

Representation received
out of time

From: Nancy Serisier
Sent: Thu, 27 May 2021 14:12:27 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: Fwd: DAO894/2020 269 Charles St. Attention Duncan Payton

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nancy Serisier [REDACTED]
Date: 26 May 2021 at 8:01:56 am AEST
To: Fiona Ranson [REDACTED]
Subject: DAO894/2020 269 Charles St.

Dear Fiona,

How are you? I realise the time to comment on DAO894/2020,269 Charles St, has passed ,but I would like to write a couple of lines !

The house is named on the Local Heritage list as being of local significance to Launceston.It is surrounded by houses on the register listed of local and state significance. How could demolition be even considered?

The South Central Precinct in which this house is situated,is named by Paul Davies in the 2007 Heritage Study as one of great importance to the city of Launceston.

“The Precinct has extremely high integrity and intactness”(p106).

“ The properties identified as heritage items should be retained and where possible future work should recover significance where it has been lost” (p107).

Lately we have seen many old and valuable housing stock being approved for demolition. The general excuse is that the house is not listed on the Heritage Register.

Well this one is ! So will it be saved?

Kind regards,
Nancy Serisier.
Sent from my iPad

Representation received
out of time

From: PlanningAlerts
Sent: Fri, 21 May 2021 10:51:21 +1000
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0894/2020

For the attention of the General Manager / Planning Manager / Planning Department

Application DA0894/2020
Address 269 Charles Street Launceston, TAS, 7250
Description Residential - Demolish existing dwelling and construction of two dwellings with access over adjoining right of way
Name of commenter Jarad
Address of commenter [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Comment

I note that after digging through the Council's site to review these plans, that this DA has now closed for comment... though for some reason it only showed up on the planning alerts site yesterday?

I support new buildings being added into the city, especially when they make an effort to contribute to and improve the street scape and not just mimic the old buildings around them. This project however, required the demolition of the existing building and the addition of an entirely out of character modern box. The existing building is part of our cities heritage and character and it's place in the street should be protected by council.

There is one diagram in the application that implies that the new building will not be seen from the street. This is quite misleading as the building is visible from the footpath on the other side of the street and the cars as they pass, which is not referenced. Will only pedestrians leaning against the blue stone wall look up? Seriously?

By all means, develop the back of the site and add to the existing building, but don't remove another part of the character and heritage of the city for a modern pair of townhouses and an economic outcome.

Representation received
out of time

From: PlanningAlerts
Sent: Fri, 21 May 2021 08:51:38 +1000
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0894/2020

For the attention of the General Manager / Planning Manager / Planning Department

Application DA0894/2020
Address 269 Charles Street Launceston, TAS, 7250
Description Residential - Demolish existing dwelling and construction of two dwellings
with access over adjoining right of way
Name of commenter LISA WALKDEN
Address of commenter [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Comment

What is the proposal regarding the rather large imposing front fence when I walk past I make sure I walk close to the gutter because if it fell on you it would be deadly - what is going to occur to this during construction and afterwards?

This comment was submitted via PlanningAlerts, a free service run by [the OpenAustralia Foundation](#) for the public good. [View this application on PlanningAlerts](#)



From: PlanningAlerts
Sent: Thu, 20 May 2021 14:56:31 +1000
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0894/2020

For the attention of the General Manager / Planning Manager / Planning Department

Application DA0894/2020
Address 269 Charles Street Launceston, TAS, 7250
Description Residential - Demolish existing dwelling and construction of two dwellings with access over adjoining right of way
Name of commenter Di Biermann
Address of commenter [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Comment

The proposed design is completely out of keeping with this heritage area, and inconsistent with the style of buildings in the area.

