

From: [peter.c](#)
To: [House of Assembly - GAA](#)
Date: Monday, 21 September 2026 11:28:53 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] - [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Committee Secretary,

Please accept the submission below from **Peter H. E. Coxhead** to the House of Assembly Government Administration Committee A's ***Inquiry into AI Data Centres in Tasmania***.

I am making this submission in my personal capacity. My contact details are provided below for verification and correspondence. I am content for the submission to be considered for publication by the Committee.

Given the closing date, I have included the complete submission directly in this email so that there can be no uncertainty about the material being submitted. I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt.

Name: Peter H. E. Coxhead

Email: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Postal address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Kind regards,

Peter H. E. Coxhead

SUBMISSION TO THE INQUIRY INTO AI DATA CENTRES IN TASMANIA

**House of Assembly Government Administration Committee A
Parliament of Tasmania**

Submitted by: Peter H. E. Coxhead

Date: 21 September 2026

Individual submission

Purpose of Submission

This submission is provided to assist the Committee's Inquiry into AI Data Centres in Tasmania.

It addresses the cumulative implications of large-scale AI and data-centre development for Tasmania's electricity system, water resources, infrastructure, environment, planning system, communities and long-term economic interests.

The submission does not proceed from the position that AI data-centre development should either be accepted or rejected as a class. It proposes a framework under which individual developments can be assessed according to their actual costs, benefits, resource requirements and risks.

Particular emphasis is placed on practical measures capable of implementation through planning, regulation, approval conditions, infrastructure policy and legislation.

Several recommendations have potential application beyond AI data centres. These are identified because the emergence of this industry provides Tasmania with an opportunity to improve its broader approach to major industrial development.

The central proposition is that Tasmania should establish the public-interest conditions governing this emerging industry before individual developments, infrastructure commitments and resource allocations make those decisions increasingly difficult to change.

Executive Summary

Tasmania has an opportunity to benefit from the development of artificial intelligence and data-centre infrastructure, but only if development occurs within a framework established in advance to protect Tasmania's electricity system, water resources, environment, communities and existing industries.

The question should not simply be whether individual data-centre developments can obtain planning approval.

The appropriate question is:

What conditions should Tasmania establish now so that this emerging industry produces lasting benefits for Tasmania without transferring its costs and risks to the Tasmanian community?

Individual assessment is inadequate where several developments collectively draw upon the same electricity system, water resources, telecommunications infrastructure, environment and workforce.

Tasmania therefore requires a statewide and cumulative framework based upon a simple sequence:

SEE → ASSESS → ACT → MONITOR → ENFORCE

Where the characteristics or impacts of a proposal remain unknown, those impacts should not simply be treated as zero. The absence of sufficient information should be recorded as an assessment deficiency requiring resolution before approval.

The Tasmanian public should not carry the financial, environmental or infrastructure risks created by private data-centre developments while the principal benefits accrue elsewhere.

Nor should Tasmania regard this industry solely as a problem requiring regulation.

Handled intelligently, it provides an opportunity to establish new standards for resource-efficient industrial development, including renewable-energy innovation, recycled-water

infrastructure, productive use of waste heat, new forms of intensive agriculture, improved infrastructure and measurable social benefits.

Tasmania should seek to become not merely a place where AI infrastructure is located, but a place demonstrating how major new industries can be integrated intelligently into a small community and resource-constrained environment.

Summary of Recommendations

This submission recommends that Tasmania:

1. Establish a statewide framework governing major AI and data-centre development before further large-scale development occurs.
2. Require cumulative assessment of electricity, water, infrastructure, environmental and community impacts rather than assessing each proposal in isolation.
3. Require major new electricity loads to bring additional supply, storage, firming or equivalent capacity rather than simply consuming existing system capacity.
4. Protect households, essential services and established Tasmanian industries through enforceable demand-curtailement arrangements for very large new discretionary loads.
5. Ensure that additional electricity imports and infrastructure required principally for private developments are not indirectly subsidised by existing Tasmanian consumers.
6. Restrict diesel and other fossil-fuel generation to genuine emergency backup, with enforceable transition arrangements towards cleaner alternatives.
7. Require assessment and, where practicable, productive use of waste heat, while establishing a new **Resource-Integrated Agriculture** planning framework to facilitate intensive agriculture using recoverable heat, recycled water and other suitable resource streams.
8. Encourage distributed renewable generation and research into lower-impact technologies including rooftop solar, storage, vertical-axis wind generation and appropriate marine or tidal technologies.
9. Require proponents to meet infrastructure costs attributable to their developments.
10. Establish the principle that potable water should not be used for industrial purposes where fit-for-purpose non-potable water is reasonably available, supported by purple-pipe infrastructure for new industrial development and staged retrofitting where practicable.
11. Require assessment of full lifecycle environmental impacts rather than limiting assessment to impacts occurring within a development boundary.
12. Maintain genuinely independent regulation while recovering appropriate regulatory costs from industry.
13. Require independently verifiable evidence, monitoring and research, with appropriate public access to monitoring information.

