

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

2nd December 2018

Dear Mr Stretton

Re: Development Application Ref: SF6852 - Amendment 47 at 38A Faulkner Road, Ravenswood (127363/1)

I am submitting this representation letter in response to the application mentioned above. My home is located on _____ The main reason for purchasing our home over 6 years ago was due to the privacy and surroundings that the existing zoning provides.

Due to the topography, if 38A Faulkner Road were to be rezoned as rural residential, with the intention for houses to be built on the south-west boundary, the houses would not meet the performance criteria of 10.4.6 Privacy for all dwellings, of the Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015.

10.4.6 Privacy for all dwellings (P2)

A window or glazed door, to a habitable room of dwelling, that has a floor level more than 1 m above the natural ground level, must be screened, or otherwise located or designed, to minimise direct views to:

- (a) window or glazed door, to a habitable room of another dwelling; and
- (b) the private open space of another dwelling; and
- (c) an adjoining vacant residential lot.

Our dwelling at on Ravenswood Road, Ravenswood is zoned as General Residential and is entitled to the privacy rules listed in 10.4.6. It has a predominantly flat backyard with a fence that is 6ft high. To preserve the privacy we currently have, fences would need to be unreasonably high, as the current 6ft fences do not block the view into our yard and windows from 38A Faulkner Road, natural sun-light would also be blocked, affecting our lighting and heating costs during winter.

See photos below that show that show how any houses built on a block adjacent to our property would look directly into our backyard and to our windows. The windows/doors that face towards 38A Faulkner Road include a bedroom, bathroom, laundry/toilet and kitchen. During heavy rainfall, water pools in our backyard, there is also concern that excavation on the higher, adjoining land will exacerbate this problem.



View to 38A Faulkner Road from our kitchen window.



View to 38A Faulkner Road from our back yard.



The pink line on the picture above is the hill that is referred to above which would threaten our privacy and go against 10.4.6 if built upon.

The blue line indicates the sloping hill down to Distillery Creek which connects the the North Esk.

River health/water quality – the hilly, rocky topography is such that the disturbance of rocks, soil and trees on the property may have an effect on the water quality due to lack of filtering and run off draining into Distillery Creek, which connects to the North Esk River.

Habitat corridor – From the North Esk River, through Distillery Creek, through 38A Faulkner Road to the properties on the Eastern side of Faraday Street is likely to be classed as a habitat corridor. Unfortunately, numerous wallabies and possums are victim to road-kill on both Ravenswood Road and Farraday Street. By adding dwellings onto 38A Faulkner Road, the network of areas which enables migration, colonisation or interbreeding of flora or fauna species between two or more areas of habitat would be blocked.

Native animals that we see in our yard at include yellow-tailed Black Cockatoo, sulphur-crested cockatoo (pictured in the circle below), endemic bird species including green rosella, bandicoots, blue-tongued lizards, wallabies and possums. The property also contains native plants, such as wattle trees, and may be a favourable spot for native fauna due to the close-by Distillery Creek and North Esk. Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015, section 14.4.5 needs to be considered strongly, in regards to this application, as many animals would be displaced.

14.4.5 Landscaping and vegetation management

P1 Development must be located to minimise native vegetation removal and manage the natural and landscape values, having regard to:

- (a) the extent of native vegetation to be removed;
- (b) any remedial or mitigation measures or revegetation requirements;
- (c) the type, growth, habit, texture and suitability of the vegetation species proposed;
- (d) provision for native habitat for native fauna;
- (e) the preparation, planting, timing and maintenance of the vegetation and landscaping during and after construction;
- (f) weed management;
- (g) the management and treatment of the balance of the site or native vegetation areas;
- (h) the type, size and design of development, including buildings, outbuildings, structures, car parking, roads, driveways, pathways, walking trails, storage areas, signage and utility services, fences, retaining walls and undisturbed areas; and
- (i) the extent that landscaping softens and screens the development; and as shown in a detailed landscaping plan.



Sulphur-crested white cockatoos pictured above in the green circle.

Rural resource and land capability – the section of 38A Faulkner Road, classed as Class 6, actually has cattle routinely grazing in the area. Within the past week, the number of cattle was greater than 1 per ha, based on the approximate 25 ha size of 38A Faulkner Road listed in the application, which suggests there is sufficient and suitable grazing available on the property.

