

Chelsea Blyth

From: Chris Flood [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 25 October 2021 5:22 PM
To: council; Planning
Subject: Representation Ref Griffiths DA
Attachments: Flood Representation 379 LowHeadRoad.docx

CAUTION: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As per attached
Thank You
Chris Flood
[REDACTED]

To: Shane Power, General Manager, George Town Council, council@georgetown.tas.gov.au

From: C. Flood

Re: Representation: DA 2021/99 - Application for Residential - Dwelling Addition, Outbuildings (x6) and Frontage Fence by S. Griffiths, 379 Low Head Road, LOW HEAD (C/T 13172/4 & 25920/1)

Date: 25 Oct 2021

Dear Shane,

To DA 2021/99.

I own the adjoining properties 2/371 and 377 Low Head Road as has my immediate family for 60 years, and ancestrally, longer than that.

The existing dwelling on the subject site, 379 Low Head Road, enjoys river frontage on the historic Cordell Point. From where it overlooks, it is clearly visible from the public realm including the Tamar River, Pilot Bay, and the Low Head Pilot Station. Cordell Point is a low rocky promontory bordered by significant native vegetation, with low density holiday/permanent housing and small outbuildings.

Because of the site's sensitive neighbourhood character, I am concerned regarding the bulk, height, number and location of the proposed outbuildings. In particular (from a personal point of view) the new boat shed and garage on the northern boundary.

Our property (to the east) once enjoyed a view of the river however, over the years incremental building extensions and more recently, vigorous growth of the Macrocarpa hedge into trees has now negated this perspective. If the new construction were to proceed, this outlook will be further affected by an imposing wall of Colourbond. I appreciate that there may have been a conscious effort to reduce this impact and shadow by slanting the roof away (upwards to West) but we will be viewing it square on, and for all intents and purposes it will appear massive, (approx. 6.6m high) given that it originates very close to the boundary.

For us, growing vegetation to interrupt this view would be very challenging in the Low Head climatic environment. Any further distancing from the boundary, reduction in height or movement to the west would have a positive and appreciable effect.

To my knowledge, the status and longevity of the adjacent (north) Macrocarpas has not been discussed with neighbours, and it would be of interest to see what affect short/long term major pruning, and building impacts might be.

I also note from the submitted plans the shadow diagrams. It would be interesting to view from our perspective, at different times of the day and year. Shoulder season and summer later afternoon sun seems to disappear early in our yard, I would be interested in the effect of this new proposition.

Unfortunately, I was not aware of this impending development, and therefore have not had opportunity to discuss with the owner prior to their DA submission. Some of these concerns may seem abrupt, however they are at front of mind at this juncture.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Given my modest knowledge of the planning guidelines, I apologise for questions rather than statements of compliance or otherwise below.

Regards,

C. Flood

Chelsea Blyth

From: Planning
Subject: FW: DA 2021/99

From: Nicholas Bartley [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 24 October 2021 5:11 PM
To: council <council@georgetown.tas.gov.au>
Cc: Lucie Bartley [REDACTED]
Subject: DA 2021/99

CAUTION: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

This email is a representation against **DA 2021/99** - S Griffiths

We currently reside at 381 Low Head Road, Low head 7253.

The proposed boat shed & caravan garage on the northern boundary is not in line with neighborhood character nor does it meet the requirements of the George Town Interim Planning Scheme (2013) – Part D Section 10 – General Residential Zone.

This development application has failed to address some key aspects of the planning scheme which I have discussed below.

Section 10.4.13.3 – Building Height

A1 – a) The proposed boat shed & caravan garage is on an internal lot and it exceeds a height of 6m.

P1 – c) The visual impact of the building from our residence, pilot's bay & low head pilot station, is not in line with the neighborhood character. The approval of a large-scale industrial steel shed would detract from the residential coastal appeal of the area.

Section 10.4.13.5 – Rear and Side Setbacks

A2.1 – b) The proposed boat shed & caravan garage is not adequately set back from the side boundary.