14. Establish effective enforcement powers and continuing obligations throughout the operating life of major developments.
 15. Establish independent oversight of the regulatory system, reporting ultimately to Parliament.
 16. Require standardised public reporting of major resource consumption, environmental performance and compliance.
 17. Require credible emergency-management and resilience arrangements, with development-specific emergency costs borne by proponents.
 18. Require adequate decommissioning security and ensure environmental and other obligations transfer with ownership.
 19. Use major developments to build enduring Tasmanian skills, research capability and technological expertise.
 20. Establish a **Major Development Public Benefit Obligation**, requiring major future projects to provide an additional, measurable and enduring public or social benefit.
 21. Require national-security and strategic-resilience assessment of major AI and data-centre infrastructure before final approval.
-

1. Establish a Statewide Framework Before Further Large-Scale Development

Tasmania should establish a statewide regulatory framework for major AI and data-centre development rather than allowing the eventual framework to emerge incrementally from individual project approvals.

The framework should establish minimum requirements for electricity, water, backup generation, emissions, noise, infrastructure, waste heat, public reporting, decommissioning, emergency management and community benefit.

Local planning approval should not substitute for assessment of statewide consequences.

Where Commonwealth, State and local-government responsibilities overlap, responsibility for each component should be clearly identified.

The framework should apply consistently to future proposals so that communities, proponents and regulators know the rules before substantial investment decisions are made.

2. Require Cumulative Assessment

Large developments should not be assessed as though they exist independently of every other development.

Before additional major loads are approved, Tasmania should publish and regularly update a cumulative assessment of proposed and committed data-centre demand.

That assessment should include, where applicable:

- electricity demand and firming requirements;
- transmission and distribution infrastructure;
- water demand;
- backup generation;
- emissions;
- telecommunications infrastructure;
- construction demand;
- workforce requirements;
- emergency-management capacity; and
- cumulative regional environmental and community effects.

A project that may be manageable in isolation may become unacceptable when combined with other developments.

Where sufficient information about a proposed project's material impacts has not been supplied, the missing information should be identified as an assessment deficiency rather than assumed to represent no impact.

3. Additional Electricity Demand Should Bring Additional Supply and Firming

Major new electricity users should demonstrate how their additional demand will be supplied without transferring unreasonable costs or supply risks to existing Tasmanian consumers.

Where new renewable generation or storage is relied upon to justify a development, those commitments should be measurable and enforceable.

Approval conditions should establish milestones for delivery.

Failure to deliver promised generation or firming should constrain the new load rather than transfer additional risk or cost to Tasmania.

Tasmania should encourage proponents to invest in additional generation, storage, demand management and other technologies that strengthen rather than merely consume the electricity system.

4. Protect Existing Tasmanian Electricity Users

Households, essential services and established Tasmanian industries should not bear disproportionate consequences from the introduction of very large new discretionary loads.

Major data-centre operators should be capable of reducing demand during periods of genuine system constraint.

The operating hierarchy should be:

additional renewable generation and firming → commercially purchased imports where available → demand curtailment by the new large load → fossil-fuel generation only for genuine emergencies.

The principle should be:

Grid constraint should trigger demand flexibility, not routine fossil-fuel substitution.

Binding curtailment arrangements should therefore form part of approval for very large electricity users.

5. Imported Electricity Should Not Become a Hidden Public Subsidy

Interconnection with mainland electricity markets can contribute to system reliability and may allow data-centre operators to purchase electricity commercially when Tasmania is constrained.

However, additional demand should not result in Tasmanian households or existing industries effectively subsidising electricity imported primarily to service a new private industrial load.

