management . So, whilst I am not arguing about the closure of Ashley, merely having a new facility is unlikely to solve the problem unless the place is properly staffed and managed. And there is accountability in that management – something that was not evident during any of those enquiries.
Folks, we've had this conversation before. I'm glad however, your utter ineptitude when listening to community and reflecting the abilities of the Minister has remained consistently accurate. Stop holding consultations in locations that are inaccessible to much of the community it immediately concerns. Doing so is seen as blatant disregard for genuine consultation and merely using it as a tool to legitimise an already present agenda. As a community we have endured government both state and local doing this to us for decades. Recently you oversaw consultation for our school farm, which has too many in the community that this project will immediately impact, become a 4.3 million dollar polished turd. You did, however, manage to give us a shining example of how not to do community co-design. Are we also to expect the same quality of service this time round? Any matters concerning the Brighton municipality should be held at the Civic Centre or the council chambers. It is centrally located and accessible to vastly more of the community. It is safe to assume anyone living out of the Bridgewater, Gagebrook, Herdman's Cove area likely has access to transport and therefore would find it easier to come to us. This includes the Southern Midlands as many right through Mangalore to Bagdad are closely part of our right knit community. Pontville Hall is not accessible to much of the community that will be most impacted by this development. Do. Better.

Ministerial Correspondence

Opposed to Pontville
I am a major shareholder in Lark Distillery and have been influential in its advancement to now being one of the world's best whisky distilleries. Lark recently won Gold awards in most Australian Whisky categories including No.1 Distillery, No.1 Personality (Bill Lark), No.1 Distiller (Chris Thomson), Best Single Malt and Best Blend. Lark is clearly the

Tasmanian showcase distillery where whisky can become a leading industry, exporter and tourism contributor.

This could all be threatened if your Government adopts this Potential Site as your preferred development site for the new youth detention facility.

In 2021, Lark purchased the heritage property, Shene, including its distillery, cooperage, bond stores, visitation centre and whisky inventory. Shene was purchased as a going concern and the sale proceeds allowed the vendor to develop Callington Mill, thus extending the "whisky trail" from Hobart to Oatlands.

Shene is less than 1 km from the potential site.

Lark's intention is to transform Shene, now Lark Pontville, and its magnificent 19th century buildings into a first class tourist destination, possibly including a hotel and to this extent Lark received a Government grant to facilitate early planning and development. Many jobs were to be created in construction and operations.

I urge you as Premier and your Minister to remove 466 Brighton Road from preliminary considerations.

Neutral
Brighton Council welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback in relation to the proposed locations for a new Youth Justice Facility in the south. The proposed location at 466 Brighton Road, Pontville appears to be a potential location for the facility with regard to size, zoning, and vehicle access. However, it is noted that access to the site via public transport would prove to be difficult. A brief investigation of the available transport providers shows that regular public transport access to the site is severely constrained. Should the Pontville site be selected for the proposed facility, we would urge you to consider extending more regular public transport opportunities for the families of the affected children. Whilst the site is not within our municipal boundaries, it is functionally very linked to the township of Brighton and as such Council would welcome further consultation as project investigations progress.
Dear Minister, I am writing to you on behalf of residents of Risdon Vale and Otago Bay about the proposed site for the new Youth Detention Facility. I attended the drop-in consultation session on Saturday 15 April. It was evident at the session that there is considerable concern about the proposal. Residents have asked me to contact you to ask you to meet with them to address their concerns. I believe it would be beneficial to the community to hear directly from you as a key decision maker in this process. The Youth Justice Reforms are a key opportunity for Tasmania and it is critical that we, as a State, to get this right. I look forward to hearing from you.
Thank you for receiving our email and responding. We (our growing group of community members against the Youth Detention Centre in our area of Otago and Risdon) believe that in the interests of public consultation with the local area it would provide a demonstration of good faith if you can arrange for the public consultation period to be extended by an additional 5 weeks (to the 22nd May). A vast majority of our community have only just found out about this proposal this week. The Q&A sheet provided by your department notes:

Public consultation will be held over six weeks commencing in March 2023 seeking feedback on the preliminary site assessment.

The news release on DECYP website states:

Public consultation on the shortlisted sites begins today (23 March), providing stakeholders and the community the opportunity to review the criteria used to assess the sites' suitability and provide feedback.

The first direct attempts by the government at community consultation that we have identified (in the form of a postcard with a sparse amount of information) were received on the 27th March.

