

Council Meeting - Agenda Item 9.1 - Attachment 4 - Amendment 68  
Applicant's Response to Representations  
27-99 Opossum Road Kings Meadows - 24 February 2022

Date 10/02/2022

Mr. Iain More  
Planning Department  
Launceston City Council

Via Email: [contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au)

**RE: DRAFT AMENDMENT 68 – DA0506/2021 – REZONE AND SUBDIVISION,  
LAUNCESTON GOLF CLUB – 27-99 OPOSSUM ROAD, NORWOOD. – RESPONSE TO  
REPRESENTATIONS**

We wish to respond briefly to a number of matters raised by the public, during the public exhibition period.

We have included a separate response from ECOtas which has focused on the environmental aspects of the representations. This letter does not address those matters that ECOtas have covered in their response.

We will note however that the Bushfire Hazard Management Plan for the site does not recommend wholesale clearance of the hazard management areas. Select trees and groups of trees can be retained. This can be further discussed with Council.

**Traffic:**

A TIA has been undertaken for this development. While a number of submissions have raised concerns over the additional traffic movements, it has been concluded by a Traffic Engineer that the small traffic volumes attributable to the development, in the scheme of the surrounding network capacity, means offsite impacts arising from the development should not materially affect the wider road network. The additional vehicles have been estimated at **119 per day**. This is not a significant increase on the surrounding road network.

**Property Valuations**

Comments regarding property valuations are not relevant to this assessment, noting that no evidence has been presented that there will be any impact.

**Golf Course viability**

The golf club has made the decision to rezone and subdivide, following a difficult few years for the club. Comments that the membership “appears strong based on daily usage”, are irrelevant. How the membership appears or the viability of the golf club are irrelevant when Council and the TPC make its assessment.

**LAUNCESTON**

10 Goodman Crt, Invermay  
PO Box 593, Mowbray TAS 7248  
P 03 6332 3760

**ST HELENS**

48 Cecilia St, St Helens  
PO Box 430, St Helens TAS 7216  
P 03 6376 1972

**HOBART**

Rear Studio, 132 Davey St,  
Hobart TAS 7000  
P 03 6227 7968

**DEVONPORT**

2 Piping Lane,  
East Devonport TAS 7310  
P 03 6332 3760

### **Additional Residential Expansion.**

A number of representations have raised the issue of the road stub which allows future access to the South. We further note that this was raised by Councillors in the regular Council meeting when the application was initiated late last year. There appears to be a thought that the club has additional expansion plans to the south.

We wish to note, that while allowing for future connectivity is considered sensible land use planning, this connectivity was something never proposed by the Golf Club. Council officers had requested this road lot be placed into the development to allow the potential for future subdivision and connectivity. The club has no plans for any additional rezoning or subdivision of land south of this site.

### **Dust and Dirt**

Council have conditioned the draft permit with a number of conditions to ensure the impact on nearby residents is not unreasonable. Condition 5 and 13 on the draft permit both ensure that there will be minimal "dust and dirt" to effect neighbours.

### **Privacy & Ball Damage**

How the proposal impacts on privacy, either as a result of subdivision, or the relocation of the 6<sup>th</sup> tee, is not relevant to this application, nor does it require assessment under the relevant scheme or legislative provisions. The impact from golf balls by realigning the 6<sup>th</sup> tee will be considered by the club as part of its relocation of this hole.

### **Conclusion**

We understand that the development will result in changes along Negara Street, and to nearby residents. The area is a residential area where residential development is expected. The club has sought to minimize the impact on neighbours through the design of the proposed subdivision. The club is conscious of the vegetation through this area, and have therefore sited the proposed road within an existing cleared area.

We request the Councils continued support for the rezone and development, allowing the application to proceed to TPC hearings and a final decision.

Kind regards  
Woolcott Surveys



James Stewart  
Senior Town Planner

#### **LAUNCESTON**

10 Goodman Crt, Invermay  
PO Box 593, Mowbray TAS 7248  
P 03 6332 3760

#### **ST HELENS**

48 Cecilia St, St Helens  
PO Box 430, St Helens TAS 7216  
P 03 6376 1972

#### **HOBART**

Rear Studio, 132 Davey St,  
Hobart TAS 7000  
P 03 6227 7968

#### **DEVONPORT**

2 Piping Lane,  
East Devonport TAS 7310  
P 03 6332 3760



28 Suncrest Avenue  
Lenah Valley, TAS 7008  
mark@ecotas.com.au  
www.ecotas.com.au  
(03) 62 283 220  
0407 008 685  
**ABN 83 464 107 291**

## Woolcott Surveys

ATTENTION: James Stewart (Senior Town Planner)  
PO BOX 593  
Mowbray Heights TAS 7248

8 February 2022

Dear James

**RE: 27-99 Opossum Road (Negara Street), Kings Meadows  
SF7239 – DA0506/2020 – Amendment 68  
RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS**

### ***Preamble***

I refer to engagement of Environmental Consulting Options Tasmania (ECOtas) by Woolcott Surveys to provide commentary on representations made in relation to SF7239 – DA0506/2020 – Amendment 68.

