

George Walker

From: PlanningAlerts <contact@planningalerts.org.au> on behalf of Monica Jane de Wit
Sent: Friday, 11 September 2015 9:45 AM
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0352/2015

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

Application DA0352/2015
Address 19 Bain Terrace Trevallyn TAS 7250
Description Residential - single and multiple dwellings; construction and use single dwelling and of three multiple dwellings and associated earthworks; subdivision one lot into two lots; construction of new access off Wattle Way and upgrading of existing access off Bain Terrace
Name of commenter Monica Jane de Wit
Address of commenter
Email of commenter

Comment

The Manager, My concern with the new development at 19 Bain Terrace, Trevallyn is the number of dwellings on the block, it seems over crowded and that one or more of the decks may look over and into our yard, but my first and main concern is the ultra modern architectural design of all 4 dwellings, i feel that it is not sympathetic to the surrounding character homes that have been restored and those homes that are yet to be restored, they all add to keeping the aesthetic appeal of Bain Terrace. I don't oppose future development of the block at 19 Bain Terrace, but feel something architecturally subtle and complementary to the surrounding homes would be more favourable. Kind Regards

Monica de Wit

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



George Walker

From: Marcus Towle
Sent: Sunday, 20 September 2015 1:41 PM
To: records
Subject: Re Development Proposal for 19 Bain Terrace, Trevallyn

To the General Manager,

Thank you for the opportunity to view the proposed development plans for 19 Bain Terrace and to provide feedback on them. As a property owner in Wattle Way I feel that development of the proposed site would be of benefit to the area and would enhance what is currently an undeveloped block. Having reviewed the proposal I think that the design and features of the proposed development have been done very well, giving consideration to how best to locate and develop the residences on the block with reference to their design, access points and overall design scheme.

On the consideration side I would like to put forward the following 2 points:

Privacy Issue - Wattle Way side

I have noticed that there appears to be balconies on the Wattle Way side (viewed via Section Through Wattle Way Boundary 1:200). While not affecting my property so much I would be concerned by the potential privacy issue for Wattle Way residences in general with no privacy measures/ screens installed. The balconies on the front would certainly provide an extensive city view without the need for them to be openly wrapped around onto the Wattle Way side (without at least some privacy screening).

Impediments/Disruption to Wattle Way during construction stage

During contraction stage I appreciate that there will be an amount of disruption (noise and traffic) to Wattle Way and surrounding residents - all of which occurs naturally in this process. What I would like to request is that there is consideration given to how to minimise these things - especially on the traffic side relating to the potential blocking of access to Wattle Way. If construction trucks/ tradespeople vehicles are parked in the street it is foreseeable that Wattle Way (due to its narrowness) will become impassable for residents to be able to enter and leave their properties. I don't know if sections of the current railing are going to be removed to provide site access or spaces to park vehicles off the road but it would be good to know consideration has been given to this.

In summary, I am certainly in support of the proposed development and commend all those involved to date for the good design and consideration that has been given. And would appreciate my concerns on my points listed above being noted for further consideration in follow-up council discussions.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment and if you need to contact me please feel free to email me on this email address.

Regards

Marcus

George Walker

From: Michael Croll
Sent: Monday, 21 September 2015 2:25 PM
To: records
Subject: Representation to development DA0352/2015. Address 19 Bain Terrace Trevallyn.

To the general manager.

Dear Sir.

We would like to note that we are supportive of this development and that this representation does not constitute an objection. Having said that we would like one issue to be considered and incorporated into any permit issued.

OBSTRUCTION OF WATTLE WAY

During the demolition of the old house on this site there were difficulties with the obstruction of Wattle Way by heavy vehicles. It was apparent that the vehicles were using Wattle Way rather than the site itself, due to the awkward gradient of the terrain. This resulted in our inability to move in and out of our drive way and at times drive down the lane; at times the lane was blocked for some time. We are concerned that this will occur again if appropriate forethought is not given for future construction practices.

