

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Sam Lincoln [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 November 2020 8:16 AM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** DA0763/2020

Dear Ian,

I have looked over the following DA for 15 Queen St, Invermay. I am the owner of [REDACTED] which is [REDACTED] the proposed build currently the backyard sunlight is already blocked out from the property that was built @ 13 Queen St, Invermay a few years ago and if the above DA was to proceed there would be minimal sunlight for [REDACTED] backyard and I am also worried about the privacy of [REDACTED] yard having a property of that height overlooking [REDACTED] back yard.

I also believe that Invermay has a number of older properties and the visual look of more properties built like the above DA will deteriorate to the older buildings in the Invermay area.

I am contactable @ anytime on the details below,

Kind Regards,

Sam Lincoln  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 November 2020 8:41 AM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** DA for 15 Queen St, Invermay

Dear Ian,

I have looked over the following DA for 15 Queen St, Invermay. I am the owner of [REDACTED] the proposed new build will create shading issues in [REDACTED] backyard as the shading graphs completed in the plans cover a large portion of [REDACTED] backyard that will be shaded @ a number of different times, we already have a large 2 story house that blocks sunlight in the back area of the property, I am also worried about the privacy of [REDACTED] yard having a property of that height overlooking [REDACTED] back yard.

I also believe that Invermay has a number of older properties and the visual look of more properties built like the above DA will deteriorate to the older buildings in the Invermay area.

I am contactable @ anytime on the details below,

*Jessie Lincoln*

[REDACTED]

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Josie Towns [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 November 2020 10:46 AM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** DA0763/2020

To whom it may concern,

Please receive my written comments regarding the below,

DA NO: DA0763/2020

APPLICANT: TMK Design Solutions

LOCATION: 15 Queen Street INVERMAY

PROPOSAL: Residential - Constructions of a dwelling

CONTACT: Iain Moore

DATE OF NOTICE: 14/11/2020

I Josephina Mc Turk of [REDACTED] have great concern on the DA0763/2020 that will impact SUN, PRIVACY and AUDIO/SOUND.

Building ONE METRE off [REDACTED] up stairs deck with 15 queen streets plans showing a kitchen window will allow us absolutely no privacy at all, for both parties.

That will make the deck area for [REDACTED] not usable at all.

I believe 15 queen streets wet areas/kitchen should be on the west side of the house due to privacy. While I'm standing at my stove top ill be looking directly at the residents in 15 queen street standing at their sink.

A blind or curtain is not something we can achieve with a picture window as our splash back.

Also with the purposed building plans building one metre away and with the height of the internal ceilings and the way they have their roofs pitched will only allow half an hour of sun late afternoon, in my Kitchen, deck area, children's bedrooms, back yard, clothes line.

We are excepting a new child in 2021 night feeds with turning lights on and off will also impact 15 Queen street not to mention sound of crying baby through out the house. With the building plans being so close to us and not inside the guid lines.

They also need to screen their deck area.

We have built our windows up high to allow the people around us privacy so we can not look down on them. I believe the kitchen widow in 15 queen street should also be the same, due to the fact at the time of our build build 15 queen street did not exist ! it had several out houses and gardens attached to 17 queen street,

The Height and the closeness of the plans of 15 Queen street Im outraged by, We stayed inside the guid lines due to having car park next door and 15 queen street being none excitant.

The sound that carries being high on timber floors is more than u think. I can hear my 10 and 8 year old running up and down the hall way when I'm doing chores in the front and back yard. We will clearly be able to hear conversations and ongoings in 15 queen street as they will us.

We will also completely loose our view of the sky from kitchen, children's bedrooms we will be looking at a tin roof due the closeness and height.

Im more than happy for any parties to come and stand inside and out side [REDACTED] to truly understand the ongoing impacts that 15 queen street will have.

Kind regards  
Josephina Mc Turk

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Rawnsley, Nathan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 November 2020 4:18 PM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Cc:** Nathan Rawnsley  
**Subject:** 15 Queen Street

Dear Sir,

Re: Representation DA0763/2020, Residential - Construction of a dwelling, 15 Queen Street INVERMAY TAS 7248, Lot 2 RP 175689 Vol 175689 Fol 2, Lot 2 RP Pending

In making this representation we refer to the public notice details advertised online at the City of Launceston, eServices portal.

