



West Coast Council

# GRANVILLE HARBOUR PUBLIC TOILET FACILITY PROPOSAL

Community Consultation Feedback and Comments

**Public Consultation**

**31 October 2020 to 25 November 2020**

# GRANVILLE HARBOUR PUBLIC TOILET FACILITY PROPOSAL

## COMMUNITY CONSULTATION FEEDBACK AND COMMENTS

The West Coast Council has been working on a proposal to develop a toilet facility within the Granville Harbour community boundary. The proposal has been a complex one, with Council needing to take into consideration the requirements of the Granville Harbour residents, the visiting community and those stake holders who also have an active interest in the area, such as the Parks & Wildlife Service of Tasmania. Therefore, community feedback was sort and is presented below.

The proposal was released for public comment for a period of 3 ½ weeks, closing on 25 November 2020. The comment period was advertised via social media, Council website and local radio.

There were 16 submissions received in relation to the proposal feedback.

---

**Name:** Ron Foss

**Town:** Queenstown

Support the initiative to have a toilet block at Granville and would urge you to contract a local to oversee and clean. I think having a local with an interest in the facility would likely minimise vandalism/theft and allow a better cleaning regime.

---

**Name:** Lenny & Maureen Cairns

**Town:** Zeehan

With regards to the proposed toilets at Granville Harbour, as we are local shack owners whose shack is approximately 100metres from the site, we are not in favour of the proposed toilet site the reasons being,

1, It will encourage campers to camp on the foreshore, this would create more traffic causing more risk to the community children, also would create noise, and potential drunken behaviour which does not happen now, which will mean more rubbish left to be cleaned up.

2, Unpleasant smell if it is not maintained correctly

3, Vandalism and littering in and around the toilets, hence more cost to us ratepayers.

4, Potential rate increase to cover costs of maintaining.

---

**Name:** Ian Wotherspoon  
**Town:** Granville Harbour

To Whom it May Concern

Thank you for giving the Granville Harbour community an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed public toilet facility.

It's so pleasing to see some progress being made.

**Comments:**

**Examples shown.**

Example 1 would appear to be slightly better than no. 2, but it may well be a matter of which one fits better into the budget. In reality I don't have a problem with this aspect.

The outside sink is a great idea.

Given the facility's proximity to the sea and subsequent prevailing conditions it might be wise to have access facing east (or people could be blown off the seat!) Or re-assess the location. I presume there will be some sort of (solar?) lighting.

**Costing**

I'm certainly no expert but if the project can be completed for \$60,000 those concerned should be congratulated. I hope the estimate is right.

Heaven forbid, almost \$1,000 a week to clean the toilets! Wouldn't mind the contract at that rate, but of course that rate probably allows for a Council employee to do the cleaning plus vehicle costs.

\$123 per day seems exorbitant: maybe a resident on seeing this figure might express some interest in the role. And of course, visitation is much quieter in winter, lessening the need.

The arrangement at Trial Harbour might be interesting to follow up, while at the Pieman Heads neither of the two facilities get regular cleaning, although it is conceded that their use is much less than what will be the case at Granville.

**Location:**

The proposed site is great but there are a couple of issues:

1. Ideally, it is my belief that the preferred spot would be on the northern side of the harbour where the majority of campers stay, but that apparently just cannot happen; so as mentioned it may be preferable for the toilets to face east because of the prevailing conditions. An alternative so that they do face east would be for them to be on the opposite side of the road, south of the Taswater pump station. But that is highly unlikely given aboriginal heritage issues. The Trial Harbour main toilets face the sea, so an indication re the conditions [there](#) might be relevant for comparison.

2. Several years ago we sought approval to build a small facility adjacent to the concrete slab several metres from this proposed site. D.P.A.C, Parks and Wildlife and Aboriginal heritage personnel visited the site about four years ago, deeming it to be "sacred", although allowing what was to be built on it to be on a raised floor, ie timber, and not concrete.

That may well be an issue given the proposed toilet location is only a very few metres from that site.