Where additional imports, network augmentation or new infrastructure are required principally because of a development, attributable costs should be identified transparently and recovered appropriately from the development.

6. Diesel and Other Fossil-Fuel Generation Must Remain Emergency Backup

Emergency backup generation is legitimate where continuity of critical equipment requires it.

Routine fossil-fuel substitution for grid electricity is a different matter.

Emergency backup should remain emergency backup.

Approval conditions should clearly distinguish genuine emergency operation from commercial or routine generation.

Generator operation should be publicly reported, including operating hours, fuel consumption and emissions where appropriate.

Testing and maintenance should be permitted to the extent reasonably necessary for

emergency readiness, but backup generation should not become a mechanism for operating large electricity loads when grid electricity becomes expensive or constrained.

Tasmania should establish a transition pathway under which routine dependence on diesel or other fossil-fuel backup is progressively eliminated as technically suitable alternatives become available.

Any transitional arrangements should contain enforceable milestones and an end date rather than becoming indefinite exemptions.

Biomass or so-called forest-waste generation should not automatically be treated as impact-free renewable generation. Its complete lifecycle should be assessed, including harvesting, processing, transport, combustion emissions and embedded fossil-fuel consumption.

7. Make Productive Use of Waste Heat

Large computing facilities convert much of the electricity they consume into heat.

Where economically and technically practicable, that heat should be regarded as a potentially useful resource rather than automatically discharged to the environment.

New developments should assess opportunities for beneficial heat use before final design and siting decisions are completed.

Potential applications include:

- greenhouses;
- aquaculture;
- aquatic crops such as water lentils;
- food processing;
- laundries;
- swimming and aquatic facilities;
- timber drying and curing;
- appropriate industrial processes; and
- district or institutional heating where suitable.

Siting policy should consider potential heat users as part of development planning rather than attempting to find uses for waste heat after a facility has already been constructed.

Resource-Integrated Agriculture

Tasmania should establish a planning category for **Resource-Integrated Agriculture**.

This would recognise intensive agricultural or biological production whose location is functionally linked to beneficial use of recoverable resources from an adjoining development, including waste heat, recycled water or other suitable resource streams.

Purpose-designed planning rules should allow these enterprises to operate on land areas appropriate to their actual production systems rather than automatically applying acreage requirements developed for conventional agriculture.

A small water-lentil, greenhouse or similar intensive production facility should not require a conventional agricultural holding merely to satisfy rules designed for an entirely different form of farming.

The rules should:

- permit appropriately small lots;
- require genuine agricultural or biological production;
- require demonstrated dependence upon or substantial beneficial use of the adjoining resource stream;
- permit necessary heat and water connections;
- retain appropriate environmental and biosecurity controls; and
- prevent the classification becoming a backdoor route to unrelated residential, commercial or industrial development.

Where necessary, agricultural-land protection and planning provisions should be amended or supplemented to accommodate this new category without weakening the broader protection of productive agricultural land.

This reform should not depend upon AI data centres proceeding.

Resource-Integrated Agriculture should be available wherever co-location enables an agricultural enterprise to make productive use of an otherwise wasted resource.

8. Encourage Distributed Renewable-Energy Innovation

Major data-centre developments should be encouraged or required, where practicable, to incorporate on-site and nearby renewable generation.

This may include rooftop and car-park solar, storage and other suitable technologies.

Tasmania should also encourage research and demonstration of emerging renewable technologies where these could reduce environmental impacts.

One opportunity worth pursuing is further development of quiet, low-vibration vertical-axis wind generation suitable for industrial buildings and developed environments.

A data-centre industry capable of supporting such research could leave Tasmania with intellectual property, engineering skills and potentially an exportable technology rather than merely electricity consumption.

Marine and tidal-flow technologies should similarly remain available for assessment where appropriate, subject to proper environmental evaluation.

9. Proponents Should Pay Attributable Infrastructure Costs

Private developments should not transfer development-specific infrastructure costs to the Tasmanian public.

Where transmission, substations, roads, water infrastructure, communications systems or other upgrades are required principally because of a development, the attributable cost should be identified and recovered from the proponent.

Public expenditure may still be justified where infrastructure produces substantial independent public benefit, but that benefit should be demonstrated rather than assumed.

Cost-allocation arrangements should be transparent.