This situation could be readily addressed through the early establishment of the new access to Wattle Way with an onsite platform that will enable construction vehicles such as concrete trucks, builders trucks etc to access the site without obstructing Wattle Way.

Wattle Way is a very narrow one way lane and is restricted for movement under normal circumstances let alone with construction traffic. Local residence and their visitors never park on the lane way as we appreciate firsthand how restrictive the lane actually is.

For reasons stated above we request that a condition be placed on the permit to require vehicles associated with the construction of this development to service the site from within the boundaries unless the road authorities issue a specific road closure permit for exceptional circumstances. We would ask the road authority in providing permission for new access to also keep the lane way clear of obstructions unless a specific permit is obtained to do so.

Yours faithfully.

Michael Croll and Jo Oliver.

George Walker

From: Fiona Cramp
Sent: Monday, 21 September 2015 9:12 PM
To: Council
Cc:
Subject: 19 Bain Terrace, Trevallyn

General Manager
Launceston City Council

Dear Sir,

As concerned Trevallyn residents we are writing to appeal against the proposed residential planning at number 19 Bain Terrace. Our appeal is based on several factors:

1. The style of buildings are unsympathetic to the historic street scape which is unique to this part of Trevallyn.
2. The fourth residence (being the largest of the four proposed dwellings which will be situated at the top of the block) is too close to its neighbour, number 10 Wattle Way. The height of this triple storeyed residence would also cause significant loss of sunlight to number 10 Wattle Way as well as loss of privacy.
3. The access from Bain Terrace for the three proposed unit dwellings, and subsequent increased traffic flow, would cause significant noise pollution for the surrounding residents in Bain Terrace and Delamere Crescent respectively.
4. Each of the proposed double storeyed unit dwellings would significantly reduce the privacy of the surrounding backyards in Delamere Crescent and Bain Terrace.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus and Fiona Cramp

22 September, 2015

The General Manager
Launceston City Council
PO Box 396
Launceston, TAS, 7250

Re: DA0352 - 19 Bain Terrace Trevallyn - Objection

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed development at 19 Bain Terrace, Trevallyn.

In the first instance the former residence should never have been allowed to be demolished. It was a stately home with a long and significant family history in the area. Notwithstanding, the damage has been done in this regard and we should strive to minimise any further damage on the site and to the surrounding community area.

At the time of the original demolition notice in 2012 we, and other residents, approached the proponent, Mr Scott Anthony, on site to see what his intentions were. We were told emphatically that he would only rebuild a single family dwelling on the block. He acknowledged this would be the only option residents would support, as without such an assurance, the likelihood of a multi-dwelling outcome would thwart the demolition. The single-dwelling proposal was reinforced by the Launceston City Council representatives when we enquired, and I was placated with these assurances and did not lodge an objection to the demolition on those grounds.

I object to the fact that we were deliberately deceived by the proponent to enable the demolition of the former dwelling. Then, with stage one complete (the block irreversibly cleared) and some time passed, the proponent believes he can change tact and submit a proposal for 4 dwellings on the site. This approach is not only insincere and deceitful, but makes a mockery of the consultation process.

I am not against development, but believe it should be sympathetic to the history of the area and sensitive to neighbouring residents. The site at 19 Bain Terrace has been a single title, with a single family dwelling for well over 100 years, up to and including, I should add, the time the proponent willingly acquired title. Other residents purchased surrounding property on the basis of a single dwelling with a sense of space and proportion, for which Trevallyn is known. Their property values would no doubt be adversely affected by altering this position, and associated views and aspects. The former residence was single story, set down in the block. The proposal included a two-story construction set high in the block which will fundamentally dominate the site and surrounding area.

A brief glance down Wattle Way or along Bain Terrace would reveal all surrounding properties are of weatherboard or brick construction. The proposed constructions are contrary to the pattern of development in the area, and I believe will surely jar with its immediate surroundings. They are

typical examples of modern architecture (with multiple materials, angles and shapes), en masse, imposing itself in a predominately single format Federation landscape.