The fact the toilets will be relatively close to housing may be beneficial with respect to hearing any untoward behaviour occurring around or in the toilets. eg vandalism, although highly unlikely.

The site is also unlikely to create genuine opposition from residents with respect to obstruction of the view but be prepared for some negative comments!

**Signage:**

It might be appropriate if signage regarding the location of the toilets is placed, I'd suggest on the Main Street green as the toilets will be unsighted to those travelling into Granville.

Finally, congratulations on what has been achieved so far; there is probably quite some way to go, but there is movement at the station and before too long we can only hope visitors to this busy little settlement will have the benefit of what we have sought for so long to provide.

---

**Name:** Gerrard Newall

**Town:** Zeehan

To whom it may concern regarding the public toilet proposal at Granville harbour

I am local resident in Zeehan and i have family that are locals at Granville harbour the proposal for the toilets is a joke residents of Granville Harbour are against the public toilets being placed in Granville Harbour as the West Coast Council cannot even look after our roads or our towns there is meant to be a fire shed placed at Granville harbour in case of emergency where has that gone and the phone box that is placed in the main street at Granville Harbour that is an eye sore and so will the toilets be.

I am a local resident at Granville harbour and i say the toilets should be up at the waste transfer facility so people could drop there rubbish off at the same time because people do not take it out with them when they leave the beaches at Granville

---

**Name:** Sharon Williams

**Town:** Granville Harbour

Happy in regard to both designs as long as this does not impact our rates at Granville.

---

**Name:** Kerry Bourke

**Town:** Granville Harbour

I am a resident of Granville Harbour and I think this would be a good thing, as in the summer the fore shore going up the coast stinks of sewerage from campers so with a bit of luck this may stop.

---

**Name:** Maureen Walch

**Town:** Unknown

I would like to express my view against the proposed Public Toilet facility at Granville Harbour for the following reasons:

- increase traffic, it is busy enough already esp in the summertime and on long weekends
- increase amount of rubbish left and fire hazard due to campfires
- unjustified amount of money spent on building facility and maintenance
- location site on the waterfront??? definitely most unsightly, assuming that a car park would have to be provided also

I hope that you will reconsider the proposal. It will be very detrimental to the community and destroy the ambience of the place.

---

**Name:** Alex Simpson

**Town:** Granville Harbour

In accordance with the West Coast Council's "flyer" and Facebook Posts regarding the above proposal, I wish to offer the following comments / feedback:

#### Issues

- The toilet is proposed to be located on Reserved Land (Mt Heemskirk Regional Reserve) in an area of significant Aboriginal Heritage. The Director of Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania (AHT), accompanied by a Heritage Officer and Archaeologist visited and inspected the site, as well as the foreshore cleared areas west of the town infrastructure and advised that there were multiple significant artifact sites in the proposed location. A phone call with Kate Moody, AHT on 19 November 2020, reconfirmed the site was recorded with AHT.
- The toilet facility is proposed at a site west of the township. Given the prevailing winds are westerly in nature, odours from the facility would pass over the town.
- Notwithstanding the use of water tanks, there is no water supply near the facility. Given the fall in the land, it would likely require pumps for greywater from the septic increasing operational costs if mains connected or additional service costs if run on solar.
- As per the Tasmanian Reserve Management Code of Practice, 2003, toilet facilities on Reserved Land require a demonstrated need where non-provision would pose an unacceptable risk to the environment and human health. There is no evidence / studies detailed that clearly demonstrate this need; there is only rhetoric.
- Given the need is not demonstrated, a cost estimate of \$44,980 per annum for operations of the facility is excessive and could be re-directed to a better use. The above figures do not include facility maintenance including painting (an area of high corrosion), vandalism, extra cleaning (twice daily cleaning requirements in summer as per Parks and Wildlife Standards), parking, signage management, grass cutting, provision and maintenance of

power (mains or solar if required). Remote area toilets managed by the Parks and Wildlife Service cost in the order of \$80,000 + per annum for all O&M expenses – some are way above this figure due to remoteness and method of operation.

