

---

**From:** Iain More <Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 October 2026 9:40 AM  
**To:** TPC Enquiry  
**Subject:** PSA-LLP0041 - Amendment 40K Notification

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:**

Dear Commission,

Further to my email below, Planning Scheme Amendment PSA-LLP0040 was advertised from 10 August 2026 and 7 September 2026. The application received six (6) representations, and at its Council meeting on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2026 Council considered the representations through a section 40K report.

A link with the relevant information is below

 [PSA-LLP0040 - 40K - Send to TPC](#)

Please let me know if you require any further clarification or information.

Kind Regards,

**Iain More**

Senior Town Planner - Policy and Projects

 03 6323 3382

 [Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au)

 [www.launceston.tas.gov.au](http://www.launceston.tas.gov.au)



---

**From:** Iain More  
**Sent:** Friday, 24 July 2026 10:03 AM  
**To:** TPC Enquiry  
**Subject:** PSA-LLP0041 - Amendment Initiation Notification

To whom it may concern,

Please be aware that on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2026, by its own motion, Council initiated and certified Draft Planning Scheme Amendment PSA-LLP0041 to place 25 properties onto the local heritage register within the Launceston Local provisions Schedule.

The following link provides all relevant information pertaining to the amendment:

 [To send to TPC - 40F](#)

Please note the advertising material and TasWater referral will be provided in due course.

Should you require any further information or clarification, please let me know.

Kind Regards,

**Iain More**

Senior Town Planner - Policy and Projects

☎ 03 6323 3382

✉ [Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:Iain.More@launceston.tas.gov.au)

🌐 [www.launceston.tas.gov.au](http://www.launceston.tas.gov.au)



Please consider the environment before printing this, or any other e-mail or document.

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER

Information in this transmission is intended only for the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying or dissemination of the information is unauthorised and you should delete/destroy all copies and notify the sender. No liability is accepted for any unauthorised use of the information contained in this transmission.

This disclaimer has been automatically added.

### 11.3. PSA-LLP0040 - Local Heritage Places (35 Individual Listings)

**FILE NO:** PSA-LLP0040

**AUTHOR:** Iain More (Senior Town Planner - Policy and Projects)

**APPROVER:** Chelsea van Riet (Executive Leader Community Assets and Design)

---

#### **DECISION STATEMENT:**

To make a recommendation to the Tasmanian Planning Commission subsequent to the public exhibition period for the draft planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 to the Launceston Local Provisions Schedule of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

#### **PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION:**

Applicant: City of Launceston  
Address: 18/28 St John Street, Launceston Tas 7250  
Existing Zones: Multiple zonings  
Existing Use: Residential

#### **RELEVANT LEGISLATION:**

*Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*  
Tasmanian Planning Scheme - Launceston  
Northern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy

#### **PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:**

Council - 9 July 2026 - Agenda Item 11.2: Council determined to initiate the amendment that is the subject of this item.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. pursuant to and in accordance with 40K of *the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, considers the merit of any representations received during public exhibition of the planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 and the introduction of 35 new properties onto the local heritage register;
2. recommends to the Tasmanian Planning Commission that the draft planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 to be approved as initiated, with the following amendments:
  - a. Instrument 'Introduce 35 new properties into the local heritage listing place overlay map':
    - i. Amend to change the table and map to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;

- ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1; and
    - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston.
  - b. Instrument 'Create 35 new datasheets within Appendix A: Local Historic Code Datasheets':
    - i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
    - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
    - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston;
    - iv. Amend the datasheet associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to reference the correct folio of the register and update the description of the aesthetic characteristics and correct typographical errors;
    - v. Include the datasheet for 63 Howick Street, South Launceston and amend the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the roof and front windows;
    - vi. Amend the datasheet associated with 109 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the second storey verandah;
    - vii. Amend the datasheet associated with 107 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics to include reference to the second storey verandah;
    - viii. Amend the datasheet associated with 99 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to correct a typographical error; and
    - ix. Amend the datasheet associated with 12 Bell Street to correct a typographical error.
  - c. Instrument 'Add 35 new properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places & Remove 3 properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places':
    - i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
    - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
    - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston; and
    - iv. Amend Instrument stating 'Remove 4 properties...' to 'Remove 3 properties...'.
-

## REPORT: APPLICATION FOR PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT

### 1. INTRODUCTION

At its meeting on 9 July 2026, Council considered an application under Section 40(D) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* for a scheme amendment to the Local Provisions Schedule. The amendment was to:

- a. add 35 new properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places;
- b. create 35 new datasheets within Appendix A: Local Historic Heritage Code Datasheets;
- c. introduce 35 new properties into the local heritage listing place overlay map; and
- d. remove three properties from LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places and overlay mapping

Council resolved to initiate the amendment.

