

From: Helen Tait
Sent: 29 Jul 2016 16:57:43 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: Comment for DA 0206/2016 12 Thomas St
Importance: Normal

Attention: City Manager

I am writing to submit my disapproval and comment on the DA 0206/2016 for 12 Thomas Street currently before Council

1. 12 Thomas Street is in a notable precinct of early Launceston cottages. The cottages that remain in the area are icons of their era. In a town that prides itself on heritage presentation they are inherently fundamental to the character, visual amenity and tourism interest for Launceston.

The cottage appears to be well suitable for repair and restoration. It would be a wasted opportunity, and a heritage travesty, for 12 Thomas St to be demolished whatever was proposed to arise in its place.

2. The proposed substantial alteration to the set back interferes with the scale and the visual amenity of the residential area. Such would remove the possibility of the cottage to be restored with the cottage yard in place. (Backwalled as it is with the interest of early Launceston brick work).

3. Parking provision required for the DA would add to the already severely restricted parking for residents in the very narrow streets in the area. And any ingresses to footpaths etc required to accommodate same would interfere with the intrinsic qualities of the streetscape.

Comment (optimistic): If this residence is unappreciated by its current owners for its special qualities of scale and authenticity in historic Launceston perhaps it is the type of place that could be purchased by the City of Launceston and restored as rented residential property or perhaps as use for the purposes of 'Artists, (Writers, Arts performers etc) in Residence'.

Yours Sincerely

Helen Tait

From:
Sent: 29 Jul 2016 12:48:48 +1000
To: Contact Us
Subject: Attention General Manager Mr Dobrzynski representation re DA0206/2016

Dear Mr Dobrzynski,

I wish to submit a representation re DA0206/2016 12 Thomas St Launceston. The application seeks to demolish the existing dwelling, to construct a co joined building and use part of this as visitor accommodation.

I am the owner of (a mid 19th century cottage), which is situated in close proximity to Thomas St. With due respect to the applicants, I make the following comments and assertions.

The Launceston National Estate Conservation Study, 1977 (prepared by The Launceston City Council, to preserve our heritage buildings and precincts) , identifies this end of the city as "The South Central District". The south end of this precinct extends as far as Thomas St and includes Charles St, Balfour St ,St John St ,the top end of Frankland St, James St and Sheppy St. The study describes the area as being very much like it was at the turn of the century, residential in character, with some shops and a pub. Features include" ...small cottages and terraces tucked away in alleys and side streets." (p160). There are cast iron fences and roof top silhouettes of chimneys
The study advises against the demolition of historic buildings and puts forward a policy of restriction of over developing internal spaces in this precinct.

After a walk through the area around Thomas St, I noticed that Franklin St from Charles St to Thomas St is completely intact, with the exception of two buildings .Franklin St with its very old houses can clearly be viewed from Thomas St . Looking down Thomas St we see that the street completely retains its heritage elements ,with the exception of an inappropriately designed block of 1970 units. Directly opposite 12 Thomas St is a similar heritage cottage well maintained (. there appears to be no reason why 12 Thomas st could not be restored to this level of good order .I say this having under taken work of this nature with three 19th century properties we own in inner city Launceston) A walk into Balfour St reveals all houses intact ,no demolition and down to St John St , back up to FranklinSt , again reveals all intact with the exception of one 1930's house.

My point is that this small cottage(12 Thomas St) is part of this historic precinct. It should not be viewed in isolation to the surrounding area. The character of this area is at risk of being gradually chipped away if demolition of these cottages continues to happen. We have recently lost one in James Street and in its place have been presented with 2 units which are visually damaging and unsympathetic to the precinct.

To briefly address the key aspects of why DA0206/2016 is viewed as discretionary :

The applicants wish to use one of the units as visitor accommodation . This does not comply as the proposed development sits in a Residential Zone.

The rear set back does not comply as it is only 1.1 metres from the rear boundary. I understand it should be at least 4 metres.

I question the feasibility of the earth works which will be required in regard to the retaining walls.

I would like to conclude my representation by quoting His Worship Albert Van Zetteten

" As the third oldest settlement in Australia , Launceston is renowned for its heritage buildings and unique streetscapes. The culture of pride in the beautiful architecture and design is evident throughout the city" (A Walk in Old Launceston,2007).