At best this has left our community with less than 3 weeks for the public consultation and, as I have already noted, the vast majority of the community did not receive a postcard and have only just become aware of the proposal (which is the result of a critical failure to effectively communicate the public consultation). This leaves almost the entirety of our community less than 1 week for consultation which is certainly not a suitable amount of time for our community to suitably inform themselves such that any meaningful consultation can be achieved - particularly with the extremely limited information available. Seriously, does it seem reasonable to provide 1 week of opportunity for our residential community to consider such a substantial and area defining project?

We sincerely look forward to your direct involvement to ensure that our community is afforded the full six week consultation period as directly noted by your Department.

Further, we also reiterate our invitation to you to meet with our community in a public forum so that we can openly discuss the project. 9am this Saturday at the information event your Department has organised would be a great time given we are now almost out of time.

I have made enquiries over using our land if purchased for a Detention Facility, whilst we knew nothing of the rezoning to agriculture from rural that's not the end to the proposal.

Please read the response and feel free to call me as I'm not on email.

--

The Tasmanian Planning Scheme - Southern Midlands defines Custodial Facility as:

'Custodial Facility = use of land, other than psychiatric facilities, for detaining or reforming persons committed by the courts or for the purpose of court proceedings or police investigations. Examples include a prison, remand centre and any other type of detention facility.'

The Agriculture zone does not list Custodial facility as a permissible use. It is therefore a prohibited use.

The Rural zone lists Custodial Facility in the Use Table as a permissible use.

The Agriculture zone could be changed via a planning scheme amendment (PSA) process to either:

1. list as an exemption (specified departure) the CT upon which the Custodial facility is to be developed, or
2. rezone the land to the Rural zone.

Either approach could make a Custodial Facility permissible. As part of an PSA, the development application could be part of the application so it is a combined application. A development application needs to be assessed and approved by the planning authority in any case (i.e., if the zone is Rural the activity is Discretionary, and discretions may be invoked by the inability of the development to meet an Acceptable Solution).

The PSA process would be longer, due to the increased advertising time for the amendment documentation and the Planning Commission processes, but the DA process alone would equally take time (but less time, unless the approval, refusal or approval with conditions by Council (assuming the amendment is initiated by Council) was appealed to TASCAT by the applicant and/or other parties).

The issue with the rezoning of the land is in my view its potential loss (and the significance of that loss) to the Agriculture zone where agriculture is the primary objective. The Agriculture zone also permits as permissible activities that are non-agricultural uses. Of note is the exclusion of your property from the Sorell Irrigation District; see TheLIST extract below which shows the boundary is the northern and western edge of your land. In terms of the operation of the quarry on your land if the DA and PSA were to be initiated, the Mining Lease on your land can be surrendered post rehabilitation of the pit, and the permit expired/surrendered with the EPA and Council - in effect it is ceased, and the land rehabilitated, unless the activity is to be used as part of the construction process. Several Codes of the Scheme would apply, such as the Road and Rail Assets and Parking and Access, to any development application at the site for a Custodial Facility - this would likely be the case at any site identified for this purpose (i.e. parking required, access requirements, intensification of use of an access or possible new access). Some would not apply.

Drop-in sessions

Risdon Vale session
Aboriginal children's centre!
The notification of public consultation has been haphazard and ad hoc.
Noise pollution and Light pollution - the houses at the top of [redacted] that weren't made aware cannot be screened from light pollution. They are looking directly down on the site.
Huge NO to East Derwent Highway location.
Huge NO to East Derwent Highway/Otago site. Otago is a quiet, rural, safe suburb. The Bowen Bridge is already at traffic capacity.
Concerns re traffic, already congested there of an evening. Eyesore off bridge.
The children that get to youth detention are the worst of the worst. We have all seen them in action. This is very scary for the residential area.
What an eyesore for everyone on the Bowen Bridge.
Is the facility going to be camouflaged from the public? E.g. bridge, road.
How do you know if this new facility will work better than the one up North, as it has not been tried before and putting the community at risk?
The Otago site is far too close to residential properties. Otago zoning is rural residential.
We live in rural area. We love the peace in the area. The detention centre will devalue our homes and there will be more traffic. Please do not put the detention centre in Risdon.
I live in [redacted] and I first heard of the detention centre on the 11/4/23, there was no communication prior to this date, there is not enough time to completely understand the consequences of having this in Risdon. I feel it needs to be in the country where there are no houses. I feel for the people of Otago who have built lovely homes, and this will lessen the value of them.
No to site being built near Bowen Bridge.
Where is the evidence that this won't reduce property prices?

