

Council Meeting - 29 October 2020 - Agenda Item 9.3  
Attachment 4 - Representations - 3 Sherwins Avenue Launceston

---

**From:** Kate Bovill  
**Sent:** Monday, 5 October 2020 10:21 AM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** DA0493/2020 - 3 Sherwins Avenue

**Categories:** Lisa

The Chief Executive officer,  
Launceston City Council.

RE: DA0493/2020  
3 Sherwins Avenue  
Launceston.

I, being the owner of \_\_\_\_\_, Launceston. Object to the above planning application for 3 Sherwins Avenue.

The two blocks, No. 3 and 3a were subdivided from heritage listed buildings and they were part of the original gardens. These blocks have heritage classification.

The proposed dwelling does not have any heritage components in its design or façade.

The majority of buildings in the area are old with several having heritage listings.

The proposed design does not fit in with the streetscape.

Yours Sincerely,  
Charles Bovill,

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

---

**From:** craig maclean  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 7 October 2020 9:48 AM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** Response to Planning Permit Application DA0493/2020

As the owners of [redacted] we wish to make the following submission with respect to the above development application.

1. The proposed dwelling is unsuitable for the surrounding streetscape in scale and construction. The buildings in Sherwins Avenue are modest, single storey buildings constructed of "tin and timber". The proposed building has an extremely large footprint on its block of land and its construction materials bear little relation to the other dwellings in the streetscape. The most recent building developments in the area, fronting Margaret Street, in front of the church were designed to be sympathetic to the surrounding buildings in their use of materials and visual impact. The proposed dwelling in Sherwins Avenue, in contrast, is radically different from its surrounding streetscape. A significant area of rendered finish, steel and glass balustrading and a skillion roof will be different from every building in the area. The proposed design has a monolithic appearance, vastly different from all local buildings. The house design would sit well in a new estate, **not in a heritage area**.
2. The two-storey building will create privacy concerns for us. Because the house is built uphill from our dwelling our courtyard will be in full view from its upper storey bedrooms and deck. The large expanses of glass on the eastern elevation will greatly impact on our privacy and amenity of our property. The back courtyard area is our *only* private outdoor space. There also appears to be no shade / shadow indicators in the drawings to determine the impact of the dwelling on our property.
3. In conjunction with Council and Heritage we have gone to significant expense and trouble to ensure our dwelling is compatible with its surrounds. While much of this relates more to the "church precinct" we have also (with Council heritage advice) ensured that our garage extension, fronting Sherwins Avenue, used suitable materials to maintain the streetscape. It would be a shame if our (Council directed) efforts were negated by an unsuitable development.
4. We are appreciative of the intention to maintain the significant tree situated on the boundary line between our properties. We had taken account of this by incorporating a gap in the fencing between the properties.

Please note: the council document arrived in our mailbox today (7/10/20) - the due date. It would be appreciated if any further development application requests be emailed to

Thankyou.

**Craig and Pam Maclean**