Land used for agriculture and grazing declined from 2003-2007 according to the ABS. (<http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/4CDB914C4DA7116FCA2574F1000EA402?open=document>). Following a “consistent pattern of development”, as noted in the application in referring to similar developments, will mean further reduction in grazing land availability. This could make stock rotation onto suitable land (with stock dams), particularly difficult during times of drought. These points indicate that the current zoning and use is most suitable for this parcel of land in the community.

Pictured below (24/11/18) are cattle grazing on the section classed as class 6.



Decline in population numbers of Ravenswood, mentioned in the application, is consistent with the decline in Launceston's population over the past 7 years. Rezoning rural resource land (the area of which has declined in Tasmania) to create more vacant properties is not the solution for increasing population in Ravenswood. Education, job growth and diversity are listed by Brian Wightman, Tasmanian Executive Director for the Property Council of Australia, as the keys to population growth for Launceston (<https://www.examiner.com.au/story/5786417/launceston-can-learn-lessons-from-sydney/>).

Thank you for your time and response in due course.

Regards,

Dear Mr Stretton

I am writing to you to oppose the rezoning of 38A Faulkner Rd.

Having first lived _____ since 1967, and now having lived around the corner in _____ since 1999, I am well acquainted with the area.

Working through the report.

It is stated the land is “unsuitable for horticultural cropping and limited grazing”
Having seen cows graze in all of the paddocks for the last 50 years and knowing personally a previous owner (Lew sing) who grew vegetables for garden markets, and supplied the Chinese community including Irving Fong who had a vegetable shop in Brisbane St, makes nonsense of that statement. Lew sing who is deceased has a living son Keith who lives in Faulkner Rd and could confirm this.

Population in Ravenswood is not declining because of demographic trends it is declining because of tenant flight caused by its poor reputation and low socio-economic standing, increasing the quality of the existing residents amenities and infrastructure by encouraging people to move to Ravenswood to buy **existing** housing will help alleviate our poor property prices, reputation and social problems. 34 more property lots insular to the rest of the local community by virtue of the lot size and position will not help us.

Owner owned houses (which are in the majority) adjoining and close to the rezoning will lose value in their properties, If the proportion of rental properties in an area is too large it creates an itinerant population that does not create a community such as we have here at the moment.

This rezoning does not increase the liveability of Ravenswood , as amenities such as shops are declining, see the empty buildings at Faulkner road and the Ravenswood shopping centre, future residents will just commute, no new supermarkets, petrol stations, pubs bottle shops (recently banned by an earlier council decision) will be created by 34 lots increasing the population by <200.

I think having a green zone between 2 suburbs meets the NTRLUS which says to “ensure the community has access to a range of space and recreational opportunities”, this application does not meet those goals by filling in a green area between Waverley and Ravenswood!

Residents have been asking for many years to expand the popular Waverly lake down the distillery creek ravine to create a miniature gorge like experience with proper walking tracks picnic area this development will end that dream.

Trevallyn and west Launceston have a green divide with numerous recreational facilities, the residents of Ravenswood and Waverly here deserve the same

Ravenswood road is already overused and will become more taxed, the council, state and federal governments have ignored the residents of Ravenswood who are still waiting for a bypass for over 50 years, These concerns are known by Ross hart MP and Michelle o Byrne who attended a Ravenswood over 50s club meeting before the last state election and where canvassed for their support.

On a personal note, My family and neighbours have all enjoyed the closeness to the “Tara Hill Farm” and its fauna and flora, (nothing endangered but still worthy) and I think the skyline of Launceston will be not be augmented by a large houses parked on top of the hills.

I would like to also say that the submission time for this rezoning is not long enough for full scrutiny of the reports contents, and return submissions

Thank you for your attention

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

2nd December 2018

Dear Mr Stretton

Re: Representation letter against the Development Application Ref: SF6852 - Amendment 47 at
38A Faulkner Road, Ravenswood (127363/1)

Reason for Representing

The rezoning of 38A Faulkner Road would dramatically affect my privacy by allowing others to have a direct view into our backyard as well as to windows to a bedroom, kitchen, bathroom and laundry/toilet. It would be most concerning at night once lights are on as we don't have window furnishings on the majority of this side of our house and don't wish to purchase and install any. We purchased our home because we were attracted to the rural setting with 100% privacy in our backyard, rezoning and subdividing would diminish our happiness that we experience living in Launceston. Value needs to be placed on what Launceston offers to residents that isn't available in other cities, such as a rural setting that is close to the CBD and amenities.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Dear Planning Office,

please find below letter of representation.