We make response in particular to the following Development Standards of the Inner Residential Zone :

#### **11.4.23 Development for discretionary uses**

b) The Streetscape;

Drawings Ad10 and Ad11 make no mention of any material considerations, colours. It makes it difficult to make an assessment on impact to streetscape. Nor are any of the windows and doors dimensioned on the drawings. No indication of any fencing types, no indication of gates, landscapes, lawn. More information is requested for assessment.

e) The bulk and form of building;

The proposed building form at #15 has a break in the centre of the roof form which creates two opposing split skillion roof forms. This break creates a higher and extending upper eave to the Western roof face. This unnecessarily increases the height of the roof. As there is no clerestory window here, it serves no functional purpose to break the roof planes, in particular when the proposal is well outside of the acceptable solutions. It would be more sympathetic to the visual character of the local streetscape to create a more simplified integrated gable roof construction which is more akin to the local bungalow typology and would reduce the visual bulk and impact of the development to the streetscape.

f) The height, bulk and form of building on the site, adjoining lots and adjacent lots.

Whilst it is noted that the proposal is zoned “inner residential”, the scale and form of the building is more akin to that of a far less dense zone, general residential to low-residential zones where the development standards are designed to deal with larger building forms, heights and setbacks. Whilst it is noted that the building is constructed in the Inveresk Inundation zone, and therefore the house proper needs to be at first floor the scale and form of the building does not sit sympathetically within the local streetscape. The predominant style of the local architecture is single storey Californian Bungalow style, which have low sweeping gables roof forms, weatherboard construction.

It must be noted that the geo-technical testing taken during the development of #13 provided for a Class P - rating, this required significant structural footing engineering in order to overcome subsidence risk due to the low strength of subsoils. If the site at #15 has the same soil classification, and given the scale and proximity of the proposed development at #15. We flag potential risk of construction associated damage at

#13 / #15 due to building / piles given their close proximity. In a Class-P site, an apron of paving is typically required around a building perimeter to slope away from the building foundations and in this case towards #13 and #17. As the footings will be located within 1m of #13, we request further information in regards to site drainage and impact on the lower shallow groundwater tables as well as dilapidation reports for the proposed works, or request that the proposal consider narrowing its footprint to reduce proximity to boundary and impacts during construction and occupation.

i) Overlooking and loss of privacy; and g) setbacks to side boundary

#13 Queen Street has an existing first level entertaining deck that runs off of its main living / kitchen spaces. This is located within 2m of the Patio at #15 as the crow flies (although this is not clearly dimensioned on the plans). The deck at #13 received discretionary approval historically, and was built hard to the boundary adjoining #15. When this deck was built, the lots at #15 had not been subdivided and the adjoining house was over 11m away and only single storey, at this time there was no loss of amenity. A privacy screen was erected to provide visual privacy at this time. In the proposed development at #15 the proximity of the kitchen window looks in and across and onto the deck at #13 across and into the kitchen, again there is no dimension to note this proximity. We would argue that when both outdoor areas are in use that there would be a loss of amenity due to the inability to have a conversation without hearing the neighbours.

We would suggest flipping the orientation of the floor plans, so that the deck is on the opposite side to #15. We also note in its current form all of the bedrooms are within metres of each other. If the plan were flipped it would mean the bedrooms would be opposite bathrooms, laundries.

K) No existing or proposed landscaping is shown, further information is requested

l) visual impacts when viewed from adjoining lots;

The proposed #15 and #13 are so close that you could reach over and touch the other, being between 1.06m and 1.29m away from each other. This is arm's length distance. As there is no fence located at 1st floor level. This level of proximity creates strong visual impact when viewed from #13 and loss of amenity.

The western elevation which has a greater setback of around 1.8m would be better aligned to #13. We would recommend flipping the floor plan around or narrowing the footprint, and lengthening the building to increase the side setbacks.

As #17 is a single storey house, it does not have the same level of connection and impact as #13.

We request additional information be produced in regards to identifying distances of the upstairs patio + kitchen window in relation to #13 deck / kitchen. We also request further information in regards to the height of windows, including their sill heights. It would assist in visualising the location of the schemes planning envelopes and understanding how far outside they are of acceptable development.

n) Refer streetscape

Regards  
Nathan Rawnsley

---

This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privilege intended only for use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Jane Ryan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 November 2020 4:15 PM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** Fwd: DA0763/2020

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Planning Queries <[Planning.Queries@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Planning.Queries@launceston.tas.gov.au)>  
**Date:** Mon, Nov 30, 2020 at 9:32 AM  
**Subject:** RE: DA0763/2020

[REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Iain More <[Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au)>

Hi Jane

I suggest you lodge your concerns as representation. They need to be sent to [Contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au)

The planner dealing with the application is on leave and there have already been representations received.

You need to do that ASAP as comments need to be in today.