10. Potable Water Should Not Be the Default Industrial Water Supply

Potable water is a high-quality public resource.

It should not routinely be used for industrial processes where fit-for-purpose non-potable water can reasonably perform the same function.

Major data-centre developments should therefore be required to assess recycled wastewater, treated effluent, stormwater, brackish water, seawater and other appropriate non-potable sources before relying upon potable water for routine industrial cooling or similar processes.

Purple-Pipe Infrastructure

New industrial precincts and major industrial developments should incorporate fit-for-purpose non-potable distribution infrastructure, including recognised purple-pipe systems where appropriate.

This should become a standing principle for **new industrial development generally**, not merely AI data centres.

Tasmania should also establish a staged retrofit program for existing major industrial facilities where technically practicable, prioritising large potable-water users and locations where suitable recycled or non-potable sources are available.

The underlying rule should be:

Potable water should not be used for an industrial purpose where fit-for-purpose non-potable water can reasonably do the job.

11. Assess Full Lifecycle Environmental Impacts

Assessment should extend beyond the immediate operational footprint of a data centre.

Where material, lifecycle assessment should consider construction, generation sources, backup fuels, cooling systems, water treatment, batteries, electronic equipment, refrigerants, transport, replacement cycles and eventual decommissioning.

Environmental claims should identify the boundaries used in calculating them.

Moving an impact outside a development site does not eliminate that impact.

Similarly, describing an energy source or material as renewable, recycled or waste-derived should not exempt it from assessment of its actual environmental consequences.

12. Independent Regulation and Industry Funding

Large AI and data-centre developments require effective regulation, but the development of a new industry should not result in that industry progressively determining the standards by which its own performance is judged.

Tasmania should establish regulatory arrangements in which responsibility for protecting the public interest remains clearly with government and independent statutory authorities.

Proponents should bear the reasonable costs of assessment, monitoring, compliance, auditing and enforcement associated with their developments. This may be achieved through application fees, licence fees, regulatory levies or other cost-recovery mechanisms.

However, payment for regulation must never confer influence over regulatory decisions.

Industry should not control:

- appointment or removal of regulators or inspectors;
- environmental, health, planning or technical standards;
- selection of monitoring methodologies;
- commissioning or interpretation of research used to establish regulatory limits;
- selection of independent auditors;
- publication of monitoring results; or
- decisions concerning breaches, penalties, remediation or suspension of operations.

The principle should be simple:

Industry may fund the cost of regulation, but it must not regulate itself.

Existing independent authorities should perform these functions where they are appropriately equipped to do so. Where regulatory gaps exist, responsibility should be explicitly allocated rather than creating unnecessary bureaucracy.

13. Independent Evidence, Monitoring and Research

Regulation should be based upon independently verifiable evidence rather than primarily upon information supplied or commissioned by proponents.

Baseline measurements should be established before construction wherever relevant, including noise, water, energy, emissions and other environmental conditions.

Monitoring methods, locations, frequency and reporting requirements should be determined or approved by the responsible regulator.

Where specialist research is required, proponents may fund that research, but commissioning and oversight should remain independent of the proponent.

Researchers, consultants, auditors and technical advisers should disclose relevant financial or professional conflicts of interest.

Monitoring data and regulatory findings should be publicly available wherever there is no legitimate privacy, commercial-confidentiality or national-security reason preventing publication.

Standards should not become fixed simply because a particular industrial practice has become conventional.

Regulatory standards should be periodically reviewed against independent scientific and technical evidence, emerging technologies and demonstrated opportunities to reduce environmental or community impacts.

New or alternative technologies should be assessed upon demonstrated performance rather than disadvantaged merely because they differ from established industry practice.

Tasmania should encourage innovation rather than inadvertently protecting today's technology against tomorrow's better alternative.

14. Accountability, Enforcement and Continuing Obligations

Development approval should not mark the end of public-interest assessment.

Major developments should remain subject to measurable operating conditions throughout their working lives.

Where monitoring identifies a breach or unacceptable impact, regulators should have effective powers including:

- requiring corrective action within a specified period;
- requiring additional monitoring;
- imposing enforceable operating restrictions;
- recovering investigation and remediation costs;
- imposing penalties proportionate to the seriousness and persistence of breaches; and
- suspending relevant operations where serious risks cannot otherwise be adequately controlled.

