
From: Leigh Murrell
Sent: Wednesday, 22 August 2018 12:19 PM
To: Council
Subject: DA 446/2018

Hello,

I wish to submit my opposition to DA 446/2018 on the following points...

- 1) Moving the Motor Museum to this location will only increase an already problematic and virtually unsolvable traffic congestion issue particularly around the Charles Street bridge. The so-called "Traffic Management Plan" does not adequately address the problems.
- 2) Further development of the land in this Tidal Flood Zone will only magnify the detrimental effects of the inevitable, next inundation. More concrete and hard surfaces will alter the water flow patterns and also place extra mass on this unstable land that is also vulnerable to seismic risk.
- 3) When the next flood does occur, and it will, adding more development to the flood zone will not only potentially place at risk those tourists who are unfamiliar with Launceston but also add to the risk and burden placed upon emergency services. Added to this is the high improbability of being able to safely and quickly remove all of the very expensive and irreplaceable vehicles that would be on site.
- 4) Council's is not only arrogantly relying on what they see as their "gold Plated" levee protection system to safeguard the Motor Museum and all other buildings in the area, including the ridiculous Council supported UTAS proposal to relocate vulnerable students to this flood zone but they are also ignorantly or actively misinterpreting the term "One in 200 year flood risk". This does not mean, as some Council Officers seem to think, that there will not be another flood that over-tops the levees for 200 years. The truth is that a 200 year flood can occur tomorrow or next week and again next year. This is overblown and unrealistic "belief" in the levees will place the Council, and therefore its too often ignored ratepayers, under a massive, extra financial burden if approval is given to the Motor Museum on top of all the other inappropriate development in this flood zone.

I urge the Council to not grant approval for DA446/2018 on these grounds.

Yours Sincerely,

Leigh Murrell

1414. 111 STRETON

Town Hall

DA 446/2018

L. Ten 22.8.18

Auto Museum Meadow St

Dear Sir

I object on the following grounds

1. The recent Traffic study to be completed by Council is incomplete.
2. The Reports Quote this Subdivision would increase Traffic by 1300 ^{DAILY} by Auto Museum
3. This I find not to be True it would be less.
4. The Report makes no mention of State growth being responsible for Traffic flow estimated 40,000 Movements over Charles St Bridge Daily and does not make mention of IAD study 2012
5. Whatever the increase Auto Museum and Silo Hotel in Traffic flow it will only compound the present chaos that exists
6. The High Tide and Flood waters in the North and South Esk caused another Flood in Launceston and went within 12 Centimetres of Young over Gate at Rowing Club

Floods also went over Road Forster St. and Henry St was closed on 2 occasions. These floods occurred in 2016 - Nov 218 when

Next

Basil Litch

FILE No.	DA0446/2018			
EO	✓	OD		Box ✓
RCVD		22 AUG 2018		LCC
Doc No.				
	Action Officer	Noted	Replied	
	C. Wrenmore			

E-copy: D. Payton

From:
Sent: Wednesday, 22 August 2018 3:40 PM
To: Contact Us
Cc:
Subject: DA 0446-2018 Automobile Museum Building
Attachments: DA 446-2018, 22August2018.docx

Dear Council Planning Officer,

please find attached submission on DA 0446/2018

Manfred Koshin

22 August 2018

Mr Stretton

General Manager,

Launceston City Council,

St John St, Launceston

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you to object to the construction of a building intended for the Automobile Museum. The Automobile Museum's current location is a much better option than the unsuitable location along the dead end of Lindsay St. Where is it now it doesn't increase the traffic anywhere else. It is easy to reach from Town centre through City Park, compared to the much longer distance to the end of Lindsay St. The location at Lindsay St involves crossing and adding to the heavy traffic on the highway and the busiest junction in the North. Where the Museum sits now, it is already part of the city life.

In its current position the Museum sits close to other attractions, has multiple access streets and is therefore a suitable and easy location for locals and visitors to the city. The area at the end of Lindsay St is a one destination area, a no through way. That in itself adds to traffic, because traffic has to return (leave the location) by the same route as it arrived. The suggestion of Gleadow St as a way out is not an alternative, as it already exists as an exit/entrance to Office Works, Bunnings etc.