Catherine Mainsbridge | Senior Town Planner | City Development  
T 03 6323 3397 | [www.launceston.tas.gov.au](http://www.launceston.tas.gov.au)

**From:** Jane Ryan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 November 2020 8:06 PM  
**To:** Planning Queries <[Planning.Queries@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Planning.Queries@launceston.tas.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** DA0763/2020

Hi There

Only received notification of this in the mail 25/11/2020

and realise you want be reading this till 30/11/20

I find it hard to determine the amount of shading that will affect our block at [REDACTED] as the boundaries at the back are not shown in the plans available online

I also don't believe the building design fits in with the rest of the houses in the area and totally out of character for the streetscape. It would be a total eyesore every time you came out the back door

Thank you for the notification and ability to comment on this building

We would be pleased to know the outcome.

Due to not being in Tasmania at the present time the best way for quick communication is via email

[REDACTED]

Regards

Jane Ryan and Russell Jones



Please consider the environment before printing this, or any other e-mail or document.



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Jane Ryan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 November 2020 4:25 PM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** DA0763/2020

Hi There

Not sure how to present this as a representation  
I did forward onto this area the email I had previously sent to another council area  
Our concerns for the proposed building of DA0763/2020 are:

It is hard to determine the amount of shading that will affect our block at [REDACTED] as the boundaries at the back are not shown in the plans available online, as a keen gardener this is an issue

Also don't believe the building design fits in with the rest of the houses in the area and totally inappropriate for the streetscape. It would be a total eyesore every time you came out the back door. The proposed building will detract from the character of the streetscape

Thank you for the notification and ability to comment on this building

We would be pleased to know the outcome.  
Due to not being in Tasmania at the present time the best way for quick communication is via email

[REDACTED]

Regards  
Jane Ryan and Russell Jones

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Planning Queries  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 November 2020 4:36 PM  
**To:** Contact Us  
**Subject:** FW: Representation DA0763/2020, Residential - Construction of a dwelling, 15 Queen Street INVERMAY TAS 7248, Lot 2 RP 175689 Vol 175689 Fol 2, Lot 2 RP Pending

Hi guys,

Can you register this as a representation to DA0763/2020 please.

Thanks, Duncan

---

**From:** Matt Hurst [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 November 2020 3:59 PM  
**To:** Planning Queries <Planning.Queries@launceston.tas.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Representation DA0763/2020, Residential - Construction of a dwelling, 15 Queen Street INVERMAY TAS 7248, Lot 2 RP 175689 Vol 175689 Fol 2, Lot 2 RP Pending

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Matt Hurst [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 30 November 2020 at 15:55:01 AEDT  
**To:** Iain More <[Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** Representation DA0763/2020, Residential - Construction of a dwelling, 15 Queen Street INVERMAY TAS 7248, Lot 2 RP 175689 Vol 175689 Fol 2, Lot 2 RP Pending

Dear Launceston City Council,

This email is a Representation regarding DA0763/2020, Residential - Construction of a dwelling, [15 Queen Street INVERMAY TAS 7248](#), Lot 2 RP 175689 Vol 175689 Fol 2, Lot 2 RP Pending

We have been requested to prepare this representation and submit it to Council on by our client, the owner and occupier of No.13 Queen Street Invermay. Notwithstanding that this representation has been prepared at the request of a client, it should still be considered as a representation in its own right.

In making this representation we refer to the public notice details advertised online at the City of Launceston, eServices portal.

We make response in particular to the following Development Standards of the Inner Residential Zone :

#### **11.4.23 Development for discretionary uses**

The Streetscape;

Drawings Ad10 and Ad11 make no mention of any material considerations, colours. This makes it difficult to make an informed assessment of the proposal's impact to the streetscape.

There are also no dimensions for any of the windows and doors on the drawings. No indication of any fencing types, no indication of gates, landscapes or lawn. We request that this information is provided to allow for an informed assessment of how these design elements will impact the streetscape.

The bulk and form of building;

The proposed building form at No.15 has a break in the centre of the roof form which creates two opposing split skillion roof forms. This break creates a higher and extended upper eave above the Eastern roof face. This unnecessarily increases the height of the roof when viewed from the east. As there is no clerestory window here, it serves no functional purpose to break the roof planes for the full length of the building. This is especially the case when the proposal is outside of the acceptable solution for building bulk and form. It would be more appropriate to the visual character of the local streetscape to create a simplified integrated roof form that meets at a ridge. This revised form could be applied from behind the proposed balcony on level 1 so as to retain the feature of the split roofline when viewed from the street. The effect of this design amendment would be to lower the roofline to the proposed ridge height over the majority of the length of the building, and in doing so reduce the height and visual impact of the building when viewed from the east.