What happens after April 17? How will the decision be made?
Disgraceful to spend good money on bad behaviour. Highway access not suitable. Time frame for consultation too short.
Feel the Brighton site much preferable to East Derwent Highway: 1) Too visible from Bowen Bridge. 2) Traffic in Otago already a nightmare. 3) Area marked is prime real-estate and would be better used by the Government for housing. 4) Don't believe it will increase property price in the area. 5) Don't believe there will be no escapees.
The Brighton site is much larger and can be better screened. The Bowen Bridge is already very busy, and this facility would certainly increase this.
Where is the evidence of properties increasing and not decreasing? A huge no to the East Derwent Highway site at Otago.
Facility should stay in the North. They already have better roads.
Why does the detention facility need to be in the South? What have been the issues within the centre that has been in the North/North West?
The facility would need lighting at night - this would make the facility even more obtrusive than it would already be.
Large residential area at Otago. Risdon site is not appropriate.
20 children kept in - how can we ensure their mates will be out of our area?
It should not be in a residential area.
Along with plans for a new centre, what has been done to understand more about the issues that are causing young people to offend and be detained?
What consultation has been undertaken with the Aboriginal community who have special lands and active programs close by?
Where is the evidence for increased value of properties in surrounding areas? Examples please.
Needs more publicity - e.g., media and social media.
Where will 100 staffs be recruited? What would their roles be? Where would they be trained? Qualifications?
972 East Derwent Highway is far too visible from the Bowen Bridge and the East Derwent Highway. A discreet site, preferably in a rural area, with little surrounding housing would be more suitable.
Getting off the Bowen Bridge in the afternoon is near impossible to get onto the East Derwent Highway.
Have concerns regarding entrance and exit points to the facility. Do not want any road access off Sollamer Place.
Have reservations of any such facility being so close to the Aboriginal Centre at Risdon Pyramids.
The worst possible site for a youth detention centre. Build it away from school/residential/picturesque/future development. Very poor decision.
Traffic issues have already been on Bowen Bridge. Risdon - smaller site. Brighton - larger site.

The Aboriginal Children Centre and Detention Centre on one site - what sort of a message is that?
Better to upgrade highway from the bridge through acquired property to Risdon Brook Tavern.
Eyesore for all traffic going over Bowen Bridge.
Outrageous! Not enough time for residents to make an informed decision. No to a youth detention centre in Otago/Risdon.
Why don't you consider the Sandy Bay UTAS site? (Lots of nearby transport)
Eyesore coming off the bridge.
Where is your trial-replicated data?
Is this the best you could come up with in an inflation environment?
Why did you not consult us in 2021?
Where are the facts to support these statements?
Traffic has already been an issue.
Not a good idea to build this centre next to Aboriginal land where kids go for learning.
Right beside Aboriginal Children Centre?
Highly visible site.
What local business near Otago will benefit?
What keeps them in?
Currently zoned for transport purposes. Discretionary use only.
The whole traffic configuration on this side of Bowen Bridge is absolutely dreadful. This land is needed for a total redesign.
Our concern is if and how escapees are dealt with & prevented from getting into the community at large?
Staff Ashley Centre with better personnel and this would not need to be built. More consideration in stopping the cycle of bad behaviour.
Why is proximity to the jail a matter for consideration? Shared resources? Education programs? I do not consider proximity to a jail an appropriate matter to consider and I do not support it.
Risdon does have historical significance for both early settlers and Aboriginal people - how will this preserve that?
Whatever the facility is, it should have access to meaningful circuit breakers - to learn skills farming, outdoor skills. Site should be sheltered from external influence. Why do you want something that is visual every day? Isn't it bad enough that we see the Risdon Prison every day?
Our area is not rural we do have issues from a close neighbourhood with graffiti and burnout cars. Please leave our small area alone. We have a school adjoining this site and I feel there is no justice by placing near us.
Vote a huge no to East Derwent location at Otago. Busy area already - don't need more traffic. Already have school adjoining property. Too close to Aboriginal Centre. Will decrease property value. Leave our beautiful tight knit Otago alone.