As required by the Act, Council then advertised the draft amendment for 28 days between 10 August 2026 and 7 September 2026.

Six (6) representations from the public were received and are discussed below. Council also identified several omissions during public notice which are further examined.

### 2. SUMMARY

This report has been prepared to meet the requirements of a s.40K as it pertains to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) about draft amendments under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

The heritage listings are a continuation of strategic heritage work currently being undertaken by the City of Launceston. This is supported by the Heritage Stewardship Project which was endorsed by Council at its meeting on 3 September 2026. The project provided a schedule for proposed heritage assets and reassessments.

After considering the concerns raised within the representations, and after further discussions with several of the representors, there appear to be two main themes of concern or opposition to a property being heritage listed.

The first is a disagreement with the heritage values of the property as identified within the datasheets, of which the arguments have merit. However, it is the officer's opinion that the information within the datasheets have sound reasoning and methodology, and that the identified properties have heritage values of significance and are in need for protection. This is supported by the datasheets being prepared by a suitably qualified person.

The second disagreement is with new restrictions on properties. In particular, owners are concerned that the placement of their properties onto the register will prevent them from undertaking repair and maintenance or hinder future development. The Local Historic Heritage Code contains varying provisions on how development can occur in order to ensure the protection of the heritage values of any given site.

Council sought legal advice regarding the application of the general exemptions 4.3.3 for maintenance and repair, 4.3.4 for minor alterations, together with the exemptions in Table C6.4.1 which apply to heritage listed properties.

Repairing and maintaining a heritage listed property is broadly considered to be minor preservation of existing development. As an example, this would include the restoration of window frames or doors. In instances such as this, exemption 4.3.3 would be utilised.

Where works involve alterations such as, re-roofing, painting in different colours, or replacing windows, exemption 4.3.4 would be considered. However, this exemption does not apply to development where the Heritage Code is applicable and a permit is required under that Code.

Depending on the type of works proposed against the heritage code exemptions would determine if the provisions the code are applicable.

There is no overall blanket exemption that can be applied broadly, and instead any proposed development would need to be considered to determine whether or not a permit is required or an exemption is applicable.

It also means that when development is proposed, a planning permit may be required where it previously was not. While this is an additional consideration for property owners, the purpose of the Heritage Code provisions is to protect the heritage significance of a site.

Statements have also been made by some owners that they are aware that their property has heritage value and they are protecting the heritage value of the property through careful design, maintenance and alterations. The inclusion on the register will continue this protection, including where ownership of the property changes in the future.

Council officers are supportive of the amendment with the recommended modifications.

### **3. REPRESENTATION ASSESSMENT**

The matters raised in representations received are set out and addressed in the table below. The response has been written in accordance with the format as specified by the Tasmanian Planning Commission and satisfies s.40K(2)(c) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

The six representors were contacted to discuss their concerns in greater detail. Of the six, four responded to Councils request and on-site meetings and phone conversations occurred. These meetings and conversations assisted in the clarification of concerns and responses to the concerns raised.

For the purposes of this assessment 'Previous Agenda' refers to Thursday 9 July 2026 - Agenda Item 11.2, where Council initiated the amendment and includes detail of the proposed draft amendment.

#### **Summary of Council omissions:**

- a) Incorrect title reference for 65 Howick Street**
- b) Incorrect addressing for 86 Bathurst Street**
- c) Instrument references 4 properties being removed, however only 3 identified**

- d) 63 Howick Street datasheet
- e) 99 Elizabeth Street typographical error
- f) 12 Bell Street incorrect title reference