In a recent Examiner report the Museum people said the Museum is successful where it is. So why move an existing successful operation for a greedy university land takeover. There is no guarantee it will be successful stuck behind Office Works, despite the hotel opposite. And what would be the future for the Museum if it is not as successful as it is at its current location? Would that mean that the Kings Wharf Developments Pty Ltd would be waiting in the wings to take the building back over?

And where does the extra sewerage go? Isn't the sewerage system already under enough strain without adding another building that the application's traffic 'report' says will be visited by over 550 vehicles per day, vehicles that will contain at least 550 people who have to use toilet facilities etc. The issue of tidal flats and flood risk might or might not be a matter for the developer/building applicant. However, it is a big concern to local residents and ratepayers. It is an added load on the SES and other people involved in evacuations which then becomes an added cost to the public. Not good.

Something that is already working well, both from its own operations view and from the view of its relationship and interaction with the town centre via City Park, should not be encouraged or forced to move to any less suitable location, let alone to such an unsuitable place as in this Development Application. For the benefit of the Automobile Museum, the Town centre and ratepayers, DA 0446/2018 shouldn't be granted permission.

Thank you,

Manfred Koshin

From:
Sent: Wednesday, 22 August 2018 5:06 PM
To: Contact Us; Contact Us
Subject: Fwd: DA 0446/2018

22 August 2018

Michael Stretton,
General Manager, Launceston City Council,

Re DA 0446/2018.

The addition of this building to the Lindsay St area is yet another example of the ad hoc nature of the planning surrounding the Utas relocation, euphemistically referred to as a 'Discretionary' use. (and therein lies part of the foundations for the ad hoc muddle that has become a feature of the Utas relocation.)

The application contains two large documents, Pitt & Sherry's combined Hydrological Plan, Option Risk Assessment, and Flood Response Plan and GHD's Traffic Impact Assessment. The inclusion of these documents as part of the justification for the building development is about as useful as lipstick on a pig (or as a well-known federal politician recently mixed it up, pig on a lipstick).

The capabilities of structural engineering or raised buildings is not the concern, and is not an issue unless it involves any expenditure at all of public money. The issue is with the flood risk in this era of rising sea levels, and that aspect has not been part of any studies to date, of AEP in the Tamar Estuary at Launceston. In light of all international trends and world's best practice around flood/tidal risk, mitigation and management, this city should be reconsidering its wilful and undying faith in flood levees and mud banks. Even at this very moment, only a short while after completion of the latest renewal of the levees, some of the estuary's mud banks have slipped and are undergoing restabilisation.

The cluttered nature of planning for the western end of Lindsay St, right at the point of the meeting of three powerful bodies of water (South and North Esk Rivers with their extensive drainage basins and the 4 metre tidal range - with king tides up to 4.6 metres, and increasing with SLR - of Tamar tidal estuary) is not only testament to poor longterm planning in relation to flood risk, it is also without due consideration to the ever-increasing traffic in the Charles St bridge-Lindsay St junction area. The traffic impact assessment at one point uses a figure of 32,000 movements per day. This is too close to the figure given in the 2012 traffic report to be credible, so 6 years on, that must now be a gross underestimation of the actual numbers.

Moreover, a genuinely responsible council would wait and assess the effect on traffic of the opening and daily use of the car parking at the nearby CH Smith site, before adding any further traffic to the Charles St bridge junction.

It is irresponsible to claim that 1,342 additional vehicle movements per day is of no import within the context of overall traffic there. In 2012, the traffic in that area was already at saturation point. This 2018 report refers to oversaturation, yet at the same time attempts to claim that the additional number of vehicle movements is of no consequence.

While the Automobile Museum itself has stated that it is successful in its current location and while it is closer to the CBD - which we are constantly being told is in need of activity - the over-development of Lindsay St area is counter to world's best practice, flies in the face of the international insurance industry recommendations, gives no consideration to local amenity, and places further pressure on ratepayers and the public purse. On those bases, DA 0446/2018 for the Automobile Museum should be rejected by planners and aldermen.

Yours faithfully,

Jillian Koshin.

University of Tasmania Electronic Communications Policy (December, 2014).

This email is confidential, and is for the intended recipient only.

Access, disclosure, copying, distribution, or reliance on any of it by anyone outside the intended recipient organisation is prohibited and may be a criminal offence. Please delete if obtained in error and email confirmation to the sender.

The views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of the University of Tasmania, unless clearly intended otherwise.