

Carolyn Wrankmore

From:
Sent: Tuesday, 19 January 2016 3:12 PM
To: records
Subject: Proposed Garage at 28 Rossmoyne Street Norwood

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident at _____, I strongly object to the building of the garage at 28 Rossmoyne Street, on the grounds that the building is going right to the nature strip. From advise we have received this is not legal. No other dwellings in the street go to the nature strip boundary so I do not believe that it is at all acceptable for the proposed garage in question to be granted a building permit to do so.

Your sincerely,
Pip Milford

Development Application Representation Letter

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

Development Application Number

DA0622 / 2015

Address of Development

28 ROSSMOYNE ST

NORWOOD 7250 L'TON

Details of Represantor

Title

MISS

Given Name/s

GAY

Surname

SUTTON

Email

Reason for Representing

after viewing the plans of the garage, I feel the wall of the garage along the street side will obstruct my view coming out of my driveway making it dangerous for me with traffic coming both ways along Rossmoyne Street and I will have to drive over my footpath to get a clear view and as the traffic can be fast and heavy I feel my car could be hit and dangerous for people walking on the footpath in front of 30 Rossmoyne St.

Represantor's Signature

G. Sutton

Date

14 / 1 / 2016

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. DA0622/2015					
EO		OD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Doc. No.					
Action Officer			Date Received		
C WRAVEMORE			12/01/2016		

E COPY TO F. RANSON

Carolyn Wrankmore

From: Fred Kirkup ·
Sent: Thursday, 14 January 2016 11:14 AM
To: records
Subject: Application for Planning Permit DA0622/2015 28 Rossmoyne Street Norwood

I reside at _____ and object to this structure being built for the following reasons.

The structure on the plans would not be aesthetically pleasing compared to other domestic buildings in the street.

No dwellings in Rossmoyne Street have this type and size of structure on their boundary, which fronts the street.

Rossmoyne Street has become a busy thoroughfare and as such the building would impede our vision when exiting our driveway

The owner conducts a business from his premises and on occasions we have had already had trucks entering and exiting 28 Rossmoyne Street and crossing our driveway to gain better access. This has resulted in damage to our paved driveway. The positioning of the new structure and angle of the existing landscaping can only exacerbate this problem.

Regards

Fred Kirkun

12th January 2016.

The General Manager,
Launceston City Council,
PO Box 396,
Launceston, Tas. 7250.

FILE No.	DA0622	2015		
EO			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
RCV'D	12 JAN 2016			LCC
Doc No.				
	Action Officer	Noted	Replied	
	C. WRAINKMORE			

Dear Sir,

Re. DA 0622/2015

E-COPY F. RANSON

I wish to make a representation in relation to the above Development Application for a garage at 28 Rossmoyne Street Norwood. I will include factual statements, and at all times try to be fair and reasonable plus where an opinion is provided it will not be intended to be defamatory.

From the DA Report I wish to quote the following extract: "10.4.2 A garage or carport must have a setback from a primary frontage that is compatible with the existing garages or carports in the street, taking into account any topographical constraints" end of quote. It is clear that there are NO garages in Rossmoyne Street that have been constructed on the primary frontage and if the DA 0622/2015 was to be approved it would be contrary to both conditions listed in 10.4.2

The height of the proposed building at 3.3 metres is considerable considering it is a garage plus planned to be on the primary frontage boundary. My own garage (which has been used as an example in the DA documentation) has a setback of 5 metres from the primary frontage and is 2.2 metres at eave level with total height at roof peak of 3.8 metres.

If the proposed garage was approved it would be the only one in the street on the primary frontage boundary and therefore this would have a negative effect on the amenity of the street scape.

The other concern that I have is what possible future use maybe destined for the proposed garage and I can only give an opinion on this based on observations as a neighbour. The current garage at No. 28 is listed in the document as used for storage, hence the need for the proposed garage. The document also notes and I quote; "the design of the garage has been deliberately set to give the appearance that the building is not a garage" end of quote. The current activities at No. 28 cause no concerns to me as a neighbour, however I clearly see that these activities are expanding and if a garage of the proposed size was permitted to be constructed on a primary frontage, I do have concerns that eventually the building may be also used for storage. This is an opinion based on the activity seen as a neighbour, however if this actually occurred then any decision by Council to approve this DA now might well cause concern in the neighbourhood at a later time.

In summary I can say I have no problems with current activities at No. 28 and wish them well, however I do not believe council should permit a garage to be constructed on the primary frontage boundary contrary to existing guidelines plus also being different to current streetscape and am therefore not supportive of the advertised DA for the property. I do also have concerns for the future however this concern is only opinion based as explained earlier.

Thank you for the opportunity to put my thoughts forward on this matter.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Geoffrey Brown".

Geoffrey Brown.