**Officer response to Council omissions:**

- a) The incorrect title was referenced within all instrument tables, the datasheet, and the map for 65 Howick Street. A review of the owner and adjoining owner/occupier notifications was undertaken, with all correct persons contacted during public exhibition. The title reference was an error and is not considered substantial enough to cause detriment or significant uncertainty during advertising. The address of 65 Howick Street was correct and provided clear identification of the property during public exhibition. It is recommended that the instruments, datasheet, and map be updated to reflect the correct title reference.
- b) The address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston was stated within the instrument tables. The datasheet and mapping referenced the correct address of 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston. The address was identified when compiling notification letters. In response, owners and adjoining owners/occupiers were notified detailing the error. Council received legal advice that there is opportunity to amend the instruments through the section 50K report and rely upon the Commissions ability to consider modifications. The omission is not considered substantial enough to cause detriment or significant uncertainty during advertising. It is recommended that the instrument tables be updated to reflect the correct address of 83 Bathurst Street.
- c) The instrument stated 'Remove 4 properties to the local heritage listing within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places' however only listed three properties. Only 3 properties are identified for removal. The reference to 4 properties was made in error. It is recommended that the instrument be amended to reflect the 3 properties only. It is not considered substantial enough to cause detriment or significant uncertainty during advertising.
- d) The datasheet for 63 Howick Street was not included as part of the datasheet instrument within the previous agenda and accordingly was not endorsed nor advertised. Notwithstanding, the address and title reference is located and correct on all instruments, the mapping endorsed, and the owners notified with a copy of the datasheet.

The error is not considered to be so limiting that the datasheet cannot be considered in its final determination by the Tasmanian Planning Commission. The owners were aware of the datasheet and provided comments through a representation on their concerns, demonstrating through their submission that they had proper time to consider the amendment. The introduction of the datasheet on the property will be beneficial for future development, as without it, and if the property is still placed onto the local register without a datasheet, then there is the potential a report by a suitably qualified person may be required for future development.

The representor for 65 Howick Street identified the oversight as the amendment relates to their property's inclusion and the row of three houses being 61, 63, and 65.

While there may have been other instances where another member of the public was unable to view the datasheet no such concerns were brought to Council

attention during public exhibition. Considering the nature of the amendment and it being specific to individual properties, and the fact that the owners are aware and have made comment, it is considered that no one person has been disadvantaged. Ultimately, the property is still able to be included on the local heritage register and it will be up to the Tasmanian Planning Commission to make the final determination.

- e) A minor typographical error was found within the datasheet with the incorrect spelling of 'arched'.
- f) The incorrect title reference was listed on the tables within the instruments. The correct title reference is on the mapping and datasheet. The error is considered minor.

**Merit of Council omissions:**

This representation contains merit for minor changes to the recommendation of the amendment including the correct title reference for 65 Howick Street, amending the address of 83 Bathurst Street, referencing 3 properties for removal, amending the title reference for 12 Bell Street, changes to 99 Elizabeth Street datasheet, and changes to the datasheet for 63 Howick Street.

**Summary of representation 1:**

**2 Welman Street, Launceston**

- a) Lack of Genuine Historical Significance: The property does not meet the necessary criteria for heritage preservation. Its only known historical relevance is a drawing of a makeshift home utilised by the Presbyterian Church. Given that the church no longer exists and its historical use of the site was marginal, this tenuous link does not justify a heritage overlay.
- b) Loss of Original Character: The building is no longer in its original state. It has been extensively modified and internally subdivided into five separate residential dwellings. The original heritage fabric and aesthetics of the home no longer exist.
- c) Lack of Public Visibility: Heritage listings are typically designed to preserve streetscapes for public benefit. However, 2 Welman Street is barely visible from the upper street and completely obscured from the lower street. Both access roads are narrow, single-lane streets with no public viewing areas.
- d) Hardship and Maintenance Burden: I purchased this property in its current state as an investment to fund my retirement. The building requires extensive, ongoing maintenance. Imposing a heritage listing would introduce restrictive compliance measures, making routine upkeep and future works financially unviable. It also unfairly devalues the property, severely restricting its saleability and my fundamental right to utilise or develop the large parcel of land in the future.
- e) Inconsistent Planning Precedent in the Immediate Vicinity: Less than three years ago, the Council approved the demolition of the oldest property at the top of Welman Street (1 Tamar Street). In its place now stands a three-story, black Colorbond house that is my immediate neighbour. This modern build is entirely incongruous with any historical character. Allowing the demolition of genuine

historical properties while attempting to heritage-list a heavily modified, five-dwelling property next door represents a highly inconsistent application of planning principles.