I believe the proposed construction will also give a sense of overcrowding. Just because a block size is large does not mean it should be allowed to be carved up and jammed full of buildings. We should be mindful not to openly perpetuate this subdivision mentality as an absolute right, or the ¼ acre block (and above) culture in Launceston will be lost. I believe it is one thing to set standards for minimum parcel size on new land releases, but yet another thing to apply those minimum standards to a generously proportioned, existing allotment, that radically changes the landscape upon which people have made other significant financial decisions.

Allowing this development to proceed will set an inappropriate precedent for development in the area. Trevallyn has, after all, a significant number of large block sizes. It needs to be kept in mind that large block sizes equates to large areas of green vegetation when viewed from Launceston City. A number of trees have already been pushed over and removed from the site. The proponent plans to plant more vegetation after the 4 buildings are constructed as a way of appeasing Council and residents, but the green footprint can only be a fraction of the former footprint (or that achievable should a single dwelling be rebuilt), because a substantial proportion of the land size is taken up in dwellings and paving.

I am surprised the plans do not fall foul of scenic protection plans and pragmatic considerations of over intensification of the use of land. The proponents 'Further Information' under scenic protection recognises the former (single dwelling) "property undoubtedly provided a considerable presence upon the Trevallyn hillside from both local and distant viewpoints" and "we acknowledge that the subject site should be treated with a degree of reverence". Treating the subject site with reverence would have involved renovating the former residence to preserve the existing grandeur and aspect (rather than taking a bulldozer to it), and if the former residence undoubtedly had a considerable presence, no amount of buzz words about sympathetic form, scale and colour, landscaping and tree selection, can overcome an estimated tripling of overall building size. In my opinion the proposed development will be an aesthetic eyesore. The proponents Context Plan of how the site nestles into the surrounding area clearly shows large tracts of land and trees on the other side of Wattle Way between Delamere and Bain, and that sense of space was previously provided at 19 Bain Terrace.

It is also interesting to compare the treatment in this case against the property in North Bank that probably should have been demolished but was knocked back by Council. It was sold in near uninhabitable condition and is in the process of being renovated to its former condition.

The convergence of North Bank / South Bank / Wattle Way / Bain Terrace intersections attracts a lot of traffic flow as it is, and there have been numerous near miss accidents over the last 12 months, and a few outright collisions at what evidence suggests can be a confusing juncture. Given the number of school children walking through the area, crossing roads and down into the park to access bus stops, combined with the number of parents dropping off children to the Abacus Day Care Centre along Bain Terrace, I believe inserting 3 additional residences, each with multiple car spaces, will work against public safety .

If 4 dwellings was not the original intended plans for the property in order to sway Council to grant the demolition request, it should not be possible to move the goal posts now. If a 4 dwelling proposal was part of the original application this information should have been made clearly available so residents could make an informed decision about the demolition. If the demolition did not proceed, it would not be possible for the proponent to achieve the same level of density he now plans.

If I had more time to formulate this objection I may have been able to more specifically address the issues from a development code perspective. This objection may be similar in that respect to the well meaning but inept representation of Darryl Kerrigan in the timeless classic "The Castle". Unable to specifically articulate a legal argument (that was later developed by a learned QC) he did at least hit upon the "vibe" of the situation being all wrong, and this is surely the case here.

We trust commonsense will prevail in this case and the land continues to be used for the next 100 years or more as a single residence respecting the surrounding architecture, sense of space and visual aesthetics Trevallyn is renown for.

Yours faithfully,

DL Styles & LA Thomas

Development Application Representation Letter

18-Fmx-018 - Version 21/11/2012

Development Application Number

DA0352/2015

Address of Development

19 Bain Terrace Trevallyn

Details of Representor

Title

MRS

Given Name/s

JOANNE

Surname

BESWICK

Unit/Street No

Street

Suburb

Phone

H

B


M

Email

Reason for Representing

Please refer to attach notes - objection to the build.

