

G'Day State Growth,

Jennifer and I, with 2 kids have moved to Ulverstone from NSW due to the lifestyle Tasmania offers. I would love to see Tasmania keep the amazing lifestyle we don't see in other states. Especially having exceptional community values and support.

Below are my initial comments on the paper.

The Introduction concerns me "In 2015 the Tasmanian Government launched its first Population Growth Strategy with an ambitious agenda to increase Tasmania's population to 650,000 by 2050. We reached the 2030 population milestone eight years ahead of target and want to build on this **success**"

I feel the word "**Success**" is not appropriate and should be either removed or the sentence changed to include other metrics that added to that success. Did that success include keeping housing affordability during the growth? Were government services and infrastructure increased in line with the population growth ahead of schedule? Provide additional metrics to strengthen the success.

The rest of the Introduction states there are or will be "challengers" and we need "sustainable growth". This feels like a balanced support of the document. Please change the first line, or add more support metrics rather than only the Population figure.

The key areas I'd like to see in the report are:

Future vehicle policy, as we move away from Fossil fuels, will we have enough energy capacity infrastructure to support the desired population? If all cars on the road today, are charged via the power grid, can the planned infrastructure support it?

Food security - Tasmania is the food state. Will farming land be protected with the expansion of urban housing land needs? Will councils be allowed to build higher-density buildings within the central town earlier? Removing the need for urban land release.

Can we add a growth plan with critical alerts? If we are heading for the desired population years earlier than planned, what levers can be pulled before rents increase and financial hardship is created for those without stable housing?

The document talks of needing a younger workforce, but if the workforce can't afford to live next to jobs, they will move away, and only an older workforce that can afford existing housing will move into the areas. This will increase the aging population moving into the state.

Kind regards,
David Robinson