The height, bulk and form of building on the site, adjoining lots and adjacent lots.

Whilst it is noted that the proposal is zoned “inner residential”, the scale and form of the building is more akin to that of a far less dense zone, general residential to low density residential zones where the development standards are designed to deal with larger building forms, heights and greater setbacks. Whilst it is noted that the building is constructed in the Inveresk Inundation zone, and therefore the residential space needs to be at the first floor level, the scale and form of the building does not sit sympathetically within the local streetscape.

It must be noted that the geo-technical testing taken during the development of No.13 provided for a Class P - rating, this required significant structural footing engineering in order to overcome subsidence risk due to the low strength of subsoils. If the site at No.15 has the same soil classification, we highlight the potential risk of construction associated damage at No.13 due to the construction of building piles given their close proximity. In a Class-P site, an apron of paving is typically required around a building perimeter to slope away from the building foundations to facilitate drainage and in this case that would be towards No.13 and No.17. As the footings of the proposal will be located within 1m of No.13, we request further information in regards to site drainage and impact on the potential lowering of the shallow groundwater tables during the construction phase, as well as dilapidation reports for the proposed works. Alternatively, we request that the proposal consider narrowing its footprint to reduce proximity to the boundaries and impacts during construction and ongoing occupation.

Overlooking and loss of privacy; and setbacks to side boundaries

No.13 [Queen Street](#) has an existing first level entertaining deck that is connected to its main living and kitchen spaces. This existing deck is located within 2m of the proposed Patio on level 1 of the development. This proximity is not dimensioned on the plans. The deck at No.13 received discretionary approval when it was approved and was built to the adjoining boundary of what, at the time, was No.17. When this deck at No.13 was built, the lot at No.15 had not been subdivided from No.17 and the adjoining house on No.17 was over 11m away and is only single storey, so at that time there was no loss of amenity. A privacy screen was erected to provide visual privacy at that time. In the proposed

development at No.15 the proximity of the kitchen window looks in and across and onto the deck at No.13, then across and into the kitchen. There are no dimensions in the plans to note this proximity. We would argue that when both outdoor areas are in use simultaneously that there would be a significant loss of amenity for both residents.

We would suggest flipping the orientation of the Upper floor plans, so that the deck is on the opposite (Western) side of No.15. We also note in its current from all of the bedrooms of the proposal are within metres of those at No.13. If the upper floor plan were flipped it would mean the existing bedrooms at No.13 would be opposite proposed bathrooms and laundries, affording additional privacy.

The proposed plans do not indicate any existing or proposed landscaping. Further information is requested to determine how this might best be incorporated to reduce the impacts of the proposal on adjoining dwellings.

Visual impacts when viewed from adjoining lots;

The proposal at No.15 is so close to No.13 that someone could reach over and touch the other building, being between 1.06m and 1.29m away from each other. As there is no fence located at 1st floor level this level of proximity creates strong visual impact when viewed from No.13 and will constitute a substantial loss of amenity.

The western elevation which has a greater setback of around 1.8m would be better aligned to face towards No.13. We would recommend flipping the upper floor plan around, or otherwise narrowing the entire footprint, and lengthening the building to increase the side setbacks.

As No.17 is a single storey house, the proposal does not have the same degree of impact on privacy as for No.13 where upper level bedroom windows would be both visually and acoustically adjacent. Flipping the upper level floor plan would resolve this issue without triggering the same issue at No.17. This would also locate the upper level patio on the north-western corner of the development where it would benefit from additional afternoon sun and provide the required privacy to the deck at No.13.

#### Mechanical Ventilation

We note that the locations for mechanical ventilation plant are not shown on the proposed plans. We request that a condition of approval be included with any permit granted that stipulates that mechanical ventilation plant (for air conditioners or heat pumps) be located in the ground floor behind the garages on the western elevation of the building. This will ensure that they are not adjacent to bedrooms at No.13. We understand that the eastern side of No.17 does not contain bedrooms. It should also stipulated that ventilation plant can not be located on the eastern facade of the building or on the roof.

We request additional information be produced in regards to identifying distances of the proposed upstairs patio and kitchen window in relation to the existing deck at No.13. We also request further information in regards to the height of windows, including their sill heights. It would assist in visualising the location of the proposal's building envelopes, and understanding how far outside of the acceptable solutions they are currently proposed to be.

Should you have any questions regarding this representation please contact me directly.

Matt Hurst BTP  
Director

Parade Consulting Pty Ltd

