FILE No.	DA0708/2018				
EO	✓	OD		Box	✓
RCV'D 18 FEB 2019 LCC					
Doc No.					
Action Officer		Noted		Replied	
C. WRANKMORE					

ECOPY: L ROGERS

The General Manager
Launceston City Council
PO Box 396
LAUNCESTON TAS 7250

14 February 2019

Dear Sir

Re: Application DA0708/2018

We are writing in relation to the above Notice of Application for a Planning Permit on the vacant property at 24-26 Queechy Road, NORWOOD 7250.

My wife and I wish to register our submission to the application for the concern of our property at

We have resided at this address for 35 years and have experienced the following:

1. Underpinning works in 2007 were completed on the southern side of the above address and we have had no further movement.
2. Interior cracks in walls and cornices.
3. Concrete paths on the western side of same address have moved and cracked.
4. Outside our back fence (in Queechy High School grounds), during the summer months, large cracks appear in the clay soil when the grass dies off.

We do not object to the actual construction of the two Townhouses however we do require reassurance and compensation if our home is affected in anyway by vibration/movement etc, by the operation of heavy machinery, excavating, removal of trees (in particular their roots), as a result of these proposed construction works.

The prospective owner/builder/developer of the land, Luke Gul, has been very approachable and obliging in responding to any of our concerns however as confirmed by the geotechnical review, through Geoton Pty Ltd, these blocks are recorded as being a landslip area so this proposed application remains a concern to us if, for any reason, the geotechnician's recommendations/guidelines together with the

Launceston City Council's are not adhered to throughout the building process.

Also, it was recommended that we should have a Dilapidation Report completed on our property so we engaged Protek to do this at a cost of $770. As aged pensioners, we feel that we should not have the burden of this payment in order to protect our land/property from this prospective development.

Yours sincerely

Trevor & Kay Munro

Document Set ID: 4093570
Version: 1, Version Date: 06/03/2019

Launceston City Council
PO Box 986
LAUNCESTON TAS.7250

W.C. & S.J. Chilcott

11th Feb 2019

SUBJECT RE: Building Application DA0708/2018

Dear Sir ,

It is our intent to object to this building application on the following grounds

(1) This area has been noted as a land slip area

(2) The original concept has been that the vegetation on the skyline and hill was not allowed to be removed

(3) How is the council going to ensure that water run off is not going to effect

We realize engineering and building practices have changed with potential land slip areas and do not have objection to the submitted design of the buildings in principle
I do question the foundations shown in the application as a flat slab with footings and couple of piers

However I believe the building applicant has increased his company insurance from 1 million dollars to five million to cover potential damage to adjacent properties while building works proceed
To access this cover the adjacent property owners are expected to get a Dilapidation Report on their individual properties at their cost
I believe the developer should provide the Dilapidation Report on each property as part of his insurance cover as he is getting the benefit from this development not the adjacent land owners

Wayne Chilcott
\

Document Set ID: 4008570
Version: 1, Version Date: 06/03/2019

The General Manager
Launceston City Council
PO Box 396
Launceston Tas 7250

13th February 2019

Dear Sir

In regards to Application DA0708/2018 the property at 24-26 Queechy Road, Norwood my husband and I wish to submit an objection on this property development due to concerns we have knowing that this is a landslip area, as confirmed by the Launceston City Council and a geotechnical review which was completed by Geoton Pty Ltd prior to the property changing hands to Patrick Graham.

As new residents to Norwood we are concerned that this development may cause damage to our property once construction works precede, in particular, earth moving machinery and the removal of large tree stumps removed.

On advice we have contacted Protek to do a Dilapidation report costing $770 which as new home owners with a young family was not something that we had budgeted for in our moving. However we felt it was for our protection re any damage caused to our home from this development. It would be appreciated if this could be reimbursed to us from the owner as we do not think we should be responsible for this.

Please note that the new prospective owner, Luke Gul, has been accessible to answer any concerns we may have and we can contact him at any time to answer any questions.

We do not have any issues with the construction of the town houses but need reassurance that there will be no damage to our property during this development.

Yours faithfully

Daniel and Rebecca James

Document Set ID: 4008570
Version: 1, Version Date: 06/03/2019

From: Peter Manktelow
Sent: Monday, 18 February 2019 10:27 PM
To: Contact Us <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>
Subject: Representation DA0708/2018

The General Manager
Launceston City Council
PO Box 396
LAUNCESTON TAS 7250

18 February 2019

Dear Sir

RE: Development Application DA0708/2018 24-26 Queechy Road , Norwood.

Please accept this as my representation regarding the above DA.

.....

Council is very pro development. I cannot argue with this. The developer of the above mentioned property is entitled to realise profit from his investment. I cannot dispute this. The above two points should not , however , be to the detriment of a third party , namely myself, as the owner of Norwood.

Since the beginning of this development , first as DA0239/2018 and now as DA0708/2018 , my sole aim has been (and still is) to protect my property. Whilst the developer/geotechnical engineer and council have put together various planned mitigations , neither party can guarantee that the construction process at 24-26 Queechy Road will not cause earth movement that affects my property in a negative way. To put it succinctly.....the risk of damage to my property can be diminished but not eliminated particularly given that the proposed development is in a steep , known land slip area. Even the builder has indicated tacit risk by way of increasing the "earth movement" clause of his insurance from the normal $1 million to $5 million.

To close the gap between diminished risk and complete elimination of risk is normally achieved via insurance. That avenue is not available to me as a home owner. I have a semblance of protection via a Dilapidation Report accessing a clause of the builders insurance but this addresses an "after the fact scenario" and requires me to take legal action and furnish proof that the builders actions relate directly to damage to my property. I have had a Dilapidation Report done at a cost to me personally of $770. That is an imposition to me personally while council and the developer effectively gain from this project.

Can the Council guarantee that heightened vigilance will be applied by way of seperate inspections at the critical phases of stump/root removal , earth excavation , retaining wall placement , footing construction and cessation of operation of heavy vibration causing machinery ?

Whilst obviously not a requirement , it would ease my mind if the Council could extend the courtesy to me of a progress report as each phase/inspection , as described above , is completed.

Should this Development Application go before a full Council meeting , I would request the opportunity to address the Councillors for the allotted 2 minutes.

Peter Manktelow