- f) The push for this overlay is a gross administrative overreach into my private property rights, driven by individuals who lack the authority, qualifications, and evidence to dictate the future of my asset
- g) If Council intends to proceed despite these facts, I require a formal, written "Statement of Reasons" detailing exactly what qualified expert evidence is being relied upon, how the property meets the heritage threshold given its modernized state, and why Council is entertaining the demands of unqualified third parties.

**Officer response to representation 1:**

- a) The datasheet describes that this class of building is an 'excellent representative example of an Inter-War Bungalow style domestic building form', demonstrating creative and technical achievements and aesthetic heritage value. Number 2 Welman Street is identified as a place of significance for its local history and association with the builder W. E Bowen of Bowen Pty Ltd, a person of importance to the locality and region, in addition to the former use and development of the site associated with the Presbyterian Aged Peoples Home.

The statement of local historic significance and historic values (statement of significance) contained in the datasheet includes a detailed description of the characteristics and associative significance that contribute to the value of this heritage place.

- b) The statement of significance for 2 Welman Street identifies that the heritage place is:  
*'Aesthetically significant as a double storey detached Inter-War bungalow. Typical of its type, the structure is homely, embracing natural materials and finishes. Key characteristic features include, feature portico entrance, galvanised iron roofs, predominant chimneys, projecting bay with decorative stained-glass windows. It is considered to contribute aesthetically and historically to the surrounding streetscape.'*

It is acknowledged in the Statement of Significance that there has been a 'sympathetic 1950s extension' to the Inter-War style bungalow. Despite the modifications to the original heritage fabric, it is considered that overall, the original heritage form is still legible and original features still remain.

- c) An additional inspection by Council's Heritage Officer confirms that the property's frontage remains visible from Welman Street and the rear of the property is visible from York Street. The fact that a high fence partially conceals the house does not diminish its heritage value, although it does reduce the opportunity to interpret it from the public realm. Moreover, the existing high fence partially constructed along the property boundary is readily reversible.
- d) The purpose of applying a heritage listing to a property is to ensure that the identified heritage values of a place are retained. Depending on the works proposed will determine if a permit is required or not. No supportive information has been provided as to how a heritage listing would devalue a property, nor is it a

consideration of the assessment. The application of protection to a heritage place would not preclude nor encourage buildings, works or demolition of a property altogether and it does not impose additional maintenance obligations on landowners. Rather, it introduces heritage as a future consideration and the property will still be able to be developed subject to zoning and any other relevant provisions, including the Local Historic Heritage Code.

- e) Although the property at 112 Tamar Street was previously identified in a 2007 Heritage Study as a place of local significance, a planning scheme amendment had not been undertaken to formally apply a heritage listing to the place at the time of the previous planning permit application for full demolition. Without a heritage listing in place, there is no mechanism within the planning scheme to consider the properties heritage significance, nor how any development may impact on surrounding heritage uses. The demolition of the original building at 112 Tamar Street highlights the need to progress planning scheme amendments for heritage places and precincts, to ensure places with heritage value are protected.
- f) The proposed amendment has been initiated to ensure properties with heritage qualities are protected into the future. The heritage qualities identified within the datasheets were prepared by suitably qualified people.
- g) The datasheet, prepared by suitably qualified persons, identifies the heritage values associated with the place. Furthermore, 2 Welman Street was identified in an earlier 2007 Heritage Study undertaken on the behalf of the City of Launceston as a place of local significance. It is unclear what 'unqualified third parties' the representor is referring to. Not agreeing with an assessment and determination of the heritage values of a property does not invalidate that assessment.

It is unclear what 'unqualified third parties' the representor is referring to.

**Merit of representation 1:**

This representation contains merit and consideration, however does not warrant change to the recommendation for the amendment.

**Summary of representation 2:**

**63 Howick Street, Launceston**

- a) The representors requested detailed information around how a heritage listing would affect proposed future changes to the property. Following a phone call with the representors, confirmation regarding a rates query was provided via email and a final submission by the representors was received.
- b) details included in the datasheet are incorrect, namely that the new PVC front windows installed that the roof is painted tin, not galvanised iron.
- c) the inclusion of 63 Howick Street as a local heritage place is not supported as it would impact the resale value of the property, attract additional costs and permit requirements, extend completion timelines for planned development.
- d) the council should offer the property owners an incentive in their rates structure to compensate/off-set costs to owners

**Officer response to representation 2:**

- a) The Senior Rates Office at the City of Launceston has confirmed that the introduction of a local heritage listing to a property does not impact the rates.
- b) The description in the datasheet will be updated accordingly. The description in the datasheet has been updated accordingly to accurately reflect the modifications to the place. These changes do not materially affect or diminish the overall heritage significance of the property.
- c) No supportive information has been provided as to how a heritage listing would devalue a property, nor is it a consideration of the assessment. A development proposal is assessed on a case-by-case basis and depends on the scope of the proposed works to determine what permit triggers would apply. The statutory assessment timeframe for planning applications is governed by the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and applies irrespective of whether a property is affected by a local heritage listing.