This comment was submitted via PlanningAlerts, a free service run by [the OpenAustralia Foundation](#) for the public good. [View this application on PlanningAlerts](#)



From: PlanningAlerts
Sent: Thu, 20 May 2021 10:20:28 +1000
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0894/2020

For the attention of the General Manager / Planning Manager / Planning Department

Application DA0894/2020
Address 269 Charles Street Launceston, TAS, 7250
Description Residential - Demolish existing dwelling and construction of two dwellings with access over adjoining right of way
Name of commenter Allan
Address of commenter [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Comment

Here is my submission against the demolition of another of Launcestons very early buildings.

The Frankland survey and assessment rolls demonstrate that this building was constructed after 1839 but before 1853 - this is not many years after the founding of Melbourne and when Pt Arthur was still newly established. It is still among Launcestons earliest existing buildings. This place was already old when the Albert Hall was built. We should consider this a treasure as luckily the outside at least is largely intact and in good condition. I admit that it lacks the marble pillars that aldermen usually look for when doing their heritage assessments on these places.

To demolish yet another of our earliest residences, especially on a main Rd. seen by tourists, would be another great loss to the community. This place is particularly prominent, in that it is situated high up. Its loss will negatively effect the heritage values LCC see happy to promote.

Heritage is one our major assets in Launceston, and we need to simply stop destroying it bit by bit.

I am assuming that no research has been done on this place (as is generally the case). Without a simple assessment (not just walking past) we cannot know what we are losing if this demolition is approved.

It is obvious that a modern building built in such a prominent position will have a negative impact on the streetscape which is largely intact.

Was this property included in the council funded but long ignored Paul Davies Heritage Study ?

Thanks,
Allan

This comment was submitted via PlanningAlerts, a free service run by [the OpenAustralia Foundation](#) for the public good. [View this application on PlanningAlerts](#)



From: Bruce Jones
Sent: Tue, 18 May 2021 20:41:52 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: DA0894/2020 Objection
Attachments: 269 Charles Street_DA0894_2020.docx

Good Evening

We wish to submit the following objection to DA0894/2020. Please see attached document.

Regards

Bruce & Alana Jones



18th May 2021

Chief Executive Officer
Launceston City Council
Town Hall, St John Street
Launceston 7250

Re: DA0894/2020 Objection

Dear Sir/Madam

We wish to object to the above Application for a Planning Permit.

We have many concerns.

Proposed House 1 does not comply with Clause 11.4.8 A1 as the height of the dwelling above natural ground level is 11.85 metres which is far in excess of the height characteristics of the surrounding area. The application does not address P1 and in particular fails to demonstrate how the building height is appropriate to the site and the streetscape in regard to:

(c) the visual impact of the building when viewed from the road and from adjoining properties – specifically those properties to the south; and

(d) the degree of overshadowing on adjoining properties.

The proposed 2m front boundary setback for House 1 does not comply with 11.4.9 Frontage setbacks A1.1 as the setback proposed is 2m. The application does not demonstrate how it meets the corresponding performance criteria. Specifically, little regard has been given to the compatibility of the setback to the streetscape and the appearance when viewed from roads and public places.

The application fails to demonstrate how the works will comply with the Heritage Code. Specifically, Clause E3.6.5 Height and Bulk of Buildings, Clause 13.6.8 Roof form and materials and Clause 13.6.9 Wall materials.

Most of the rock wall on the right of way is only allowing 3.6 metres width, not 3.96 metres as per the title. How does the applicant intend to return the right of way to 3.96 metres?

Our house (46 Frankland Street) is 1.6 metres from the southern boundary. (Not 4.1metres as shown on Page 4 of the DA).

DA Page7 shows parts of the building are outside the acceptable rear and side setback envelope. Why? This needs to be addressed.

In the proposal there will be two houses all with double garages and no provision for visitor parking in the new development. As per 11.4.19 of the Inner Resident Zone Plan; Proposed drawings do not address; A1 (b) Parking, including visitor parking (e) Storage for waste and recycling bins. This will impact on the right of way as there will be four houses plus visitors entering the right of way, increasing traffic to and from Charles Street.

