

[REDACTED]

From: Glenda King [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 13 April 2021 3:11 PM
To: Contact Us
Subject: DA0102/2021 26 WELMAN STREET, LAUNCESTON

Dear Mr Stretton,

I wish to make the following comments regarding the proposed redevelopment of 26 Welman Street.

My points are as follows:

1. The proposed plans outline a structure which will cover almost the entire block. This means that neither the front nor rear setbacks as required under the Planning Scheme will be met.
2. Following on from the above, the building of such a structure will mean the virtual total removal of existing vegetation currently on site. This once again is yet another development stripping an inner city residence of green cover.
3. Further to point 2, the new development does not seem to indicate any future green plantings on the site resulting in a net loss of green cover for this city.

Regards,

Glenda King

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: Megan QB [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 13 April 2021 2:57 PM
To: Contact Us
Subject: Response to DA0101/2021
Attachments: Planning_Application_26_Welman_Street_2021-04-13_v1.pdf

Dear Mr Payton,

Please find attached a response to the consultation DA0101/2021.

With kind regards,

Megan

Megan QB
[REDACTED]

Mr Duncan Payton, Town Planner
City of Launceston
duncan.payton@launceston.tas.gov.au

Tuesday, 13 April 2021

Re: DA0101/2021 26 Welman Street, East Launceston, 7250

Dear Mr Payton,

Thank you for bringing to our attention the proposed plans at 26 Welman Street. Our property is [REDACTED] the proposed development and in studying the plans there seems to be relatively little impact on us from a planning perspective, and we would not wish to impede a neighbour's development of their property where it complies with planning regulations.

However we wish to bring to the attention of the Council some general compliance/amenity issues with the proposals (in relation to *Inner Residential Zone* of the *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*).

The City of Launceston primary frontage and rear setbacks for *Inner Residential Zone* (11.4.1), are significantly intruded by the upper storey of the proposed property. The Northeast corner of the primary frontage has a 2.7m setback and the Southeast corner has 0m setback (rather than 4.5m), which seems to fail to meet the spirit and intent of "11.1 Zone Purpose", specifically "11.1.1.5 To provide for development that provides a high standard of amenity and contributes to the streetscape" and the general principles of Development Standards 11.4.1 to 11.4.6, for example, 11.4.1 P1(b) "be compatible with the relationship of existing buildings to the road in terms of setback or in response to slope or other physical constraints of the site"; and 11.4.4 P1(a) "do not dominate the façade of the dwelling or dominate the streetscape". The rear setback of the upper storey is 1.2m which is again smaller than the guidelines recommend.

A 'site coverage of no more than 50% excluding building eaves' (11.4.1) is recommended. The plans outline how the lower storey is within the existing building outline. The upper storey is extended sideways and lengthways to cover more than the 50% recommended. The location of the building side setbacks of the upper storey from the boundary are 0.37-1m (Northwest) and 0-1m (Southeast) (11.4.3). And 11.4.5 states: *Balconies, decks, roof gardens, parking spaces and carports (whether freestanding or part of the dwelling) that have a finished surface or floor level greater than 1m above natural ground level must have a side setback of no less than 3m and a rear setback of no less than 4m.*

The roof line is square (unpitched) and may impact on the overall building envelope and shading of windows in the adjacent residence to the southeast of the proposed development. The plans show the maximum height of the second storey is '56.180' (p7) relative to the datum level. The floor of the second storey starts at 3m above the groundline (p7) and the height of the second floor starts at 52.080. This would appear to exceed the building envelope.

The plans do not reflect the overall topography of the area between 26 Welman Street and the properties on Elizabeth Street which are significantly lower (3+m lower than the groundline). The full-height windows of the Lounge on the upper storey (where there is no suggestion of using frosting or glass higher than 1.7m) will potentially be 'overlooking' the rear of the properties in Elizabeth Street (11.4.5). For example the rear garden of #7 Elizabeth Street is 1m across and ~6m vertically down from the West corner of the proposed swimming pool. The location of any external air-conditioning or pool heating units has not been indicated (there may not be any) but noise could be an issue.

I would be happy to discuss any aspect of this response if that would be helpful.

With kindest regards,

[REDACTED]

Megan Quentin-Baxter

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: David Anderson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 8 April 2021 4:11 PM
To: Contact Us
Subject: Re: DA0101/2021 - 26 Welman Street

8th April 2021
Re: DA0101/2021 - 26 Welman Street, Launceston, 7250

I am the owner of [REDACTED] which adjoins the northern boundary of 26 Welman Street, and would like to raise a concern with the proposed development.

From my reading of the Development Application, it does not meet planning guidelines related to setbacks from the street and surrounding properties, or site coverage regulations of the current Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015.

- The site coverage regulation at 10.4.3 of the Scheme calls for not be more than 50% site coverage. The planned development appears to have a significantly greater coverage than 50% with the building envelope covering most of the land
- The building setback proposed for the side boundaries is significantly less than the current building, and far less than is required in the Planning Scheme
- The proposed building setback from the street frontage appears to be at maximum 2.7m which is significantly less than the required 4.5m
- Garage setback is again not compliant

For my property at [REDACTED] it will reduce privacy and will overlook the rear of my property due to the non-compliance with side setbacks.

I strongly oppose the development, due to the non-compliance with the current building regulations, affects on privacy and overlooking of my property, and lack of consistency with surrounding buildings and the current streetscape.

Please keep me informed of progress for the application.

Sincerely
David

David Anderson
[REDACTED]