It is important to note that heritage listings do not prevent works or development from being undertaken but allows for an assessment of proposals where a planning permit is required to ensure they are in keeping with the identified heritage values of a place or area.

- d) Council provides assistance to property owners through free pre-lodgment advice from Heritage and Planning Officers to help applicants understand heritage requirements and identify appropriate design responses at an early stage. In addition, Council's 2026/27 Fees and Charges include a waiver of planning application fees for heritage-only residential applications (only the advertising fee is required to be paid).

The submitter's comments regarding fee relief are noted and are constructive suggestions that may assist in supporting heritage outcomes more broadly. However, such matters are beyond the scope of the current planning scheme amendment, which assesses the identified heritage significance of the proposed precinct against the relevant heritage assessment criteria.

**Merit of representation 2:**

This representation contains merit and consideration, and the datasheet has been updated to reflect details provided by the respondents. However, the updates do not warrant a change to the recommendation for the amendment

**Summary of representation 3:**

**101 Elizabeth Street, Launceston**  
**107 Elizabeth Street, Launceston**  
**109 Elizabeth Street, Launceston**

- a) The properties were purchased in 2008, approximately 18 years ago, when they were neglected, poorly maintained and significantly altered from their earlier appearance. The rear laneway was being used as a thoroughfare by alcohol and

drug users accessing the Salvation Army building, creating safety and amenity concerns.

Prior to the purchase of the properties, a due diligence check occurred regarding the heritage status of the properties, and it was confirmed by the heritage society that the properties had not been identified. Permits have since been issued and works have been undertaken, including partial demolition, additions and the construction of a garage to prevent the laneway to the rear from functioning as a thoroughfare.

- b) The front of the buildings also changed, in particular the front entry courtyard fencing along with removing the upstairs original sash windows on the right hand side of each Terrace replacing them with French doors opening onto second storey decks. All three terraces balconies and timber works have been altered due to the rotting of the original closed in facades and balustrades. The photographs included in the datasheet are not current and do not accurately represent the properties as they exist today. Alterations have occurred, and the terraces no longer resemble their original form.
- c) These Terraces were not in good condition prior to their purchase in 2008. After putting in so much effort and money, now the Heritage Society see fit to want to change its mind and now consider them as having heritage value be consider after us having it for 18 years, it doesn't seem consistent or extremely relevant to the past.
- d) If the properties do have history, why protect them now? Recent history has been one of neglect and lack of care and it appears that because of past investment in updating and upgrading the properties, they are now of interest for preservation.
- e) Since ownership, new council overlays were introduced allowing for a change in the building requirements. For example the corner unit 1 /99 Elizabeth St changed which allowed them to build something that resembles a commercial structure because of the revised overlay. It then went through council planning without original consultation and agreeance with the adjoining property owners of Unit 2 /101 Elizabeth Street, allowing permission for an extension not consistent with the streetscape and has changed the view forever.
- f) With all due respect the alterations that have been allowed and changed over the past 18 years have changed their original look forever and they are no longer in keeping with their past Heritage properties. The actual look of the terraces today has completely altered what they represented in the past and as such there is no reason why these properties should now be considered heritage listed. They were bought and altered to try and keep them as similar as possible but because of what has been approved and changed throughout the years under council planning, as well as the alterations to the overlays, they can no longer be kept the same as originally built. There is no reason why at this point they should be changed and be called heritage listing.

**Officer response to representation 3:**

- a) While the terraces at 99-109 Elizabeth Street, West Launceston had been identified in a 2007 Heritage Study undertaken for the City of Launceston as places of potential State heritage significance, no formal heritage listing had been applied to

the properties through a planning scheme amendment process. Accordingly, when any planning permit applications were assessed for these properties, they were considered against the provisions of the planning scheme that applied at that time, which did not include a heritage listing or associated heritage controls for these properties.