3 December 2018.

The City General Manager,
Town Hall, St John Street
Launceston

Dear Sir,

Re SF6852, the Application for Amendment 47 to Planning Scheme for 38A Faulkner Rd Ravenswood
SF6852 - Amendment 47

In relation to all the detail in the Application document, the Liveability and Community section of Northern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy (NTRLUS), Goal 2 (see mentioned in the Application, pp. 11-12) it states that the intention is to 'create healthy, strong and vibrant urban and rural settlements in accordance with the regional land use categories and related regional planning policies. This applies equally to rural settlements, and so applies to that parcel of land and to other rural sections of Ravenswood.

In relation to population as mentioned in the Application, and in relation to land use 'strategies', serious consideration must also be given to the location of the area in question and its access connections to Launceston, Newstead and St Leonards (see all marked on the Map p, 10 of the Application). All the connecting roads, Henry Street, Hobler's Bridge Road and Station Road), to Launceston and Newstead are all subject to frequent flooding and road closures. Rezoning the land in question could not be called a strategic or wise alteration of the current zoning. The current zoning should remain as is, Rural Resource, in order to avoid putting even more pressure on emergency services and road access to Ravenswood.

As under LIPS 2015, the land, 'the site', in question in this Application should remain as is with residential development and subdivision discouraged in favour of its current use and its value to the environment.

This parcel of land already meets the Strategies of NTRLUS Goal 2 section in that is 'distinct land' with the 'visual amenities characteristic of municipal areas and Northern Tasmania collectively' as stated in Goal 2 (p.12 of the Application). Retention of this parcel of land in its current zoning would continue fulfil that section of NTRLUS Goal 2. It is an open space of environmental value, and should remain as part of the 'range of quality open space' (Goal 2) for the benefit of the wider community. Alteration of this zoning to allow housing development will not improve the 'liveability' of residents as claimed in the Application. It would diminish the liveability and amenity of the local area. The Application fails to give any consideration to the reasons that people have chosen to live there in the first place - that is, the open rural feel and 'bush' nature of the area.

Much of the site is physically unsuitable for development would result in unknown consequences for the environment and for existing local residential properties located below the site. Unknown consequences would be inevitable as the site and the surrounds on the western and

southern boundaries consist of a) a rocky slope and any development would interfere with water runoff and b) its southern boundary sits on the cliff above Distillery Creek, and any development would interfere with water runoff into that Creek, which feeds into the North Esk River Estuary. It is not a sound environmental proposition to rezone such land from its current use.

Despite all the discussion in the Application, the Planning Scheme Amendment to the zoning of the parcel of land at 38A Faulkner Road should not be permitted to proceed.

Yours faithfully,

Attention: Michael Stretton (Launceston City Council – General Manager)

NOTE: I have also sent this submission as a word document attached to this email.

Subject: Submission against rezoning of land at 38A Faulkner road.

I am opposed to the proposal of changing the planning amendment 47 for the rezoning from Rural Resource to Rural Living of 38A Faulkner Road Ravenswood. My objection is based on the following four points:

- a) Land Capability Assessment findings by AK Consultants may be flawed.
- b) Current infrastructure in “old” Ravenswood already under resourced.
- c) Comments and reactions from some residents bordering the proposal.
- d) Straw poll and personal loss of the quiet lifestyle, flora and fauna.

1. **Point 1 - Land Capability Assessment findings by AK Consultants may be flawed.**

I am not questioning their integrity or qualifications but rather suggest AK Consultants did not seek or understand the value of the history of Tarra Hill Farm. The original farmer Mr Lew who has since passed away made his living from farming this property for approximately 30 years and somewhat bewildered by the “hobby farm” reference by AK consultants.

Mr Lew’s son, Keith, who lives at _____ has more insight into the farming attributes at Tarra Hill Farm and also the history of the farm which may have assisted AK Consultants. Many people living on the boundary of this proposal have lived there for 30 to 50 years and also may have been of assistance to AK Consultants including to the location of Keith.