- The facility is proposed to be located on the foreshore at Granville Harbour. The proposal does not align with the Principles and Outcomes of the *State Coastal Policy 1993* relating to preservation of Cultural and Historic Resources and, Coastal Uses and Development.
- The facility is proposed for the foreshore at Granville Harbour. During the 1950, 60's, and 70's, multiple structures were erected across coastal areas (now formally Reserved Land). In 2020, this practice has virtually ceased as it is deemed inappropriate to disturb view-fields, heritage sites and public open space with facilities that can be located in areas of minimal impact and greater convenience.
- The proposed location for the toilet facility will be a draw card for campers to co-locate within the town boundary. Camping within the confines of the township of Granville Harbour should not be permitted, the same as any other residential community, other than in designated camping areas which are managed. There is 120 kilometres of free range camping available north and south of Granville Harbour to visitors to use for no fees. A public toilet facility in the town would only exacerbate an already problematic area of campers within the town boundary. It is an issue that is in breach of current Legislation (*National Parks and Reserves Management Regulations, 2019*) and one that requires increased enforcement from the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service.
- The West Coast Community Plan 2025 (and Supplement) under Granville Harbour has no mention of it being a tourism destination and tourism is specifically not mentioned in accordance with the majority views of the community at the consultation sessions held in the town. Every other West Coast township mentions tourism as being supported or desirable. The majority of the community at Granville Harbour voted against being a tourism destination, seeking to leave things as they were. The majority view was that there were plenty of other west coast towns to meet that need and Granville Harbour should remain as is. As the West Coast Community Plan is endorsed by the Community and Council, the Public Toilet proposal is in conflict with the Plan and the resources should be re-directed to towns with greater defined need.
- The Reserve Activity Assessment required for the facility is likely to be Level 2. It could be as Level 3 Assessment if a detailed Archaeological Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment is required and Council seeks to progress the proposal contrary to any Tasmanian Government Departmental advice recommending it does not proceed. The cost of this assessment would be very high with no guarantees and a time frame of possibly greater than 4-6 months.

### **Option**

Should the Council decide to proceed regardless of the above, the following may assist:

- The refuse site (with large skip-bin) just east of the town may be a suitable site. The land is degraded with no known heritage issues (would need to be confirmed). It is downwind

of the town, and if powered by solar and fed by large tanks it could tap directly into the eastern end of the greywater main that supports the town and be gravity fed (no pumps required – lower operating costs). There is a suitable lookout location adjacent to the site that would stand a reasonable case of being supported by Parks as a carpark for the toilet. All people entering or departing the town would pass directly by the facility (it would be highly visible) and it would be co-located next to the rubbish skip, encouraging people to dispose of their rubbish correctly whilst in situ. It would discourage camping at the site as there is no open suitable ground nearby. It is away from the foreshore and does not impede view fields. There are no existing services at the site so construction becomes less complicated. Construction does not impact the local amenity. It would require surveillance or signage to deter vandalism. It would not become a focal point for parking etc in the town and therefore should align with the community's desires for things to remain as is. It would be very challenging, given current demographics, and transient nature of a lot of local community members to find a suitable long term local maintenance person / cleaner to service and maintain the facility on a daily or twice daily roster.

### **Conclusion**

A proposal on the foreshore has a number of obstacles that range from community angst from some members to significant environmental / heritage issues. Regardless of location, for it to be located on Reserved Land, it must meet a “need” criteria and no evidence (other than rhetoric) has been presented to make the project cost effective or required to negate an unacceptable risk to the environment or public health. The ongoing ground and structural maintenance costs of the facility have not been forecast and would place an unreasonable additional non-forecast burden on Council funding. It breaches a number of State Policy documents in its proposed form and would likely attract camping inside the town boundary of Granville Harbour in direct breach of current legislation.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Do not proceed with the proposed toilet facility as presented.
2. Place a sign at the start of Granville Harbour Road stating:

***There are no Public Amenities in the Granville Harbour township.  
The nearest public amenities are located at Corinna and Zeehan***