Repeated non-compliance should attract progressively stronger consequences rather than becoming an accepted cost of doing business.

Material changes to a development — including substantial increases in computing capacity, electricity consumption, water use, generation capacity or environmental demands — should trigger reassessment rather than automatically being treated as part of the original approval.

Enforcement should be sufficiently effective that failure to meet important conditions can affect operating approval or expansion rather than merely attract an absorbable fine.

15. Independent Oversight and Parliamentary Accountability

Effective regulation requires a further safeguard:

independent oversight of the regulatory system itself.

The organisations responsible for approving, monitoring and regulating major developments should not be the final judges of whether that regulatory system is functioning effectively.

Tasmania should therefore establish or designate an independent oversight mechanism for major developments.

Its role should be to examine the performance of the system as a whole rather than duplicate the work of individual regulators.

The oversight function should:

- audit regulatory and approval-agency performance;
- examine whether approval conditions are being monitored and enforced;
- identify regulatory gaps, overlaps and failures of responsibility;
- examine cumulative impacts across multiple developments;
- review whether standards remain appropriate as evidence and technology change;
- identify conflicts of interest and risks of regulatory capture;
- examine systemic complaints from communities, workers, researchers and other affected parties;
- assess whether environmental, infrastructure and social-benefit commitments are being delivered; and
- recommend legislative, regulatory or administrative changes where deficiencies are identified.

The oversight mechanism should have appropriate authority to obtain information necessary to perform these functions, subject to legitimate privacy, legal and national-security restrictions.

Reporting to Parliament

Regular reports should be provided directly to the Tasmanian Parliament and made publicly available.

Serious regulatory failures, persistent non-compliance or emerging systemic risks should be capable of being reported without waiting for the next scheduled report.

Government and relevant agencies should respond publicly to significant recommendations within a specified period.

The accountability structure should be clear:

Proponents operate. Regulators regulate. Independent oversight examines the system. Parliament remains accountable to the Tasmanian public.

No organisation in that chain should be left as the sole judge of its own performance.

16. Transparency and Public Reporting

Public confidence requires access to meaningful information.

Major data-centre operators should publish standardised information at appropriate intervals covering matters such as:

- electricity consumption;
- peak electricity demand;
- water consumption and source;
- Power Usage Effectiveness where appropriate;
- backup-generator operation;
- relevant emissions;
- delivery of committed renewable generation and storage;
- waste-heat recovery and beneficial use;
- material environmental monitoring results; and
- compliance with significant approval conditions.

Commercial confidentiality should protect genuinely sensitive commercial information, not become a blanket reason for withholding information needed to understand use of public resources or environmental impacts.

Public reporting should be sufficiently standardised to permit comparison between facilities and assessment of cumulative effects.

17. Emergency Capability and Resilience

Large data centres should demonstrate credible emergency-management arrangements before operation.

These should address fire, loss of grid supply, communications failure, cooling-system failure, fuel incidents, extreme weather and other reasonably foreseeable events.

Emergency arrangements should be coordinated with relevant Tasmanian emergency services rather than assuming that existing public capacity can absorb whatever additional demand a development creates.

Where a development materially increases requirements for specialist emergency equipment, training or infrastructure, the attributable cost should be borne by the proponent.

Emergency planning should also examine failures affecting multiple interconnected facilities rather than considering only isolated equipment failures.

18. Decommissioning and Transfer of Ownership

Tasmania should not inherit abandoned industrial infrastructure or remediation costs after a project reaches the end of its commercial life.

Major developments should therefore provide adequate financial security for decommissioning, site rehabilitation and removal or safe management of infrastructure.

The amount should be periodically reviewed so that it remains adequate as costs change.

Sale or transfer of a facility should not extinguish environmental, decommissioning or other approval obligations.

Those responsibilities should transfer explicitly to the new owner, with government satisfied that the incoming owner has the financial and technical capacity to meet them.

A change in corporate structure should not provide a mechanism for escaping long-term obligations.

19. Tasmania Should Capture Skills, Research and Economic Capability

The value of a major new industry should not be measured solely by construction expenditure or the number of permanent jobs within the facility.

Tasmania should seek opportunities to build capabilities that remain useful beyond an individual project.