Representor's Signature



Date

22/9/15

LAUNCESTON
CITY COUNCIL



Town Hall St John Street Launceston Tasmania
PO Box 396 Launceston Tasmania 7250

T 03 6323 3000 F 03 6323 3001 TTY 03 6323 3003
E council@launceston.tas.gov.au www.launceston.tas.gov.au

PLEASE NOTE: If a report on a Planning Application matter goes to Council, the full content of the submission will be included in the report and will be available for public access. It is therefore the responsibility of the author of the submission to make sure that what is written is factual, is fair and reasonable, and is not defamatory against any person.

Personal Information Protection Statement
As required under the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004*

1.	Personal information will be collected from you for the purpose of dealing with your application, and may be used for other purposes permitted by the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> and regulations made by or under that Act.
2.	Failure to provide this information may result in your application not being able to be accepted and processed.
3.	Your personal information will be used for the primary purpose for which it is collected and may be disclosed to contractors and agents of the Launceston City Council.
4.	Your basic personal information may be disclosed to other public sector bodies where necessary for the efficient storage and use of the information.
5.	Personal information will be managed in accordance with the <i>Personal Information Protection Act 2004</i> and may be accessed by the individual to whom it relates on request to Launceston City Council. You may be charged a fee for this service.

File No. DA0352/2015				
EO		OD	✓	Box
				✓
Doc. No.				
Action Officer			Date Received	
C W RANKMORE			22/09/2015	
E COPY TO; G WALKER				

Objections in relation to application - DA0352/2015

(Corner of Wattle Way and Bain Terrace)

Joanne Beswick - 9 Trevallyn Road

1. Objection to a fully modern build with no ability to integrate into the heritage of its surrounds.

The location of the proposed build is in an area of Trevallyn which is highly valued for its preserved heritage buildings and gardens. Like the city itself, the 'old' part of Trevallyn, where the build is proposed, is now recognised as being of great value to the community for its uniqueness and beauty. This beauty is composed of two main factors, the style of the current buildings (heritage) and the abundance of greenery.

The proposed build is completely modern and at complete odds with the heritage style of this part of Trevallyn. Buildings are exposed and are of high impact to the area. No other build in the area is of such a scale and has the ability to be so dominant on its surrounds. Buildings are exposed and will have the ability to change the skyline dramatically. The proposed build is to such a large scale that is unmatched by any other build in Trevallyn and in particular to this area. It is in this area of Trevallyn where the style of buildings is what the community values and the home owners work to preserve.

Local home owners take a lot of time and spend a lot of money to maintain heritage homes and English style gardens, but this is what we as owners, the local community and tourists enjoy and value. It is this same reason why Launceston itself is highly valued and its efforts to preserve the heritage aspects are what make up a large part of its identity. The proposed build does not enhance or preserve the identity of this key area. As home owners we work towards maintaining the architectural legacy and beauty of this area, this bold modern build with minimalist gardens does nothing to preserve the heritage legacy of its surrounds.

2. Objection to a lack of intent and future ability of owners to integrate the build into the local environment through greenery.

Trevallyn has an abundance of large trees and English style gardens. This level of greenery is valued by the community and the Council who strongly advocates for maintaining the greenery through scenic protection. The

council regulates removal of trees to ensure the 'green' element of the environment and its surrounds are not degraded. The council requires buildings to not be made visible if greenery is to be removed. The proposed greenery of this build is not adequate or in keeping with the greenery of the local environment.

The proposed vegetation surrounding the build is modernistic and at complete odds with the vegetation of the local environment and the heritage values. The proposed vegetation is minimalistic and is native in its form.

Local homes are generally screened with trees and shrubs and most homes are not visible in their entirety. This modernistic build is highly visible and is not screened appropriately to allow for partial seclusion of the build and to promote blending in with its environment.

The aim of the landscaping is to screen our neighbours and unsightly fences whilst maintaining views. The document and the build itself is all about the build and what is in its best interests of the build. The local community and the much valued heritage values of the area are not considered on any level. The proposed vegetation is to break up the build site for the sole benefit of the occupants and not to assist with integration within the immediate environment. A minimalistic native garden with synthetic lawn is not in keeping with the local heritage inspired environment.

The greenery of the local area in part defines this area and is central to preserving its character and heritage.

