

Council Meeting - Agenda Item 9.3 - Attachment 7  
Representations - 7 Weedon Avenue South Launceston - 29 July 2021

**From:** "Caroline Ball" [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 28 Jun 2021 15:31:38 +1000  
**To:** "Contact Us" <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>  
**Subject:** DA0212/021

***John and Caroline Ball,***

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To the Chief Executive Officer,  
Launceston City Council,

Dear Maria

We received a notice from Launceston City Planning regarding PD21024 for 7 Weedon Avenue; , and we are lodging a formal objection to the additional dwelling planned., we are appealing to Council's discretionary powers

We moved here in 1977 and have been viewing with growing concern the increasing number of infill dwellings in Weedon Avenue, Kings Meadows. We know that the council has a policy of infilling. We have had two additional dwellings on our fence lines at [REDACTED]. Having looked at the plans, and despite the loss of mature trees and the accompanying bird life, we did not object to the second dwelling at 9a Weedon Avenue

However the density of infilling over the past few months has increased greatly involving the removal of several more mature trees. There are no longer native birds such as New Holland Honeyeaters, Spinebill Honey eaters, Silvereyes, Blue wrens etc.. which were all present when we moved to this pleasant area of Kings Meadows. These new dwellings are so crammed together that there appears to be no space for trees to be replaced and little room planting e.g. a vegetable garden,

**While the Council will benefit from much needed rates from the properties, it has without doubt a duty of care to the residents already residing in the area as well as the incoming ones.**

We are asking the council to look at the destruction of the amenities in the area. It is well known that trees have a beneficial effect on health

*"A recent study ([Scientific Reports](#),) found that residents in urban neighborhoods with more trees reported feeling healthier and had fewer*

*cardio-metabolic conditions, such as heart disease and diabetes. Co-author Marc Berman told [The Washington Post](https://www.iflscience.com/health-and-medicine/there-are-health-benefits-living-near-trees-study-suggests/) that after controlling for income, age and education, the study "found a significant independent effect of trees on the street on health". <https://www.iflscience.com/health-and-medicine/there-are-health-benefits-living-near-trees-study-suggests/>*

- This rapid change has greatly affected the ambience of the area with little of the natural appearance of Weedon Avenue left.. Needless to say the value of our property will also be affected to our detriment.
- • There seem to be too many additional dwellings being permitted in one street losing more of the previous pleasant ambience.
- • We request that the Magnolia tree and Norfolk Pine be retained to help continue the bird life and to alleviate the harsh appearance of the dwellings.
- • Finally, this three bedroom double storey house appears to be outside the permitted envelope

We look forward to your response to our concerns.

John and Caroline

27.06.2021

dwellings are so crammed together that there appears to be no space for trees to be replaced and little room planting e.g. a vegetable garden,

**While the Council will benefit from much needed rates from the properties, it has without doubt a duty of care to the residents already residing in the area as well as the incoming ones.**

We are asking the council to look at the destruction of the amenities in the area. It is well known that trees have a beneficial effect on health

*“A recent study ([Scientific Reports](#),) found that residents in urban neighborhoods with more trees reported feeling healthier and had fewer cardio-metabolic conditions, such as heart disease and diabetes. Co-author Marc Berman told [The Washington Post](#) that after controlling for income, age and education, the study "found a significant independent effect of trees on the street on health". <https://www.iflscience.com/health-and-medicine/there-are-health-benefits-living-near-trees-study-suggests/>*

- This rapid change has greatly affected the ambience of the area with little of the natural appearance of Weedon Avenue left.. Needless to say the value of our property will also be affected to our detriment.
- • There seem to be too many additional dwellings being permitted in one street losing more of the previous pleasant ambience.
- • We request that the Magnolia tree and Norfolk Pine be retained to help continue the bird life and to alleviate the harsh appearance of the dwellings.
- • Finally, this three bedroom double storey house appears to be outside the permitted envelope

We look forward to your response to our concerns.

John and Caroline

27.06.2021

**From:** "Robyn Weston" [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 28 Jun 2021 11:38:20 +1000  
**To:** "Contact Us" <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>  
**Cc:** "Michael Eddleston" [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** DA0212/2021 7 Weedon Avenue - Representation from R Weston/M Eddleston  
**Attachments:** DA0212.2021 Representation to Council.docx

To the Chief Executive Officer,  
Launceston City Council

DA0212/2021

Please find attached our representation to the Notice of Application for a Planning Permit for the subdivision of 7 Weedon Avenue, South Launceston.

regards,  
Robyn Weston & Michael Eddleston

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

28 June, 2021

The Chief Executive Officer  
Launceston City Council

### **DA0212/2021 – 7 Weedon Avenue**

We are writing to you in response to the Notice of Application for a Planning Permit for the subdivision of 7 Weedon Avenue, South Launceston, and the construction of an additional dwelling.