- b) The statement of significance contained in each of the datasheets for the properties at 99-109 Elizabeth Street detail that they share consistent aesthetic characteristics through their use of unpainted and unrendered face brickwork, weatherboard cladding, galvanised iron roofing, prominent chimneys, double-hung sash windows, ground floor projecting bays, second storey veranda's and bracketed eaves. The frontages remain visible from the street and are not obscured by fencing or outbuildings.

Although alterations to the original built form have occurred over time, the presentation of the aesthetic values remain highly legible. Accordingly, the properties remain highly significant, both individually and collectively, as a rare group of Federation-era terraces.

- c) The building's condition is not a relevant factor for determining heritage significance, rather it's the building's intactness and integrity. Intactness refers to the degree to which a place retains its significant fabric and form. A place may be highly intact, but the fabric may be in poor condition. Integrity refers to the degree to which the heritage values of a place are still evident and can be understood or appreciated. Despite modifications to the terraces at 99-109 Elizabeth Street, overall the properties are considered to retain significant heritage value that is worthy of protection as local heritage places.
- d) A comprehensive Heritage Study was undertaken in 2007 on the behalf of the City of Launceston, however formalised protection of the identified places and precincts through a planning scheme amendment did not occur at the time. This amendment has been initiated to ensure that 35 properties with identified heritage value are appropriately managed and that the impacts of any future development is considered.
- e) See response outlined at point a), above.
- f) See responses at points b) and c), above.

**Merit of representation 3:**

This representation contains merit and consideration. Minor changes to the datasheets for the datasheets are recommended.

**Summary of representation 4**

**65 Howick Street, South Launceston**

- a) It is requested that 65 Howick Street be removed from Amendment PSA-LLP0040.
- b) The representor submits that the datasheet does not demonstrate that the property meets the threshold for local heritage significance under Clause C6.3.1.

- i) No identification of significance arising from association with a particular community or cultural group, and no event, activity, phase of development or historical theme is identified.
  - ii) The significance assessment primarily relies on the property being representative of a common housing type ("basic housing stock"), but does not explain why this particular example warrants listing over other comparable examples.
  - iii) The datasheet does not identify the property as a rare example.
  - iv) The datasheet is said to assert conclusions rather than provide supporting analysis, with no comparative assessment of similar properties.
  - v) The contribution to the surrounding streetscape should not form part of the basis for listing if significance is assessed solely within the title boundary.
- c) The exhibited instrument misidentifies the land. The title reference for the property is CT157260/1. The advertised reference is on all instruments, as well as the datasheet is CT219788/1. As the incorrect reference to the property has been stated, the extent of the datasheet is wrong. Does the incorrect folio have any bearing on how owners were identified and notified?
- d) Three corrections required.
- i) The incorrect title reference for the property
  - ii) Criterion (a)(iv) describes the property as 'a single storey, detached Victoria cottage with shopfront'. The property has no shopfront.
  - iii) Criterion (a)(i) states that Charles Joseph Heath 'owned the property until 1935', fifty-two years before the house was built. Council confirms it should read c. 1935.

Council confirmed such errors are able to be considered to a section 40K report. In this instance this is not adequate as the instruments are endorsed and misidentify the land and misdescribe the place. The purpose of the exhibition is to consider and respond to the amendment. A person considering this amendment during the exhibition period would have understood that Council proposed to list a Victorian cottage with a shopfront, on a title belonging to a different property, owned by a man who disposed of it half a century before it was built. The corrections, whilst communicated by email to the representors, do not appear in exhibited documents, and no other representor or member of the public has seen them. This could result in the Planning Commission approving an instrument materially different than one exhibited.

- e) The stated basis of the listing is internally inconsistent. What is the extent the significance is attributed to our property that relies on streetscape? The consideration of the property appears to rely on consideration of the values beyond the title boundary, however it was stated to use that local heritage place is assessed within the properties title boundaries. The datasheet specifically references adjoining properties. It is submitted Council cannot maintain both positions.

The instrument shouldn't be approved while the two coexist. Primarily, if the entire site is included, then the heritage code would apply for all development on the land. As the building frontage is of high importance, the extent should be limited to this.

- f) The setting was considered and dismissed. The Launceston General Hospital redevelopment, directly opposite the site, has been overlooked. It was confirmed that council did not consider it. Directly opposite our property, on the Charles and Howick Street corner, the Department of Health is constructing a seven-storey car park as part of the Launceston General Hospital redevelopment.