Please also note that the houses in this area generally have a frontage that faces the water rather than Low Head Road. Therefore, the interpretation of the rear boundary may also need to be considered for the boundary that backs onto 377 Low Head Road, and subsequently so would the required setbacks outlined in section A1 – b.

Other objections:

- The impact of vegetation cleanup in order to construct the boat shed & caravan garage could result in killing the existing Macrocarpa tree on the northern boundary. Macrocarpa trees are prone to dying when pruned or if their root system is disturbed.
- Potential noise pollution. The extremely close proximity of the boat shed & caravan garage to my place of residence may result in excessive unwanted noise from works conducted within the shed.

Putting aside all of these non-compliance issues, the application is not in line with the principals and recommendations of the Georgetown Structure plan (Part2). Below is an extract taken from page 49. The extract highlights the importance to **protect sightlines from low head road and public spaces** (such as the pilot station and the beach at pilot bay).

If this application is approved, the background picture used for this very extract would include a large industrial steel shed in the top right corner.

The Scenic Values Area identifies the strip of coastal land that extends from North Street to the **Low Head** Peninsula tip. The land area immediately east of Low Head Road from North Street is characterised by linear residential development, parallel to the carriageway and farming land (pasture).

Land to the east of the linear residential area is a mix of pasture and native vegetation.

It is estimated that there is more than 200ha of residual native vegetation. Eucalyptus amygdalina coastal forest and woodland and pockets of Eucalyptus amygdalina forest are the two prominent native vegetation communities that make up a significant portion of residual native vegetation. The residual native vegetation is contiguous and extends further to the south.

The Scenic Values Area is defined as it potentially falls to increased development pressure as the coastal outlook and its connection to the hinterland makes it desirable.



Thank you for taking the time to consider our objections.

Nicholas & Lucie Bartley.

Enc: **Planning Scheme Code Assessment.**



Figure 1 379 Low Head Road - DA2021/99

Planning Scheme Code Assessment.

(at first glance)

Code 10.4.11 Outbuildings and Ancillary Structures for the Residential Use Class other than single dwelling applies.

Will the new Boatshed and Caravan Garage intrude on the skyline to such an extent that it will be clearly visible from the public realm including Pilot Bay Beach, Low Head Road, and the Low Head Pilot Station? What effect does the future status of the Macrocarpas have upon this? Does the setback on the northern boundary comply?

Code 10.4.13.2 Site Coverage applies.

There seems to be a large number of large outbuildings (20m of drive through garage) is this commensurate with other buildings in this location? Shipping containers (southern boundary) don't seem to be within the context of the neighbourhood. Will they be visible over the fence from my northern boundary?

Chelsea Blyth

From: Planning
Subject: FW: DA 2021/99 Objection

From: Margaret Matson [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 23 October 2021 5:01 PM
To: council <council@georgetown.tas.gov.au>
Subject: DA 2021/99 Objection

CAUTION: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I am writing in regard to **DA 2021/99 – S Griffiths**

My interest in this is because I am the land owner of the adjacent property – 381 Low Head Road.

After reviewing the documentation, I would like to object to the boat shed & caravan garage that is proposed to be constructed on the northern boundary. I don't believe it is in line with the neighborhood character and would be an eyesore for neighboring houses as well as the public community viewing the coastline.

The proposed location of the building is in extremely close proximity to my living room area which I am concerned about for a number of reasons such as;

- Ongoing noise pollution
- Potential loss of Macrocarpa trees due to construction. Therefore, if the tree dies, the shed will be an extremely prominent feature of the coastline due to its large size and height.
- Potential windows overlooking my property from proposed loft leading to lack of privacy
- Unnecessarily close to my boundary given the large size of the applicant's property
- Potential loss in value of my property from an aesthetic appeal

The proposed shed seems more suitable for a rural farm than a coastal environment such as Low Head.

I am also a shareholder in the Low Head Company which own the adjoining property along the waterfront so I am also representing my interest as a shareholder and also to preserve the best interests of the Low Head community.

Thank you for your time to review my rejection letter.

Margaret Matson

Sent from my iPhone