Just because this simple little Victorian cottage is not heritage listed. it does not mean it is not worthy of preservation. It is part of and contributes to the whole uniqueness of inner city Launceston.

Yours faithfully ,

Nancy Ann Serisier

ATTENTION.

Mr Robert Dobrzynski
General Manager
L.C.C.
7250.

FILE No.	DAO206/2016		
EO	OD	Box	
RCVD		29 JUL 2016	LCC
Doc No.			
Action Officer	Noted	Replied	

Jean Chapman

CCOPY: G WALKER 2451m

re development application DAO206/2016 for the demolition of the cottage at 12 Thomas Street and construction of 2 units on the same small block.

I wish to place my objection to this application.

1. Wouldn't there have to be a drainage issue with the small area at the back of the building? The construction at the back of the block has its wall right on the boundary and there is only a small area, just over a metre, on the low side of the block between constructions.
2. I came to Launceston from the mainland to see all of the beautiful old buildings that Launceston and the older suburbs have to offer and fell in love with the place. 13½ years ago I migrated here permanently only to witness ~~the~~ destruction one by one of these old cottages. Tourists love the old architecture and it is a big drawcard.
3. Thomas Street is hardly a street, it is no more than a laneway and, I should imagine, wouldn't be capable of taking any more traffic^{than} that currently makes use of it.

4. It would be a shame to see yet another 1800s cottage demolished only to be replaced with a modern multiple storey construction. The way we are progressing - we won't be much different to cities on the mainland. Tourists won't be drawn here if we are no different

Yours sincerely
Jean Chapman

Jy.

DA0206/2016		
✓	Box	✓
RCV	29 JUL 2016	LCC
No.		
Action Officer	Noted	Replied
C. Wrenkmore		

Allan Miller

Mr. Robert Dobrzynski
 General Manager
 Launceston City Council
 7250

ECopy. G WALKER 2.48 pm. 26,

28 July 2016

re Development Application DA0206/2016 for Demolition of house at 12 Thomas St. and construction of 2 dwellings at same address.

I wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:

- The application fails to address the heritage values of the place. How old is the cottage? Who built it? Who commissioned it? What if this building is a very early example for Launceston? What would the impact be on the heritage character of the area if this building is demolished? I believe that Launceston has already lost too many of its early buildings. We need to think carefully about further removal of the remaining examples of buildings of this type as it, along with other buildings that remain in the area, serves as a time capsule for tourists (which ironically the developer is intending to attract) and future generations. The current application acknowledges that Thomas St. consists mostly of "small cottage weatherboard dwellings built in the 1880s". What is proposed is not consistent with the surrounding character of the area.
- The proposed building, which is 2 stories by necessity due to the size of the block, will totally dominate that whole end of the street. This effect will be made even worse due to the fact that there will also be 2 driveways squeezed in as well.
- Currently the original part of the cottage is not hard up against the street (although the current application claims it is – only the later added on verandah over the door is hard up to the street – the cottage is at least a metre back) but as the proposed structure is to be moved forward to the street, and is proposed to be twice the height, it will effectively turn that end of the street into a tunnel due to the streets narrow width. Indeed, Thomas St in the current application is described as a "Laneway".
- It could also be argued that a standard sized car would have considerable difficulty driving into either of the driveways due to the narrowness of the street, and the necessary narrowness of the proposed driveways.
- There are no 2 story buildings on that side of the road – the "2 story structure" referred to in

the current application is on the opposite side of the road (the high side of the hill); is set back from the road by around 4 metres and is cut deep into the hillside, so the overall height is less, and is therefore of less impact.

- I believe that a precedent was set a few years back in James St, where another very early cottage was lost to a similar development – that development is considered by some on how not to develop a small block in a heritage area due to the fact that it is a total contrast to the heritage that surrounds it (and indeed the heritage it replaced). I would hope that LCC would look at that building and be cautious to not repeat that mistake.
- When will the recommendations from the Launceston Heritage Survey 2007 be implemented? Was this cottage recommended for local heritage listing? Is this area in a heritage precinct identified by Paul Davies?

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Allan Miller', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Allan Miller.