Tasmanian Planning Policy 6.2.2, strategy 6, requires Council to "support the retention of appropriate surrounding settings and site context that contributes to the significance of the local historic cultural heritage values.

The datasheet states that our property is of high importance for the facades "visible directly from the street", and that it contributes to the surrounding streetscape. A place whose significance is expressed in those terms cannot sensibly be assessed as though the opposite side of that street were not being permanently rebuilt. Council proposes to impose enduring development controls on us in order to protect a street presence that the State is in the course of altering.

- g) The conduct of the exhibition. We wrote to Council on 2 August 2026, nine days before the exhibition opened, asking when the period would commence and seeking the assessment material for our property so that we could consider the proposal properly and in time. We received an automated acknowledgement the same day. Council's substantive answers came on 11 August, the day exhibition opened, on 12 August, and on 26 August. The last of these, which answered the two questions most material to this representation, arrived twelve days before the closing date.

Consultation in 2023. It was stated that the owners were notified in 2023. We have no record of receiving any such letter. Can Council show who the 2023 letter was sent to and received by?

- h) Request for further opportunity for a supplementary written submission if Council disagrees with the contents of the submission.
- i) The datasheet for 63 Howick Street was not advertised. This property forms part of the basis on which our property is said to be significant.
- j) It is requested:
- That our property be removed from Amendment PSA-LLP0040, and that if Council wishes to pursue a local heritage listing of the property, it do so in a subsequent amendment supported by a fresh assessment which addresses surrounding setting and site context as required by Tasmanian Planning Policy 6.2.2, strategy 6, and which is undertaken after completion of the Launceston General Hospital car park, so that the setting can be assessed as it will in fact exist rather than as it existed before the works began; or
  - That our property be removed from Amendment PSA-LLP0040, and that if Council wishes to pursue a local heritage listing of the property, it do so in a subsequent amendment based on a corrected instrument, datasheet and overlay map, exhibited in that corrected form, so that the amendment Council actually proposes can be considered by the public and by any other person who may wish to make a representation on it; or

- That if our property is to remain within Amendment PSA-LLP0040 and be listed, the Specific Extent be confined to the street-facing facade of the dwelling, and the words "The entire site including setting and setback" be deleted. The practical effect would be that the Local Historic Heritage Code applies to works affecting the street elevation of the house, and not to the remainder of the site. We also ask that the concluding sentence of criterion (a)(iv), regarding contribution to the surrounding streetscape, be deleted. Council's own datasheet identifies the "facades visible directly from the street" as the element of high importance, Ms Appleby has confirmed the listing "relates to its exterior", and Council's position is that significance is assessed within the title boundary and does not take the surrounding precinct into account. On Council's own case we submit this should be uncontroversial.

**Planner's response to representation 4:**

- a) In response to the submitters request to remove 65 Howick Street from Amendment PSA-LLP0040, further justification is provided for the proposed heritage listing, below.
- b) Heritage Tasmania's document 'Assessing Historic Heritage Significance' outlines that:

*If a place meets the local threshold indicator for at least one criterion, then:*

- i. the place can be regarded as a place of local historic heritage significance; and*
- ii. the local planning authority would be justified in listing the place in the heritage schedule of its planning scheme*

The criteria for listing places in local heritage schedules are set out in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme is included in C6.0 Local Historic Heritage Code at section C6.3 Definition of Terms (local historic heritage significance):

*means significance in relation to a local heritage place or a local heritage precinct or local historic landscape precinct, and its historic heritage values as identified in the relevant list, in the relevant Local Provisions Schedule, because of:*

- (a) its role in, representation of, or potential for contributing to the understanding of:*
  - (i) local history;*
  - (ii) creative or technical achievements;*
  - (iii) a class of building or place; or*
  - (iv) aesthetic characteristics.*
- b) its association with:*
  - (i) A particular community or cultural group for social or spiritual reasons; or*
  - (ii) The life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance to the locality or region,*

The statement of significance for 65 Howick Street details that the property has been assessed as being of significance in relation to its representation of, or potential for its contribution to the understanding of local history, creative and technical achievements, a class of building or place and aesthetic characteristics. The property does not meet the

local threshold criteria for associative value. Number 65 Howick Street has been identified as meeting the threshold for four of the listed criteria for heritage significance, therefore it is considered justified to include the property as a local heritage place.