3. Changes to the skyline and the ability to change the character and authenticity of the heritage area.

The proposed build is dramatic and imposing and modernistic. This build being at complete odds with the local environment will change the much valued heritage skyline. The local community and tourists enjoy the view of Trevallyn because of the uniqueness of the preserved heritage. Trevallyn is not admired for modernistic builds with low impact native vegetation. The build is also on a route used frequently by tourists and the community who enjoy touring the local area and adjacent parklands.

Like the vision for Launceston, it is important that the heritage and character of Trevallyn be recognised, retained and be respected, and where possible enhanced through future developments.

As quoted on the Launceston City Council's site,

"The attractiveness and special character of Launceston comes from both its heritage values but also from the authenticity and unspoilt nature of the streets and suburbs. Housing styles and density, consistent architectural features, landscaping, fences, street trees and lot layout all assist in creating a special character. Newstead, Trevallyn and South Launceston, and many other areas, have discrete areas where there is a unique character valued by the community".

The number and style of the build does not meet what is already recognised and valued by the community. Multiple large visually intrusive builds in one area creating a level of density not suited to this unique area. This build is unfortunately in a 'discrete area' of Trevallyn that is unique and valued for homes very much unlike this proposed build. This build does not manage and enhance the heritage characteristics into the future, but erodes and is insensitive to it.

It is also of concern that adjoining properties are impacted upon, in particular the heritage home to be build in front of, removing views and sunlight. Adjoining properties should not be disadvantaged by large scale builds or be devalued as a result of their desire to maximise their own needs.

4. Consideration of planning objectives

By examining the proposed build, it does not appear that 'consideration for planning' has been utilised or adhered to.

The council states:

"Where proposed developments or other changes are of a sufficient scale to alter the character of an area, a specific area plan or precinct plan, allowing holistic consideration of all planning objectives for the area may be appropriate. Specific area plans can be developed by Council in conjunction with the community, and can lessen the need for extensive pre-lodgement discussions, and reduce assessment timelines and uncertainty about the likelihood of approval. Such an approach also provides assurances to the community that the characteristics they value will be properly considered.

The planning scheme seeks to:

- (a)** identify areas of special character and implement controls to prevent inappropriate development that may detract from or significantly alter characteristics valued by the community;
- (b)** ensure that the local identity is not eroded by incremental development that is insensitive to recognised local or traditional development patterns;
- (c)** ensure that demolition of significant built heritage, loss of significant views and buildings that are out of scale or visually intrusive, do not harm local character; and
- (d)** encourage the active re-use of heritage buildings and provide flexibility to consider proposals on their merits'.

In reference to (b), it is important that Trevallyn's heritage is not eroded and this proposed development is then used as evidence and justification for future developments. If such a grand scale and modernistic build which is out of scale and visually intrusive to its surrounds, is allowed in a 'discrete' area valued for its heritage characteristics, it then paves the way for similar constructions which are insensitive to the existing traditional development patterns.

From: PlanningAlerts <contact@planningalerts.org.au> on behalf of Renata DeMichiel
Sent: Tuesday, 22 September 2015 4:55 PM
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0352/2015

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

Application DA0352/2015
Address 19 Bain Terrace Trevallyn TAS 7250
Description Residential - single and multiple dwellings; construction and use single dwelling and of three multiple dwellings and associated earthworks; subdivision one lot into two lots; construction of new access off Wattle Way and upgrading of existing access off Bain Terrace
Name of commenter Renata DeMichiel
Address of commenter
Email of commenter

Comment

Renata De Michiel - 23 Bain Terrace

Objection in relation to - DA0352/2015

1. Objection to a modern build that Is not in keeping with the heritage of it's surrounds.

The location of the proposed build is in the historic, picturesque and unique setting, of the older part of Trevallyn. It will significantly change the ambience of one of the original streets of Trevallyn, Bain Terrace.

The original house which was demolished was a great loss to the suburb, city and history of Tasmania as a whole.

The city council has a responsibility to the residents both past and current to preserve the integrity of it's history for future generations.