There are two comments about the farm below that I wish to have the council to be informed about although these comments may need to be confirmed for 100% accuracy by Keith.

Comment 1. The proposed lots 1 through to 8, (east of the current access road of 38A Faulkner Road) were historically high value crop production. It appears that since about mid 1990’s that this land has not been utilised and may appear to be low grade but is most likely “high value potential” for agricultural crops for an interested party.

Mr Lew supplied a Launceston green grocer in Brisbane street and generously supplied a number of neighbours that were in need.

Comment 2. The proposed lots 100, 101, 22 through to lot 34 have extensively been used for cattle & sheep grazing over the past 50 years plus that I have lived adjacent to Tarra Hill Farm. See the 4 photos below, (showing grazing left, centre, right & cattle in the distance), taken yesterday, 29/11/2018, from the back fence which shows the good grazing pasture. In fact, the current farmer, (leasing the farm), had to slash the fence line for a fire break clearly shown in the photos. The current farmer that is currently grazing approximately 50 Wagyu cattle upon this pasture. Yes, I did say Wagyu cattle and we all know and understand the value of such cattle.





2. **Point 2 - Current infrastructure in “old” Ravenswood already under resourced.**

In the older section of Ravenswood, there is very little current service infrastructure, two takeaway shops, one with a fuel service and a city mission outlet. In my view, I feel that more service infrastructure is needed before any more development is considered.

Instead of developing this area for obviously more wealthier persons, I had hoped the council may purchase this land and allow under privileged residents of Ravenswood to create community vegetable gardens and other innovative markets. This would assist and promote the pride and community values that Ravenswood desperately needs. It would also upgrade their personal skills and learning of an agricultural lifestyle similar to what the council is doing on LCC property just off Vermont Rd for new migrants. Indeed, that has been a very successful outcome for the participants and community.

3. **Point 3 - Comments and reactions from some residents bordering the proposal.**

Many residents living on the boundary of this proposal were somewhat shocked when I canvassed with them about what was occurring with this proposal. Most were aware of a rezoning proposal but were strangely convinced that this would not come to fruition. Two examples below show that the council should examine the option of providing detailed information about the full effects of the proposal to the residents bordering Tarra Hill Farm.

Example 1. An elderly couple living in _____ for over 50 years did not understand the proposal even with the letter received from the council. They have no access to the internet and limited access to travelling. They in fact become concerned when I informed them that a successful council approval of this proposal would result in the “Rural living” Lot number 100 being constructed at their rear fence.

Example 2. One family man with teenage kids and also living in _____ but only for a few years said one of the reasons they brought their home was the fact that their house bordered Tarra Hill farm. His disappointed comment, “There goes the neighbourhood” was a common theme among other residents.

4. **Point 4 - Straw poll and personal loss of the quiet lifestyle, flora and fauna**

A straw poll that I conducted with residents, just in Cromwell St that borders the farm, was 100% home ownership. My guess is that Faulkner Rd and Dean St bordering the farm would also be a very high percentage of home ownership. This is substantially different from the Ravenswood overall home ownership and shows that although there are many issues in Ravenswood, the residents are proud of where they live and bordering on Tarra Hill Farm is one distinct favourable benefit and advantage. My feeling is the majority of residents bordering the farm would oppose this rezoning proposal and would let their position be known to council if there was an easier way for this to occur. Many residents are elderly and others find it difficult to express their view.

It would be difficult to suggest a financial loss incurred by the residents if the rezoning proposal is approved but it would be a “real” dollar value as it is genuine house selling point.

On a personal level, I will miss the loss of the quiet lifestyle, flora and fauna especially the birdlife including the frequently visiting sulphur crested cockatoos, rosella parrots, magpies, etc. I suspect the bandicoots, the hares & rabbits, the wallabies and possums will disappear. The view of grazing livestock has been a favourite of all the family's children and their children over the past 50 plus years.

In conclusion and understanding the council's difficult decision over development or keeping the status quo for the residents affected by this proposal, I hope that the council will **not** approve this planning amendment 47 for the rezoning from Rural Resource to Rural Living of 38A Faulkner Road Ravenswood.

I would be happy to voluntarily assist in another Land Capability Assessment if the council views the farm history a factor that was not addressed by AK Consultants.

I would make myself available to anyone that wishes to learn about my perspective on opposing this proposal.

Regards,