We herewith provide representation to state our OBJECTIONS to this development application proposal for the following reasons.

#### **OVERDEVELOPMENT**

We **object** to the construction of a dwelling above single story that also appears to be outside the building envelope.

**Clause 10.4.2 of the Interim Planning Scheme** states the following regarding setbacks and building envelope for all dwellings.

*The siting and scale of a dwellings:*

- (b) provides consistency in the apparent scale, bulk, massing and proportion of dwellings;  
(c) provides separation between dwellings on adjoining properties to allow reasonable opportunity for daylight and sunlight to enter habitable rooms and private open space;

- With regard to (b) – There are no other two-storey dwellings on the same side of the street in Weedon Avenue or on adjoining boundary properties where this development is proposed. Therefore, the proposed building is inconsistent with the proportion of other dwellings in the immediate area, including the existing Unit 1 at 7 Weedon Avenue.
- With regard to (c) – if the existing Unit 1 is considered an ‘adjoining property’, it is our understanding of information we have received to date, that the proposed building will not comply with this clause. The height of the proposed building will create a barrier to winter easterly light into the existing property (Unit 1) at 7 Weedon Avenue.

**10.4.2 P3** states:

*The siting and scaling of a dwelling must:*

- (a) not cause an unreasonable loss of amenity to adjoining properties, having regard to:
- (i) reduction in sunlight to a habitable room (other than a bedroom) of a dwelling on an adjoining property;
  - (ii) overshadowing the private open space of a dwelling on an adjoining property;
  - (iii) overshadowing of an adjoining vacant property; or
  - (iv) visual impacts caused by the apparent scale, bulk or proportions of the dwelling when viewed from an adjoining property;

- With regard to (a) (i) – The height of the proposed building appears to create a barrier to easterly light into the existing property at 7 Weedon Avenue (Unit 1). We request that you review both the Shadow Diagrams and Landscape Plan and also consider how the loss of light will impact the ability to grow lawn, and suggest there is a more appropriate ground cover, such as paving, artificial turf, decking.
- With regard to (a) (ii) - The height of the building will visually impact the view from our back yard. Additionally, as the proposed building is two story, this is inconsistent with any adjoining properties (all single level). If built to plan this house would overlook the adjoining properties on three (3) boundaries, including ours. It will hugely reduce our private open space, as not only will the deck provide the tenants a full elevated view of our property, all vegetation will have been removed so that we will not even have a green barrier between us. For these reasons we consider that a two-storey building would cause unreasonable loss of amenity to our property.
- The footprint for the proposed dwelling appears to be within the setback rules, however overall, the plan is showing it to be outside the building envelope and unreasonably encroaches on our property. Specifically, part of the top of the proposed dwelling is outside of the prescribed building envelope. **10.4.2 A3** states:

*A dwelling, excluding outbuildings with a building height of not more than 2.4m and protrusions that extend not more than 0.9m horizontally beyond the building envelope, must:*

*(a) be contained within a building envelope (refer to Figures 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3) determined by:*

- (i) a distance equal to the frontage setback or, for an internal lot, a distance of 4.5m from the rear boundary of a property with an adjoining frontage; and*
- (ii) projecting a line at an angle of 45 degrees from the horizontal at a height of 3m above existing ground level at the side and rear boundaries to a building height of not more than 8.5m above existing ground level; and*

*(b) only have a setback of less than 1.5m from a side or rear boundary if the dwelling:*

- (i) does not extend beyond an existing building built on or within 0.2m of the boundary of the adjoining property; or*
- (ii) does not exceed a total length of 9m or one third the length of the side boundary (whichever is the lesser).*

## OVERLOOKING/LOSS OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE

We **object** to the planned kitchen window being unscreened.

We **object** to the planned second-storey deck that overshadows our property creating a loss of amenity for us.

**Kitchen Window:** Please refer to the **First floor Window Plan**. The plan states it is a fixed window and set back from the rear boundary less than 4 metres. We **object** to the plan and request that the kitchen window be moved or changed per 10.4.6 A2 (iii) to meet the requirements of **Privacy for all dwellings**.