Estimated cost \$150 fitted

3. Do something for the kids in Zeehan and spend the remaining \$59,850 (capex) on repairs and maintenance on the Zeehan Connection Centre, (it has a toilet if the grantee needs appealing) which is managed by the Zeehan Neighbourhood Centre. It would bring it up to a suitable standard for the local kids to safely enjoy its use.
  4. Spend the O&M expenditure forecast of \$44,980 per annum on O&M for the Zeehan Pool.
-

**Name:** Susan Buckley  
**Town:** Granville Harbour

I refer to the proposal of the new Granville Harbour Public Toilet Facility and wish to provide my feedback as a shack owner at Granville Harbour. The toilets are an excellent idea and will provide a service for tourists who visit the harbour. Campers will also benefit from the public toilets and hopefully they will stop using the bush as their toilet thus eliminating the unwanted toilet paper which has been a problem for many years. Ideally it would be more cost effective if a local could clean the toilets as I feel this would not have to be done on daily basis during the winter months. Most locals come into Zeehan on a weekly basis and could pick up supplies. This would reduce the estimate of the ongoing cleaning costs. It states that the proposed site is the only site for consideration but if this is not suitable would it be possible for the toilets to go directly opposite with the toilet doors facing east for protection from the wind? I feel that this is a long-awaited improvement for the community of Granville Harbour.

---

**Name:** Julie & Kerry Webb  
**Town:** Granville Harbour

As property owners we are strongly against this proposal.

The majority of camper's camp on the northern side of the Harbour and on the beaches further on and will not use this facility.

By making a toilet available it will encourage many campers to camp near the toilets and will create a problem with them leaving rubbish and making a mess of the foreshore area. The local community already clean up after messy campers that choose to stay, and we work hard to keep our foreshore tidy and clean.

The yearly cost is huge and an added burden to the west coast rate payers. It cannot be justified spending this money considering no community gain. Surely this money can be spent in a more beneficial manner. **NO TO PUBLIC TOILETS. DEFINETLY NOT.**

---

**Name:** Phillip Morgan  
**Town:** Granville Harbour

I would like to thank council for this toilet facility. I think it about time to have this at Granville Harbour, I know this is a topical conversation here but its time. The placement is not ideal, but it is the most practicable. And I also note this will change Granville Harbour if implemented.

As a full time, resident and have had a place here for 25 years and have had people knock on my door to ask if the wife can use my toilet has happened more than once.

---



**Name:** Miriam Young  
**Town:** Granville Harbour

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yes, I think a public toilet would be beneficial for tourists. I have personally been asked by tourists 'where it is'?

However, the area should never become a camping ground considering its proposed location is in front of shacks and dwellings. No camping would not only need to be clearly signposted but regularly POLICED!

Regarding the design and water supply, it needs to be appropriate to enable the facility to be hosed out. For example, the Fossey River toilets appear to be regularly hosed out, and to date in my experience, they have always smelt clean.

I would also like to suggest that a request be made to Parks and Wildlife (yet again) to consider more patrolling of the coastline north of Granville, given the massively increased use of the area and subsequent damage being caused. Perhaps a registration booth at the commencement of the track might encourage more responsible use of the area, and assist with traceability and safety?

---

**Name:** Kate Moody – Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania  
**Town:** Hobart

Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania (AHT) has recently become aware of a proposed toilet facility at Granville Harbour (<https://www.westcoast.tas.gov.au/news/latest-news/granville-harbour-public-toilet-facility-proposal>).

Please note that the Granville Harbour foreshore is culturally rich and that the proposed toilet location is within a significant Aboriginal heritage site. Any development or works in this area would require a permit under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975*. These concerns were raised by AHT several years ago when an earlier iteration of the project was proposed in this area.

When considering impacts to Aboriginal heritage, avoidance is always the preference. As the toilet facility does not appear to be critical infrastructure at this particular location, we would strongly recommend that alternative locations which avoid Aboriginal heritage are explored as it is unlikely that a permit application would be supported for the current proposal. AHT would be happy to work with the West Coast Council on further options.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss further.

---