

October 17 2018

General Manager
City of Launceston
PO Box 396 Launceston TAS 7250

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to express concerns in regards to:

Development Application DA0521/2018

For the construction of two dwellings at:

Lot 43 Title No. 170590 (10 Cartiere Place, Newstead)

My parents own the _____ and I am concerned with the potential negative impacts of the proposed development on their property and the surrounding area. I am concerned with the proposed development's non-compliances with *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015* and its response to the conditions of the site. Specifically the:

1. Proximity of unit one to the boundary with _____ and the non-compliance with the building envelope control
2. Magnitude and extent of the proposed earthworks
3. Location and design of the car parking and shared driveway
4. Use of masonry (brick veneer) construction in a hillside location
5. Relationship of the proposed development to the objectives of the Scenic Management Code - *Carr Villa and Punchbowl Reserve Precinct*

My concerns are detailed as follows.

1. Proximity of unit 1 to boundary and non-compliance with the building envelope control.

The proposed building locations and height of buildings does not appear to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*, or adequately address its performance criteria.

The east corner of proposed unit 1 is within 1.7m of the boundary with No. 8 Cartiere Place.

The proposed design exceeds the permissible building envelope in this location by 1200mm.

Due to the topography of the area, some deviation from the building envelope could be considered reasonable. Strict compliance with the building envelope control is not always possible or desirable on steep sites, as it may lead to excessive lowering of site levels.

From the supplied drawings, however, the proposed non-compliance does not appear to be a result of designing for the site's topography, as the building is approximately level with natural ground in the location of the breach of the envelope.

That is, the proposed non compliance is a result of Unit 1 not being located a far enough distance away from the boundary with No. 8 Cartiere place to allow for compliance with the building envelope.

I am concerned that this may impact the privacy and amenity of both my parents' property (8 Cartiere Place) and the future residents of the proposed Unit 1.

2. Magnitude and Extent of Proposed Earthworks

I am very concerned about the amount of earthworks - specifically the amount of cut and height of retaining walls - proposed for the site.

The proposed earthworks do not appear to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*, or adequately address its performance criteria.

Again, due to the topography of the area and the steepness of the site in particular, some deviation from strict compliance with the maximum cut and fill controls could be considered reasonable. However, the proposed amount of cut and extent of retaining walls, as described in the available drawings, appears to be excessive and has the potential to have a considerable negative impact on the flow of water and water management in the area.

The available drawings show considerable changes in site levels (in excess of those allowed under *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*) over a large portion of the site area

This has the potential to have significant negative impacts on my parents' property, which is immediately downhill of the proposed development.

The garages of both units are lowered substantially into the site for most of their areas.

As shown in sections 02 and 03, the proposed garage floors are set significantly below natural ground level. The garages lower the site levels between 777mm and 2257mm for Unit 1 and 898mm and 2654mm for Unit Two. This is significantly in excess of the acceptable solution in *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

Further, as shown in site section 05, the eaves of both units are below natural ground level in some locations.

That is, both the lower (garage) and upper (living) levels of both the proposed units are effectively a whole storey below natural ground level in some places.

This does not seem a reasonable approach to earthworks or designing for a steep site.

Several retaining walls of up to 1600mm in height are proposed, however, as illustrated in site sections 04 and 05, the amount of 'cut' in the location of the retaining wall is actually much greater than 1600mm.

Considerable battering is shown behind the proposed retaining walls, before the ground returns to natural levels. In some instances this is up to an additional 700mm, taking the total change in level at the retaining wall up to 2300mm.

This is considerably in excess of the 1m acceptable solution under *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

Further, the available documentation does not appear to demonstrate how the proposed amended site levels achieve the relevant performance criteria. In particular, the proposed design and accompanying documentation does not demonstrate how it has regard to:

"the topography of the site, the impact on adjoining structures, the management of ground water and stormwater, and the potential for loss of topsoil or soil erosion."

The proposed design, as shown in the available drawings, does not appear to demonstrate a considered design approach to the steepness of the site. For example, the upper floors of both dwellings are set at a single floor level. Some stepping in floor levels could reduce the amount of earthworks required for the proposed dwellings. This strategy has been utilised on a number of recently constructed dwellings in Cartiere Place.

Additionally, the amount of cut and fill proposed does not demonstrate consistency with good principles for hillside construction, as outlined in the Geotechnical Report which accompanies the Development Application.

