

Re: 1A George Town Road, Newnham- Rezone the land from Recreation to Inner Residential

Reference: SF6960 – Amendment 57

As an owner of property in the area, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], I wish to raise the following objections to the proposed change in zoning.

1. The zoning in this area is likely to change with the imminent implementation of the State-wide Planning Scheme (SwPS). The original application makes a relational claim for zoning based on the current zoning in the residential precinct to the south, that is, the zoning to the south is currently Inner Residential (Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015). This zoning is correctly identified as changing to General Residential (as defined under the State-wide Planning Scheme) by the council officers Luke Hurst and Leanne Rogers in the council's briefing documents shown below.



Figure 5 - Draft LPS Zoning Map

The site is proposed to remain in the Recreation Zone, however, the proposed zoning for the LPS did not generally recommend rezoning of individual sites. It is also noted that the area to the south of the site is proposed to be rezoned to General Residential, rather than the current Inner Residential Zone. The potential to recommend the site be rezoned to General Residential in anticipation of this likely change was considered. However, in assessing the proposed rezoning it was suitable to take into account the current provisions, policies and zoning, rather than pre-emptively apply the General Residential Zone to respond to a situation that may not eventuate.

There appears to be an assumption in this report, and that is that council will act to rezone lot 1A to General Residential when the SwPS is adopted. In my briefing with LCC regarding the rezoning of 14 Mangin St from Inner Residential (LIP) to General Residential (SwPS), council nominates the new zoning, its extent and which areas within the LIP will change (based on the area's alignment to the new definitions of the zones). Other sites I own in Launceston that are currently General Residential (LIP), will automatically progress to General Residential (SwPS) without council intervention. If council omits to include the site at 1A George Town Road to change from this interim zoning of Inner Residential (LIP) to General Residential (SwPS) the site/zoning then allows for a much higher residential density.

I submit that the requested lot sizes 350m² in section **4.2.3 Land Supply** is within the General Residential Zoning for multiple dwellings (SwPS) of 325 m² and the site coverage requirement of not more than 50% for this use is appropriate. Therefore the zoning should be General Residential.

An Inner Residential Zoning (SwPS) will not be consistent with the surrounding residential area. It will also mean that Unify SDA can increase the density from 16 units to approximately 28, with the caveat that they, the developers, can apply for even a higher density under the SwPS- see **9.4.1 Residential density for multiple dwellings**, as shown below **P1(b)**, prior to applying for any discretionary planning items. The provision of private open space is then also compromised.

9.4.1 Residential density for multiple dwellings

Objective:	That the density of multiple dwellings: (a) makes efficient use of land for housing; and (b) optimises the use of infrastructure and community services.	
Acceptable Solutions	Performance Criteria	
A1 Multiple dwellings must have a site area per dwelling of not less than 200m ² .	P1 Multiple dwellings must only have a site area per dwelling less than 200m ² if: (a) the development contributes to a range of dwelling types and sizes appropriate to the surrounding area; or (b) the development provides for a specific accommodation need with significant social or community benefit.	

2. Site and Access:

As correctly identified in the application, there are 3 access points to the site as mentioned below.

2. Site and surrounding area

The subject site is located at 1A George Town Road, Newnham. This is on the western side of George Town Road, between Newnham Drive and Foch Street. The site has an area of 5,556m² and an irregular shape that is generally rectangular. The primary access to the site is over two crossovers to George Town Road at the north eastern and south eastern corners of the site. There is an additional rear access to the south western corner of the site from Mangin Street.

Over the last 35+ years I have lived in the locality, the access via Mangin st has been blocked (no through access, due to the layout of the bowling greens and club house). During the operation of the bowling club the access street at the rear (Mangin St) has only been used for maintenance staff and would see a daily traffic flow of 2-4 vehicles max. The main access and parking is at the front of the site, with in/out curb and channel and fencing alongside George Town Road.

I strongly repute the two clauses present in the councils recommendations as shown below.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

No significant economic impacts have been identified.

SOCIAL IMPACT:

No significant social impacts have been identified.

The residents of Mangin St suffer from issues related to the current road design on a day to day basis. The street is narrow with parking on both sides. Navigating the street and accessing driveways is problematic (high road crown, deep gutter-poorly engineered crossovers and staggered driveways), resulting in many cars being parked on the street. Large vehicular access (bigger than a car) is very limited, often vehicles cannot negotiate the road (not wide enough) and when they can, they need to reverse into or out of the street, a dangerous practice. Removal of the current turning facility on the George Town Road 1A site will exacerbate existing issues.

Open access to the site through Mangin St will increase traffic flow and due to the nature of the proposed development, ie NDIS housing, there will be a large number of service people and vehicles needed to support the tenants, some of whom will choose to use and park in Mangin St. The current plan, which is obviously not the final product, indicates a through connection between Mangin St and George Town Road. This would not only be dangerous for tenants, but also add to the current traffic flow and dangers involved in navigating the narrow, high crown road (Mangin St). Clearly it is undesirable for casual users of, and those parking in, Mangin St to use the NDIS complex as a through road to Georgetown Rd rather than try to turn around.

No through road through 1A George Town Rd, resident only parking/permits and no parking on one side of the street in Mangin would only go part way to easing the issues created by the development. Any changing of the Mangin St traffic is an issue for residents.

Hence the proposal/rezoning has the potential to negatively affect property values

3. Parking

In the documentation this is stated about parking

E6.0 Parking and Sustainable Transport Code

The code applies to all development, and would apply to the future residential development on the site. There is currently a car parking area along the frontage of the site and there is ample space on the site for the provision of parking and associated facilities to meet the needs of any future use.

Unfortunately the submission fails to look at what parking requirements and vehicular access may be required (number of spots required for residents, support staff, NDIS workers, visitors and service personel such as chef, kitchen hand etc as well as administration staff, and does not draw on any data from similar establishments. The use and access by of oversize vehicles, such as wheel chair transport, small buses, medical and delivery vehicles, also fails to be considered. I note there are no cooking facilities in the units as drawn. The proposal/rezoning should be rejected solely on this issue.

Other concerns:

- I have 2 properties in the area that would be impacted in some way by this development. However council has chosen not to formally notify me of the application
- The determination for zoning use in this case should not be done purely on this possible one use. Once zoning has been completed the site can be sold and developed however the existing or a new owner wishes to so long as it fits the new zoning conditions.. hence an inner residential zoning (SwPS) is not desirable or in keeping with the area.
- The graphic provided, as shown below, is misleading as it only shows 10 units, even though the application indicated 16. The lack of detail/accuracy suggests the final design could be considerably different.



Site
1 : 500

- Perhaps a more appropriate zoning would be particular use, this then ensures the development can be managed with appropriate caveats and ensures any change of use (in the event of sale) will then be within the control/discretion of council.
- I also have serious concerns that it is Unify SDA's intention to get this zoned Inner Residential under SwPS, and it is in fact a deliberate act, enabled with the changes to zoning from LIP to SwSP and not unintentional. Rod Neville, an engineer (Chairman of SDA) is well known to council and is well versed in such planning matters.

Dale Goldsworthy and Heidi Komzak