### **10.4.6 A2 states:**

*A window or glazed door to a habitable room of a dwelling, that has a floor level more than 1m above existing ground level, must satisfy (a), unless it satisfies (b):*

*(a) the window or glazed door:*

*(ii) is to have a setback of not less than 4m from a rear boundary;*

*(b) the window or glazed door:*

*(ii) is to have a sill height of not less than 1.7m above the floor level or have fixed obscure glazing extending to a height of not less than 1.7m above the floor level; or*

*(iii) is to have a permanently fixed external screen for the full length of the window or glazed door, to a height of not less than 1.7m above floor level, with a uniform transparency of not more than 25%.*

### **10.4.6 P2 states:**

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

*(b) the private open space of another dwelling.*

**Deck:** Please refer to the plan for a **second-level deck**.

- The plan drawings indicate only a balustrade around the deck overlooking our back yard. This will result in the loss of our private open space. It can be assumed that due to the lack of open space in the yard of Unit 2, the deck will be used as their private open space, meaning there is a high potential that the tenants will spend considerable time on the deck.
- We consider the planned balustrade lacks the appropriate screening on the eastern side of the deck. The deck will create a 'birds eye view' of our entire back yard. We request that a 1.7 metre semi-solid screen (that would still allow easterly light to penetrate the deck) is built on the eastern side to maintain our privacy. An appropriate screen will minimise the overlooking onto our private open space (e.g., use timber slats, other screening). The requirements per **10.4.6 P1 - Privacy for all dwellings states:**

*A balcony, deck, roof terrace, parking space or carport for a dwelling (whether freestanding or part of the dwelling) that has a finished surface or floor level more than 1m above existing ground level, must be screened, or otherwise designed, to minimise overlooking of:*

*(a) a dwelling on an adjoining property or its private open space*

## **LOSS OF VEGETATION**

We **object** to the removal of the Norfolk Pine tree in the front yard of 7 Weedon Avenue.

We **object** to the removal of the Magnolia tree in the rear yard of 7 Weedon Avenue.

- According to the landscape plan, it appears that all existing vegetation behind the existing dwelling at 7 Weedon Avenue is planned to be demolished. This includes three (3) well established Birch Trees and an old, very large Magnolia tree, plus many shrubs and lawn. We seek to have this development leave the Magnolia tree, even if it requires pruning to assist with the construction process.
- The Norfolk Pine tree in the front yard of the existing house is in alignment to the proposed new garage and driveway. It is assumed that this also will be demolished. This is the ONLY large original tree left in Weedon Avenue as a result of the many subdivisions. We seek to have the plans changed to construct a driveway that will not require the removal of the tree.
- New garden/re-vegetation plans are checked by the Council at the time the development completed, however we are advised by Council that this is never checked at a later date and even if trees/vegetation are planted, they could easily be neglected and die (particularly in the instance where the new property is being rented). Alternatively, if the tree/vegetation is cared for, it would take many years of growth to re-establish the loss of vegetation in the neighbourhood. The continual overdevelopment of Weedon Avenue has resulted in an extensive loss of vegetation, in particular, large/old and perfectly healthy trees. The neighbourhood character is being eroded due to these significant impacts on the landscape (including loss of animal habitat and loss of environmental quality).

## **EXISTING AND DESIRED CHARACTER**

We **object** to the eroding and denigration of existing and desired neighbourhood character of Weedon Avenue and Gascoyne Street.

- 10.1.1.4 of *The Interim Planning Scheme* states The Zone Purpose Statement as:  
*“To encourage residential development that **respects the existing and desired neighbourhood character.**”*



- The proposed development at 7 Weedon Avenue does not respect and reflect the existing neighbourhood character, particularly if surrounding streets are taken into account, such as Gascoyne Street, where subdivision is not on the scale of Weedon Avenue.
- We acknowledged and understand that, under the *Interim Planning Scheme*, a general residential block can be divided into areas of 325 square metres, however the dwellings being built on those spaces are being maximised to the outer limits of setback. Increasingly, the new dwellings are low quality, unattractive architecturally, and completely out of tune with the existing neighbourhood character. Recently, the outlook from the rear of our house is now directly facing a new development at 8 Weedon Avenue (an example of complete disregard and respect for the existing neighbourhood character, with three new unattractive dwellings now crammed into a single block – a total of 4 dwellings on one block).
- Each time a block in Weedon Avenue is subdivided this creates a loss of amenity. The significant increase in population in one small street will continue to impact the neighbourhood in many ways. This includes the loss of old trees and vegetation, loss of private open space/liveability and permanent increase in noise and traffic – not to mention the constant disruption to liveability in the area whilst construction is being undertaken.

## **IMPACT**

This DA and future development applications of this nature:

- Sets undesirable precedence for future planning and development in this area
- Continues to disrespect the existing and desired neighbourhood character
- Will significantly reduce the liveability for residents in this area
- Causes loss of ‘confidence of purchase’ for buyers
- Ignores the expectation of amenity and historical amenity, created by previous planning, and
- Potentially causes loss of our property value.