The Geotechnical Report recommends *"avoid excavations or minimise height and number"*

The extent of the proposed excavation (which covers nearly all of the built upon area and some landscaped area) and the magnitude of the excavation (up to 2654mm) does not appear to take the recommendation of the Geotechnical Report into account, or adequately consider the nature of the site.

3. Location and design of the car parking and shared driveway

The location and design of the car parking and shared driveway does not appear to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015* or adequately address its performance criteria.

The proposed design includes visitor parking and turning area within the front setback. This results in almost all of the front setback area being concrete.

This is likely to have a negative impact on the streetscape and is unlikely to fit in with the nature and characteristics of the street. It also has the potential to have further negative impacts on water management.

Additionally as illustrated in the supplied drawings, the tandem parking arrangement and turning area appears to be impractical, and difficult to access. Having visitor parking in tandem spaces may be inconvenient for residents who come and go. The proposed turning area is steep and the layout seems to require considerable manoeuvring, particularly for residents and visitors of Unit 2 who appear to have to do a 3 point turn or an 'S' shaped reversing manoeuvre to get out.

I am concerned that an impractical and steep turning and parking area may prompt residents and visitors to choose to park on the street, rather than on site.

This could have a negative impact on the accessibility of the street and its streetscape presentation.

4. Use of masonry (brick veneer) construction in a hillside location

I am concerned that the proposed construction type is inherently unsuited to the site's hillside location and steep topography.

The proposed design is of a masonry (brick veneer) construction type, with a concrete tiled roof.

As detailed in the Geotechnical Report which accompanies the development application, this type of construction is not recommended for steep hillside areas such as the subject site.

The Geotechnical Report recommends "*avoid loading the slope unnecessarily, at all scales. Consider building with flexible light weight materials*"

Pages 24 - 25 of the accompanying Geotechnical Report further detail examples of poor hillside construction practices which include 'a house of rigid brickwork.' As an example of good hillside construction, the report suggests 'A house of flexible light weight construction'

As outlined on page 24 of the Geotechnical Report the unsuitable construction type has the potential to result in a 'man-made landslide'.

This unsuitable construction type has the potential to have significant - potentially disastrous - negative impacts on my parents' property, which is immediately downhill of the proposed development.

Most, if not all, of the newly constructed or proposed dwellings on steep sites in Cartiere Place are substantially if not wholly constructed of light weight materials - both walls and roof.

The proposed construction type does not appear to take the recommendations of the Geotechnical Report into account, or adequately consider the nature of the site.

5. Relationship of the proposed development to the objectives of the Scenic Management Code - Carr Villa and Punchbowl Reserve Precinct

The proposed development does not appear to take into account the objectives of the Scenic Management Code for the Carr Villa and Punchbowl Reserve Precinct, in which it is located

The entirety of the Eastman's Green Subdivision is located within this precinct and is required to address the objectives of the Scenic Management Area.

Cartiere Place immediately adjoins Punchbowl Reserve, as such, development in the street has the potential to greatly effect the visual character and enjoyment of the reserve and the scenic precinct.

The available Development Application Documentation does not appear to address or acknowledge the provisions of the Scenic Management.

I am concerned that the proposed development, in its current form, will have a negative impact on the values of the Carr Villa and Punchbowl Reserve Precinct.

The design does not appear to address the precinct's characteristics or objectives.

As previously mentioned, the proposed design does not appear to adequately consider *"the physical (built or natural) characteristics of the site or area"* as it proposes cut and fill significantly in excess of that allowed and utilises a construction type deemed unsuitable for the location in the accompanying Geotechnical Report.

Further, it does not take into consideration *"the nature and character of the existing development"* or take into account the specific management objective:

"Development must blend in by its location, form, scale, exterior materials. Colours and landscaping"

New development in Cartiere Place has established a remarkably consistent design expression and language. In particular, there is a strong visual cohesion in materiality, colour selection and form - in particular roof forms.

This character complements the backdrop of Punchbowl Reserve and contributes positively to the visual appearance of the Scenic Precinct.

The proposed development does not 'blend in' with this character. In particular, its pitched roof form, extensive use of rendered brick and concrete roof tiles, colour selection and concreted front setback are significantly different to, and in conflict with, the character of the area.