The natural values of the proposed development site were assessed by Mark Wapstra and reported in:

ECOtas (2021). *Natural Values Assessment of Proposed Rezoning and Subdivision, 27-99 Opossum Road (Negara Street), Kings Meadows, Tasmania. Addendum: Spring Survey 2021.* Report by Environmental Consulting Options Tasmania (ECOtas) for Woolcott Surveys, 17 November 2021.

I have been provided with a copy of the representations made and address matters related to natural values raised in these below.

### ***Commentary on representations***

#### Representation 1

STATEMENT: "The Golf Course is a very pleasant green "buffer zone" between Norwood and Kings Meadows. It is home to various species of wildlife, birds, insects and native flora and fauna, including rare orchids".

COMMENT: I concur that the golf course does support native flora and fauna as indicated but do note that there are no records of "rare orchids". ECOtas (2021) discusses potential impacts and how this relates to planning scheme provisions.



STATEMENT: "Eco systems in a suburban setting also need to be preserved for biodiversity".

COMMENT: I agree with this statement in general terms but note that this concept needs to be addressed through the relevant provisions of the applicable planning scheme. In the absence of a specific concern, I have no further commentary.

STATEMENT: "I also notice from the Ecotas report that this vacant block [as per point 5 of the representation = "the plans show a vacant block on the left which looks like a road going off to the left – what is this for? It indicates to me that further additional development can then take place") or "road" was not included in their plans and it just looked like another building block. So, some inconsistencies there".

COMMENT: I assessed the area requested and shown on the maps provided in ECOTas (2021). I cannot comment on the future use of this lot (presumably referring to Lot 100 Road) or what it may access, except to say that any future development would, presumably, be subject to any assessment requirements relevant to the applicable planning scheme.

#### Representation 2

STATEMENT: "Wildlife Habitat: I do note that after residing at this location for some time, we have witnessed numerous native wildlife that use the 'recreation land' including Wallabies, Echidnas, Possums, nesting birds, ducks and needs that have habitat son this land. I do hope that this development of land does not disturb this".

COMMENT: No comment – general agreement as to fact. ECOTas (2021) discusses potential impacts and how this relates to planning scheme provisions.

#### Representation 4

STATEMENT: "I would also hate to see the disruption to wildlife this development would cause. The bushland in question is home to many wallabies and hundreds of birds can be heard from the trees in the area. What measures are in place to protect and rehome wildlife that live in the area".

COMMENT: ECOTas (2021) discusses potential impacts and how this relates to planning scheme provisions. It is not usual to include permit conditions relating to "rehome wildlife".

#### Representation 5

STATEMENT: "I query if; - when the LGC was first developed did provisions require a commitment to protect the more intact bushland areas of the site? – the loss of environmental protection by a change of zoning now would be have [sic] any offset provisions"

COMMENT: I cannot comment on this matter per se but am not aware of any particular "offset" policy related to the current planning scheme.

STATEMENT: "The subdivision proposed would; - put a rectangular wedge right into a significant area of vegetated open space".

COMMENT: I concur that the proposal will result in the loss of a patch of native vegetation. I cannot comment on the broader significance of the "vegetated open space" per se.

STATEMENT: "The subdivision proposed would; - bring hard surfaces and human activity and consequent impacts (cats and weeds, noise, hard surface and garden chemical run off, an interference with soil microbiology important to native vegetation".



COMMENT: No comment – general agreement as to fact. ECOTas (2021) discusses potential impacts and how this relates to planning scheme provisions. I am not aware of any provisions in any planning scheme that address a concept such as “soil microbiology”.

STATEMENT: “Natural values in this suburb are; - loved, valued and appreciated for their own sake and for the satisfaction of humans who care for biodiversity to exist and to be protected”.

COMMENT: No comment – general agreement as to concept.

STATEMENT: “Natural values in this suburb are; - deserve some credence both for their intrinsic value, and the fundamental need for us to be responsible to care for nature”.

COMMENT: No comment – general agreement as to concept.

STATEMENT: “Natural values in this suburb are; - could quite legitimately call up a need for special recognitions and provisions”.