We hope that you will consider our concerns in your decision.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Weston & Michael Eddleston

[REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]

**From:** "Taylor Family" [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sun, 27 Jun 2021 19:31:50 +1000  
**To:** "Contact Us" <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Submission DA0212/2021 for 7 Weedon Avenue.  
**Attachments:** Written Submission 7 Weedon Avenue.docx

To Chief Executive Officer,

Attached is our representation regarding the planning permit DA0212/2021 for 7 Weedon Avenue.

We may be contacted by phone on [REDACTED] or to this email address.

The Chief Executive Officer  
Launceston City Council

DA0212/2021 – 7 Weedon Avenue

We are writing to you in response to the Notice of Application for a Planning Permit for the subdivision of 7 Weedon Avenue, South Launceston, and the construction of an additional dwelling.

We would like to comment on the above application based on the impact on the neighbourhood and our house at [REDACTED]

**Increased density housing should have regard for integrity of existing dwellings in long established neighbourhoods.**

The number of dwellings in our immediate areas feels like they have more than doubled the population in the past 20 years. It's not the same area we settled in nearly 40 years ago and we wouldn't expect it to be. However, our house was never intended to sit closely alongside builds in the 2020's. We need the distance provided by standard blocks of the 1950's to maintain privacy and to reduce the intrusive sound that is inevitable as people go about their daily living.

Situated at the lower end of the bowl in landscape terms, our house captures sound from upper and surrounding housing tiers (of which there are increasingly more and more). We are impacted by noise emitted from these properties as the "vacant areas" continue to be filled in.

**There is therefore a direct impact on our amenity – the manner in which we enjoy sitting reading or conversing in our sunroom or lunching outdoors in our garden spaces. We will feel less inclined to potter in our garden or just sit quietly, with people on the proposed deck looking directly over us.**

**Also, proximity of builds and removal of trees and tall shrubs – impacts on bird life.** We can expect no more visits from goshawks etc. All this nature we have lost – no more possums. In fact, none of the natural treasures that used to give soul to suburban backyards.

**There is a tipping point between land utilisation and overcrowding and in Weedon Avenue, we feel it was reached a while ago.**

Additionally, we are concerned that these developments result in increased traffic movement and congestion, potentially reducing the value of our property.

I would like to think that you might read our words and see that they are real concerns from long term residents who appear to be invisible to local government.

Nevertheless, thank you for the opportunity to present our view.

Julie-Ann and Gregory Taylor

email: 

27<sup>th</sup> June, 2021

**From:** "Joshua Coates" [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sun, 27 Jun 2021 11:33:47 +1000  
**To:** "Contact Us" <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>  
**Cc:** "Zaf Rahman" [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Representation - DA0212-2021 - 7 Weedon Avenue - Construction of additional dwelling  
**Attachments:** DA0212-2021 - Representation - 2\_9 WeedonAv.pdf

Hi,  
Please see my representation for the proposed development at 7 Weedon Avenue South Launceston. I do not believe sufficient information has been provided to ensure the proposed development does not adversely and unfairly impact the surrounding property.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Joshua Coates  
[REDACTED]

27 June 2021

General Manager  
City of Launceston  
PO Box 396  
LAUNCESTON TAS 7250

**Re: DA0212/2021 – Representation for proposed additional dwelling 7 Weedon Avenue South Launceston**

I am responding to the recently advertised Development Application (DA0212/2021) for a proposed residential dwelling at 7 Weedon Avenue, South Launceston.

Upon review of the advertised plans, I have identified several items that may adversely affect my property and adjacent neighbouring properties that do not appear to have been considered by the proponent.

The elevation of the new proposed dwelling is much higher than much of the surrounding development. I note that the proposed plans show the building to be at the limit of the building envelope. I doubt the design has considered impact on surrounding property but rather maximised the development footprint.

Drawing number PD21024-02-03 – eastern elevation shows the building outside of the building envelope. This appears to be a mistake. I am concerned that attention has not been applied to the proposed vertical limits of the proposed dwelling. If the dwelling is on the limit of the building envelope, there should be no mistakes within the drawings set. This would have been one of the major design constraints for a building of this size proposed on a relatively small block.

On the same drawing, the guttering of the northern elevation is outside of the building envelope.

No shadow diagrams have been provided in the submissions. For a building at the limit of the building envelope I would expect this information to be presented. I am concerned that the building could impact sun light in on my east facing window, the primary source of natural light to my house.

I believe further information is required to demonstrate that the building will not adversely affect neighbouring property. I do not support to approval of this development based upon the information presented.

Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss further.

Yours sincerely



Joshua Coates