As a future frequent visitor to the street and Punchbowl Reserve, former Launceston resident and architectural professional, I am disappointed in the aesthetic appearance of the proposed design and its lack of regard for the emerging character of the area.

I am concerned that it will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of all users of the Punchbowl Reserve and lower the scenic values of the precinct.

I am not inherently opposed to a proposal for two units at Number 10 Cartiere Place, however, as detailed above, I have substantial concerns regarding the Development Application in its current form.

The proposed development does not appear to demonstrate adequate regard for the nature of the site and its context, in particular its steepness and hillside location.

The design proposes large areas of cut and fill with accompanying retaining walls and batter that are considerably in excess of the accepted solution - with little explanation of how the performance criteria may be met.

Further, the proposed construction type is deemed unsuitable for the location by the Geotechnical Report which accompanies the application.

These unsuitable practices may have significant impacts on my parents' property - particularly with regard to drainage - and may have flow on effects to other properties in Cartiere Place as well.

I respectfully request that the Development Application not be approved in its current form, and ask that Council require the design to be amended to address the above concerns.

Kind Regards,



Mrs Ashlee Burbidge *B.Des Arch, M.Arch*

DOB 22/02/1988

Development Application Representation Letter

Development Application Number

Address of Development

Details of Representer

Title Given Name/s

Surname Date of Birth

Suburb State Postcode

Phone H B M

Email

Reason for Representing

1. Proximity of Townhouse 1 to our home - less than 2 metres - will overshadow bedrooms + living area of our property.
2. Amount of excavation/retaining walls/concrete + impact on drainage / water flow - *big concern!*
3. Masonary construction - at odds with hillside location/planning requirements, which we (at 8 Cartiere) have gone out of our way to comply with.
4. Number of cars likely to be added to street traffic (4-6 or more!) and steep driveway - safety risk for young children in street.
5. Aesthetically unappealing + dissimilar to other properties in street.

Representer's Signature M. Stocks

Date 17/10/2018

To: General Manage Launceston City Council.

Re: DA Application number: 0521/2018.

Good afternoon,

I am the owner/occupier of _____ and would like to make an objection to the proposed development at 10 Cartiere Place DA Application number: 0521/2018.

My objection is raised regarding the following considerations;

Height and building envelope - the proposed development is out of the building envelope. This will result in direct consequences relating to both privacy and shadowing of neighbours and surrounding areas.

Earthworks - massive cut in unstable ground, which is not recommended in the Geotechnical report for 10 Cartiere and steep blocks.

Retaining walls - 1.6m-2.3m height, which doesn't fit into Launceston planning of 1m heights.

Large amount of both units floor space is below natural ground level. Geotechnical report on block says to minimise earthworks and minimise heights.

Construction materials - Brick veneer and tiled roofs - not recommend in Geotechnical report for steep blocks. Massive amount of weight on footings and surrounding land which goes against the Geotechnical report which recommends construction on steep blocks to be done in light weight cladding.

Scenic protection of Punchbowl area - won't blend in to both surrounding properties and surrounding land and reserve. This will directly detract value from neighbouring properties and ruin the landscape of the hill.

Warm regards

Locky Allison

17th October 2018

General Manager
Launceston City Council
Planning Department
PO Box 396
Launceston TAS 7250

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: Planning Permit – 10 Cartiere Place, Newstead

As residents of _____ we wish to put forward our objection to the submitted plans for 10 Cartiere Place.

On inspection of the online plans there are many aspects of that we believe need to be addressed;

- Structures are outside the building envelope leading to privacy and shadowing issues.
- Stability of ground due to massive cuts.
- Legality of retaining wall heights.
- The weight of the materials used (brick veneer and tiles) on steep block.
- Congestion of court due to insufficient parking area for two dwellings.
- Overall look of the structures is not in keeping with Punchbowl Reserve surroundings which will affect value of our property and properties in the area.

On these grounds we strongly object to the approval of development at 10 Cartiere Place.

Regards

Kim Alford

Mark Alford

To: General Manage Launceston City Council.

Re: DA Application number: 0521/2018.

Good afternoon

I am the owner/occupier of _____ and would like to make an objection to the proposed development at 10 Cartiere Place DA Application number: 0521/2018.

My objection is raised regarding the following considerations;

Height and building envelope – the proposed development is out of the building envelope. This will result in direct consequences relating to both privacy and shadowing of neighbours and surrounding areas.