Totally N

Pontville session
Staff at Ashley already have jobs who will probably not move South. Make sure Ashley is staffed with the correct people - weed out the bad ones so no need for new facility. Much cheaper to spend $40 million to do up Ashley - already existing facility will allow excess money to improve services.
Objecting strongly against a detention facility at Brighton/Pontville. Should be at Risdon (where the jail is nearby) so all the facilities are there. No public transport at Pontville/Brighton. Residential around Pontville/Brighton (opposite proposed site) but none opposite Risdon. All facilities at Risdon Jail to be used at the Risdon site, saving money. No facilities at Pontville/Brighton and too close to a major highway.
Risdon site is my preference.
The facility will attract "friends" to do burnouts in what is already a popular spot for such actions.
Public transport? There is only one bus to and from Hobart every weekday.
Why no public meeting? Obviously to avoid a public discussion. The whole "consultation" is low key and is designed to reassure.
Spend half the amount doing up Ashley and use the remaining money for public housing. Provide bus transport for staff to Deloraine/Launceston to help keep existing staff. Detention is not supposed to be a holiday camp. There is no need to move the existing facility other than for political gain/poor image of Ashley.
The presence of the centre will inevitably be obvious from the road/highway.
My property will be devalued by this facility. It will bring crime to the area.
A youth detention does not do anything to improve our lives or home life. Put it in a more remote area or combine with the prison at Risdon Vale.
There will inevitably be a stigma which will undermine the council's efforts to improve Brighton's image.
Of course, inevitably house values will be lower.
My property is [redacted], I do not want my children and grandchildren looking at it either.
I live nearby and can visibly see the "detention centre". I will not be impressed to see extra lighting and knowing that I will be no longer safe in my own home - either day or night, should there be the inevitable escape for the facility. Send them to Waddamana where they can be alone and not be a threat to anyone in the area.
Not happy with the advertising and public awareness. Don't like how the Government has gone about the process about choosing the spot. No Southern Midlands.
It's a rural area/heritage which you are trying to pollute with light, noise, and danger. We know these facilities don't work and you know it's going to pollute the rural aspect of Brighton and Pontville. Build it next to the barracks – it already has security and light and noise pollution. Makes sense to everyone except the Government.

Social media

Neutral
Our first notification was by a card in our letterbox on 29/3 which did not have any important details of public meetings, etc. Very poor effort as not everyone is connected to the internet or social media
It's been out for consultation for a while now, since 23 March. They're just paying for a reminder to show on your Facebook feed in case you didn't know and were interested. It's probably been on multiple TV/radio stations and newspapers as well, they did a media release in March. If there's another way you'd like to be communicated with, put that in your feedback so they can do better next time.
Melaleuca sounds good. Daily flights. No centre of population. No schools
Just make it bigger!
I do love the 'not in my backyard' brigade
Fit for purpose. Take it elsewhere, maybe Maria Island.
They wouldn't dare build something like that in Sandy Bay. Brighton's fair game.
Bring it on
Give 2 options, one for maximum security facility and one for youth detention. Suddenly, the youth detention won't seem so bad to have in the neighbourhood.
Are they still going to build another up north as well as a new prison, that would make more sense.
Get a person with brains to do something for once.
Only a brave Minister would embark upon this process in the areas they have put forward. Typical lack of thought by an unimaginative public service. Stop, think, plan something that is innovative and serves the Tasmanian community. Be imaginative, don't make the same mistakes we have been making since the white invaders arrived.
Why not use the UTAS land in Sandy Bay when UTAS moves into Hobart?
Don't put it on Main Road Brighton, there is marijuana growing just across the road. The smell from the hothouse is bad enough for residents in the area, let alone having minors smelling it everyday.
Risdon
As an aside [redacted], I totally agree with you that there needs to be an extensive consultation process. I live near Otago my daughter lives nearby. We first heard about this proposal and consultation process was a few days ago on Facebook, a medium we don't often use and the process closes soon. No letter drop. Really good consultation? Wow, that is so inept.
Thank you for the very short timeframe to put forward a submission. (Over a holiday period when people are away.) Unfortunately, due to lack of notice, we won't be able to attend the public meeting. Very interesting tactics. We have submitted our opposition today.
Hi [redacted] the site is obviously unsuitable. Apart from the traffic issues, the cultural and heritage connections: that land should belong to the indigenous community, the fact that local residents will be severely affected, we actually to do better than the same old. If we believe that these individuals can be rehabilitated, then clearly and facility should not be considered an extension of the RP which I note you are already doing. It should in fact be as far away as possible. Having dealt with juveniles for 45 years, the very last thing we should be doing is placing them in a centre for failure. If you believe this has nothing to do with race, then you are very much mistaken.

[redacted] actually that site would not be a good idea. The traffic congestion is always shocking in this area so having more traffic coming to this point is not a great idea. Also, this sort of facility doesn't deserve to be built on a parcel of land that has wonderful water views, how about they look at other areas, not this residential area. How about Mangalore where there's less residential housing in a rural area.
[redacted] unsure why the reference to the "white invaders" is used in this process. It's got nothing to do with race. But anyways, the site at EDH is clearly the better site of all three as it's close to PT as well as the adult prisons. The act of embarking on this process is what people want, consultation. At the end of the day, a secure juvenile facility is definitely required as evidenced by the recent stabbing both in Hobart 13yo) and Burnie (17yo). These youths cannot be placed in community care.