These could include:

- electrical and renewable-energy engineering;
- cooling and heat-recovery technology;
- water recycling;
- cyber security;
- advanced agriculture;
- vertical-axis wind research;
- marine-energy research;
- maintenance and technical services;
- education and training;
- local research partnerships; and

- development of technologies capable of being exported elsewhere.

Where public resources or substantial public infrastructure are involved, proponents should demonstrate how the development contributes to enduring Tasmanian capability.

20. Major Development Public Benefit Obligation

Tasmania should establish a broader principle for future major developments:

Approval of a major project should require a clearly defined additional social or public-benefit component.

That benefit should be identified before approval and should be proportionate to the scale, resource demands and impacts of the development.

It should produce a measurable and enduring benefit to Tasmania or to communities affected by the development.

Ordinary payment of tax, compliance with existing law and employment that is simply necessary to operate the project should not, by themselves, satisfy the additional public-benefit requirement.

Qualifying benefits could differ between projects.

They might include research and development, community infrastructure, environmental restoration, technology development, training, public facilities or other measurable contributions.

For data centres, one example could be support for research into quieter and lower-vibration vertical-axis wind generation suitable for industrial environments. If successful, such research could provide benefits extending far beyond the individual development and potentially beyond Tasmania.

The requirement should apply to **major future developments generally**, not only AI data centres.

Major developments should leave something of lasting public value behind.

21. National Security and Strategic Resilience

Large-scale AI and data-centre infrastructure should not be assessed solely as a planning, energy or economic-development issue.

Large concentrations of computing capability, communications infrastructure, electricity supply and potentially sensitive data can have strategic and national-security implications.

Tasmania should therefore require an appropriate **national-security and strategic-resilience assessment** before final approval of major AI and data-centre developments, undertaken in consultation with the relevant Commonwealth authorities.

The assessment should consider, where relevant:

- physical security;
- cyber security;
- ownership and control;
- foreign ownership, control or influence;
- dependence upon overseas technology and supply chains;
- submarine and terrestrial communications links;
- electricity dependencies;
- concentration of critical infrastructure;
- resilience and redundancy;
- recovery following major disruption; and
- consequences of simultaneous failure of interconnected infrastructure.

It should also consider whether concentrating very large computing, energy and telecommunications assets in particular Tasmanian locations materially alters Tasmania's strategic risk profile during international conflict or another major national-security emergency.

The purpose of this requirement is **not for Tasmania to prescribe military or intelligence responses**.

Those decisions properly belong to Defence, national-security agencies and other appropriate Commonwealth authorities.

Tasmania's responsibility is to ensure that strategically significant infrastructure is not approved without the relevant risks first being identified and assessed.

This principle should also extend beyond data centres to future major developments involving critical infrastructure or strategically significant concentrations of communications, computing, energy or other essential systems.

Conclusion

Tasmania does not need to choose between rejecting technological development and accepting it on whatever terms proponents offer.

There is a third option:

Establish the terms under which development is welcome.

Those terms should protect existing Tasmanian households and industries, ensure proponents bear the costs they create, prevent routine dependence upon fossil-fuel generation, protect potable water, require transparent monitoring, capture useful waste resources, encourage innovation, provide independent regulation and oversight, and ensure major developments leave measurable public benefits behind.

Some of the reforms proposed in this submission should proceed regardless of how many AI data centres are ultimately developed.

Purple-pipe industrial water systems, Resource-Integrated Agriculture, productive use of waste heat, improved cumulative assessment, independent oversight and a Major Development Public Benefit Obligation could improve Tasmania's approach to industrial development generally.

AI data centres therefore present Tasmania with more than a planning challenge.

They provide an opportunity to reconsider how new industries are integrated into Tasmania's economy, environment and communities.

Tasmania should aim to be known not simply for supplying electricity, water, land and infrastructure to a rapidly growing global industry, but for demonstrating a better model of industrial development:

innovative, resource-efficient, independently regulated, publicly accountable and designed to leave Tasmania better equipped for the future.

The objective should be straightforward:

Tasmania gains the benefits. Proponents meet the costs they create. Public resources remain protected. Innovation is encouraged. And the rules are established before development makes the decisions for us.

Closing Statement

I respectfully ask the Committee to consider these recommendations in developing its findings and recommendations to Parliament.

I would be willing to provide further information or clarification concerning any of the proposals contained in this submission if requested by the Committee.

Peter H. E. Coxhead



21 September 2026