Earthworks - massive cut in unstable ground, which is not recommended in the Geotechnical report for 10 Cartiere and steep blocks.

Retaining walls - 1.6m-2.3m height, which doesn't fit into Launceston planning of 1m heights. Large amount of both units floor space is below natural ground level.

Geotechnical report on block says to minimise earthworks and minimise heights.

Construction materials - Brick veneer and tiled roofs - not recommend in

Geotechnical report for steep blocks. Massive amount of weight on footings and surrounding land which goes against the Geotechnical report which recommends

construction on steep blocks to be done in light weight cladding. Scenic protection of Punchbowl area - won't blend in to both surrounding properties and surrounding land and reserve. This will directly detract value from neighbouring properties and ruin the landscape of the hill.

Warm regards

Anna Allison

Dear General Manager,

Representation – DA0521/2018

In regards to the development application for proposed construction of a dwelling at **10 Cartiere Place, Newstead (DA521/2018)**.

We object, as owners and residents of _____ to the following:

- Height - above building envelope which will affect privacy and shadowing.
- Earthworks - massive cut in unstable ground which is not recommended in geo tech report.
- Retaining walls - 1.6m-2.3m height which doesn't fit into Launceston planning of 1m heights.
- Large amount of both units floor space is below natural ground level. Geotechnical report on block says to minimise earthworks and minimise heights.
- Brick veneer and tiled roofs - not recommended in geotech report for steep blocks. Massive amount of weight.
- Two units on that particular site, whilst large enough in regards to the zoning, we do not consider appropriate given shape, slope and ultimately the design which clusters the two units at the bottom end of the property in close proximity to No. 8 and will therefore, result in overlooking and overshadowing (as noted above). In addition, the location at the end of the cul-de-sac will result in too much traffic for the narrow street.
- The proposed design will detract and is not consistent with the already established neighbourhood character of the street.

I can be contacted on _____

Kind regards,

Georgie Loone | AAPI CPV, B.UPD, Grad Dip (Property)

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to oppose the proposed Unit Developments for Lot 43, 10 Cartiere Place Newstead.

Reasons for this are that I am told the earthworks could make the grounds unstable, not something we would like so close to our home and that brick and tiled roofs are not recommended in the geotechnical report for steep blocks such as this.

I also don't believe the the street is large enough to accommodate the extra traffic that comes with units and style of units will detract value from our property as they are all family homes here.. Street parking is limited for visitors or if the dwellers exceed the parking spaces they have allowed for.

Kind regards,

Simone and Stephen Pohan

Good afternoon,

We are writing to object to the DA application number 0521/2018 for 10 Cartiere place. Please consider this important matter.

We are the owner/occupier of _____ and would like to make an objection to the proposed development at 10 Cartiere Place DA Application number: 0521/2018.

We have reviewed the plans have a number of concerns, that could have a negative impact on the road and neighbours.

I believe that the lot has been approved as a sub division, however this in itself is very concerning both due to the nature of the steep slope and the risks associated with the land, as well as the nature of the small cul-de-sac road and the increase of traffic.

Our objection is raised regarding the following considerations;

Earthworks

- Earthworks - massive cut in unstable ground, which is not recommended in the Geotechnical report for 10 Cartiere and steep blocks.
- Retaining walls - 1.6m-2.3m height, which doesn't fit into Launceston planning of 1m heights.
- Large amount of both units floor space is below natural ground level.
- Geotechnical report on block says to minimise earthworks and minimise heights.

Construction materials

- Brick veneer and tiled roofs - not recommend in Geotechnical report for steep blocks. Massive amount of weight on footings. This is of a concern to the immediate housing as well as the neighbouring.
- The Geotechnical report which recommends construction on steep blocks to be done in light weight cladding. Similar to the design of our house.

General

- The style of the houses are quite different from the rest of the street. The street has enjoyed some good publicity from the modern and creative flare on many of the houses, increasing the popularity of the area. The designs of these houses could directly detract the value from the neighbouring properties, and ruin the landscape of the hill – something that can be seen from far.

I do hope that you will consider these objections, primarily because of the concern of landslippage and damage to the area, as well as the invasion of privacy in what is a small area already.

Warm regards,

Dr. Brandon and Jasmin Krapf