COMMENT: ECOTas (2021) discusses potential impacts and how this relates to planning scheme provisions. The need to “special recognitions and provisions” was not identified.

STATEMENT: “While the environmental report for this DA says that no specifically threatened species would be at risk we know from the Natural Values Atlas, Australian Plant Society surveys etc that many less rare native species are still found here and their future existence on site is tenuous under relentless pressure”.

COMMENT: ECOTas (2021) discusses all publicly available knowledge on records of threatened species. With regard to “many less rare native species”, this concept is acknowledged by this planning scheme does not have provision for dealing with such species. For the record, however, ECOTas (2021) did provide a complete list of vascular flora from the site and I do not believe that any such ‘less rare native species’ are present.

STATEMENT: “In regard to dismissing degraded remnant bushland we know that; - seed banks persist in the soil; - restoration of remnant bushland is possible and sometimes swift and spectacularly successful with the right attention to rehabilitation”.

COMMENT: No comment – general agreement as to concept but not relevant to any particular planning scheme provisions.

STATEMENT: “We also know of the outstanding situation where extremely rare orchids remain valued and protected in the grasslands of the Campbell Town golf course”.

COMMENT: I have extensive knowledge of the Campbell Town Golf Course situation and how threatened species are managed. The proposed development at Launceston Golf Course is a very different situation with no such threatened species present.

### Representation 7

STATEMENT: “We are concerned that while it seems to be a small unused, unimportant piece of land and that overall land for suburban housing is I short supply, building on this spot will be probably more ecologically harmful than building on some of the more degraded land in outer parts of the suburb”.

COMMENT: This is pure speculation. Having assessed numerous so-called “more degraded land” in numerous locations, often these sites contain more important values than more intact native vegetation such as threatened flora, hollow-bearing trees, etc. Assessment can only be made on the proposed site – it is not a reasonable proposition to suppose that other sites may not have such values.

STATEMENT: “This is part of a [sic] ever reducing bit of green in the middle of a congested suburb. We must protect all land but in inner city areas it has become crucial. The scraps of land are part of the corridor, they provide refuge, not just for animals but also for an indeterminate number of plants including rare and possibly threatened plant species”.



## **SF7239 – DA0506/2020 – Amendment 68: Response to Representations**

COMMENT: These statements appear to contradict the previous in that the sites is not being referred to as a "scrap". ECOTas (2021) clearly demonstrated that the site does not include "rare and possibly threatened plant species" so this is needless speculation that such species may be there. ECOTas (2021) provided a complete list of vascular flora species recorded such that it is also speculation that there is an "indeterminate number of plants".

### Representation 9

STATEMENT: "The removal of existing bushland and significant trees will result in the loss of habitat for numerous native animal, insect and bird species, including black cockatoos, rosella parrots, possums and pademelons all of which I see every day from my back windows overlooking the golf course".

COMMENT: ECOTas (2021) discusses potential impacts and how this relates to planning scheme provisions.

STATEMENT: "Carr Villa is also removing a great deal of existing bushland, as has the Punch Bowl development, so these three habitat losses combined pose a serious environment loss for these species".

COMMENT: I am not aware of any planning scheme provisions that deal with the concept of cumulative impacts.

STATEMENT: "The regularity of bushfires in the PunchBowl [sic] region and burning off ion Carr Villa causes ongoing loss of habitat for the animals and birdlife, means the nearest safe haven for them is the lush greenbelt of the golf club. A reduction in this available environment is detrimental to these species and puts extra pressure on the little bushland that is available".

COMMENT: I disagree with this statement. Launceston City Council undertake well-planned fuel reduction an ecological burning including in the nearby Carr Villa bushland areas (and I have advised direct on this activity and observed firsthand the excellent beneficial impacts). The representation is, in my opinion, an uninformed opinion on fire management.

### Representation 10

STATEMENT: "Also that area is a habitat for wildlife. Paddymelons [sic], rabbits, native hens and birds such as the white coecatou [sic] with yellow breats [sic], plus many other breeding [sic] birds, and echidnas, the long beak one. It is a haven surrounded by modern, noisy civilization".

COMMENT: No comments – but noting rabbits are considered an introduced pest species.

Note that this statement does not constitute legal advice, and provides my interpretation of the provisions of the *Launceston Interim Planning Scheme 2015*, which may not represent the views of Launceston City Council. It is recommended that formal advice be sought from the relevant agency prior to acting on any aspect of this report.

Please do not hesitate to contact me further if additional information is required.

Kind regards



**Mark Wapstra**  
**Senior Scientist/Manager**