In my opinion as the original dwelling was demolished - I propose the developer re-design a build in keeping with the heritage of the area.

Consideration to be given to the heritage build to the rear of the proposed build and the one to the side.

Sunlight and views will be restricted to these existing dwellings if the build proceeds.

Sunlight being a human right to preserve.

Vegetation must also be considered as an important aspect of the nature and natural setting of Trevallyn. Planting trees and plants in keeping with older style 'English gardens'.

I do not object to a build. Although - I ask for the developer to have empathy and re-consider the design A heritage style facade/ with modern interior. A design that will not cause disturbance to the character of Bain Terrace.

Many thoughtful architects would have the vision for this type of design to blend with the existing.

To allow this build to proceed - will set a precedence for future modern style builds that are out of character and will change our city.

Launceston is one of the few cities which has much of it's Victorian history preserved, this is a legacy to past council members, and residents passionate about Launceston.

Thank you for receiving my requests

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



I wish to object to the development application for 19 Bain Terrace Trevally. I object on the basis of the following:

1: *The application states "A portion of the proposed building falls within the 4m setback zone".*

This is not acceptable.

2: *The application also states "In order to reduce perceived building bulk, minimise visual impact and avoid loss of amenity to adjoining properties (and the broader precinct)" the house is to be imbedded within the site.*

One can hardly state that there may be a perception that the house is Bulky, will cause negative visual impact and cause loss of amenity to adjoining properties. These consequences are hardly subjective, the development is gigantic!

3: *"The former residence that adorned the subject property undoubtedly provided a considerable presence upon the Trevallyn hillside from both local and distance viewpoints. The designers of the proposed development for this site are cognisant of the expectations for replacement of the site's (and precincts) grandeur."*

I don't think this means we should replace a character home, whose grandeur was partly due to the fact that it sat within spacious gardens (since completely destroyed), with four bulky buildings. They hardly convey a sense of grandeur, they convey a sense of "how much can I cram into one space in order to return a profit?" this also argues against the following point (4) in the submission....

4: *"We also acknowledge that the subject site should be treated with a degree of reverence and that any future proposal (in this case a family home and allied development with similar attributes and stature) has the potential to equally address those inherent qualities of the place that have been removed".*

This development is in no way reflective of the former grand home. This is a modern home which in no way reflects any of the attributes of the former property. The architecture is

completely different, materials different, proportions completely different. I can in no way see how this argument by the applicant is remotely accurate.

"The subdivided lots will maintain property sizes commensurate with adjoining land holdings and development patterns." One look at the house next door on Bain Terrace and the house behind it on Wattle Way will clearly show this statement to be incorrect.

George Walker

From: Tonya Jacobson
Sent: Tuesday, 22 September 2015 8:37 PM
To: Council
Subject: Objection in relation to - DA0352/2015

I wish to voice my concerns over the proposed development of 19 Bain Terrace, this very modern build is not in keeping with the majority of dwellings in this historic street. It seem like a large number of buildings even for a block this size. It would be preferable to see a development more in keeping with the character of this historic area. I am also concerned about disruptions to traffic flow for Wattle Way residents during the build.

Thank you
Tonya Jacobson

From: PlanningAlerts <contact@planningalerts.org.au> on behalf of Susan McClarron
Sent: Wednesday, 23 September 2015 11:57 AM
To: Council
Subject: Comment on application DA0352/2015

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

Application DA0352/2015
Address 19 Bain Terrace Trevallyn TAS 7250
Description Residential - single and multiple dwellings; construction and use single dwelling and of three multiple dwellings and associated earthworks; subdivision one lot into two lots; construction of new access off Wattle Way and upgrading of existing access off Bain Terrace
Name of commenter Susan McClarron
Address of commenter
Email of commenter

Comment

I strongly agree with Renata deMichiel in all but one point - the exterior of the new buildings should not be a heritage reproduction, but should blend aesthetically with the older surrounding buildings and should be designed by an architect with knowledge of historic Launceston buildings. Their height and dominant features should not detract from the overall appearance of the surrounds.

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