There is no provision to contain or drain water running onto the right of way and Charles Street. Should there be provision to do this through the use of grated drains. At present all water from the right of way runs over the footpath onto Charles Street. Where or how do they propose to drain the water?

Site coverage: As per 11.4.7 of the Inner Resident Zone Planning Scheme below: Site Coverage must be no greater than 60% House 2 plan is greater than 60% of house 2 site. Page 5 of DA.

Density control of multiple dwellings 11.4.16 Of the Inner Resident Zone Planning Scheme.
Acceptable solutions: A1 Multiple dwellings must have a site area per dwelling of no less than 350m² **House2 is 213.5sq m** which is less than the requirement. Performance Criteria P1 Multiple dwellings must not detract from the character of the surrounding area, having regard to: (a) the character of the streetscape; (b) the density of dwellings in the surrounding area; (c) the proximity of multiple dwellings on nearby sites; and (d) the proximity to public transport routes and services; and **must have a site area per dwelling of not less than 250sq m.**

During construction what guarantee do we have that an already fragile southern boundary (271 Charles Street and 46 Frankland Street) does not suffer further subsidence?

We urge council to reject this application in its current form until all concerns are addressed, particularly regarding the right of way which in its present form does not reflect that of the title and may require legal counsel to remedy.

Regards

B Jones & A Jones

Bruce & Alana Jones



From: Ferg Cameron
Sent: Tue, 18 May 2021 19:16:41 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: Representation re - DA0894/2020

Attn CEO LCC

I have concerns about the amount of extra traffic congestion that will be travelling over the right of way between 265 and 269 Charles Street.

The right of way currently services 3 properties.

With the additional dwelling will come the loss of 4 existing parking spots and an increased traffic movement.

Occasionally visitors to the 3 properties will park on the incorrect side of the right of way and on the neighbours property.

With the current proposal, assuming that both new households have 2 cars and that they are parked in the garage, there will be no off street parking for visitors and all visitors to the new dwellings will be required to park on the street outside the property.

I have concerns with the proposed set back of 1500mm between entrance to the double garages and the Northern Boundary of the right of way. Will this enable easy access, particularly for house 1.

Perhaps the setback could be increased slightly to facilitate easier ingress and egress of vehicles.

I am sure that with reasonable negotiation between all parties involved, a suitable outcome can be achieved.

Kind regards

F.A.CAMERON



From: Taylor Hunter
Sent: Tue, 18 May 2021 19:21:29 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: Fw: DA0894/2020 Objection
Attachments: 269 Charles St. DA08942020.docx

Apologies for not including my phone number on my previous email. It is 0413977027

Regards

Taylor Hunter

From: Taylor Hunter

Sent: Tuesday, 18 May 2021 5:03 PM

To: contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>

Subject: DA0894/2020 Objection

Please find attached objection letter for the above DA.

Regards

Taylor Hunter

17th May 2021

Chief Executive Officer
Launceston City Council
Town Hall, St John Street
Launceston 7250

Re: DA0894/2020 Objection

Dear Sir/Madam

We wish to object to the above Application for a Planning Permit.

I'm a regular visitor to Charles Street and feel that this proposal is no way compatible with the buildings in the immediate vicinity. Surely with the time and effort that has been expended on this proposal, it could have sat more naturally within the surrounds, not dominating the other heritage properties.

Regards

Taylor Hunter

From: Robyn Bond
Sent: Tue, 18 May 2021 09:23:12 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: Planning permit DA0894/2020 objection

Chief Executive Officer ,

Ref DA0894/2020 objection

Dear Sir/Madam,

We wish to object to the above application for a Planning Permit.

This area is in an area with many heritage listed properties and it is not visually sympathetic to its immediate neighbours and especially the general landscape. The building will tower over the properties on either side and hence will not blend into the landscape of Charles Street.

Charles Street is already has congested traffic flow and the narrow right of way onto Charles Street from this property will increase this problem and cause more traffic accidents.

Regards
Robyn Bond and Ian Pearton



Sent from my iPad