While the cottages at 61-65 Howick Street are described in the datasheet as representing the "basic housing stock of much of the area", a review of the Victorian cottages in South Launceston that were identified in the 2007 Heritage Study for Places of Local Significance, which is a foundational study that underpins this planning scheme amendment, indicates that relatively few extant examples retain this particular cottage typology. Many of the Victorian Cottages identified in South Launceston have been altered, substantially modified, demolished, or present different forms, materials, scales, settings, or architectural features. In contrast, 61-65 Howick Street continues to demonstrate the key characteristics of modest late Victorian freestanding cottages, including its fine-grain allotment pattern, modest scale, cohesive row presentation, and retention of Victorian features. As such, the place provides an increasingly uncommon and representative example of this form of workers' housing within South Launceston. Specifically in relation to 61 Howick Street, the word 'rare' is used to describe the early former shopfront addition, which has become an increasingly rare building form in suburban areas.

When mapping a place, it is usually important to include land surrounding a building, to ensure that any development, including subdivision, does not adversely affect the heritage significance. In the instance of 65 Howick Street, the mapping is proposed to be applied to the title boundary. However, the assessment of the heritage significance of 65 Howick is necessarily informed by values and characteristics that are visible from the public realm. In the case of 61-65 Howick Street, the recognised heritage values relate not only to the individual buildings but also to their collective presentation and contribution to the historic streetscape. Accordingly, consideration of streetscape contribution does not extend significance beyond the title boundary; rather, it forms part of the assessment of how the heritage values of the place are demonstrated and understood.

Conversely, the surrounding streetscape is not a relevant consideration in assessing the significance of a local place, which is of individual significance, however in situations like this, an individual property can contain its own historical relevance, and still collectively contribute to the streetscape. The house is not proposed to be part of a precinct and so the context (streetscape of Howick Street) is not relevant.

- c) The title reference was an error and had no bearing on how owners and occupiers were notified.
- d) Whilst understanding the representors concerns, the presumption that the site cannot still be considered due to errors is incorrect. The purpose of public exhibition is to allow the general public, and in this instance, property owners, to raise matters they do not agree to, and in instances such as this, identify minor errors. This is a fundamental part of the amendment process.

As previously stated, considering the nature of the amendment and it being specific to individual properties, and the fact that the owners are aware and have made comment, it is considered no fundamental disadvantage has been served. In no way have the owners of the property been disadvantaged due to the omissions in the advertised material,

evident by their submission. Ultimately, it will be up to the Tasmanian Planning Commission to make their decision if the errors were minor.

e) See response contained at point b), above.

f) The Tasmanian Planning Policies (TPPs) were assessed in section (da) of Attachment 1 of the previous agenda. Policy 6.2.2, strategy 6 states:

*Support the retention of appropriate surrounding settings and site context that contributes to the significance of the local historic cultural heritage values of buildings, part of buildings, infrastructure, places/features, precincts and landscapes.*

The officer's response in the section 40D report stated that the intent of the proposed amendment is to provide protection of the local historic heritage significance of the properties through the standards of the Local Historic Heritage Code.

The representor has argued that due to the redevelopment of the Launceston General Hospital (LGH), that the streetscape is in a state of change.

Whilst strategy 6 would broadly require a higher degree of consideration within a heritage precinct amendment, the policy consideration is a necessary requirement for all scheme amendments. The argument that as there is other development occurring within the area that may affect streetscape, that individual properties that contain heritage values or contribute to that streetscape should not be listed without that broader consideration is not supported.

This amendment cannot consider current development within the wider surrounding setting and has no ability to impact how surrounding properties are developed. Policy 6 does not allow this to occur. The amendment considers the heritage values of the property and acknowledges that these qualities contribute to the surrounding setting. The strategy does not mean that local listings should be rejected because other development is occurring within the streetscape.

As per the general application of the policies, no one TPP, policy, or strategy should be read in isolation from another to imply a particular action or consequence.

g) Council can confirm that a letter was sent to the owners of 8 March 2023. Our records indicate no response from the landowner was received.

h) The representors were notified that a response to their representation will be located within the 40K report, and provided the day it will be published. The Tasmanian Planning Commission hearings will allow further submissions at the Commissions discretion.

i) Datasheet not advertised, administrative error and discussed in more detail earlier in this report.

j) See response contained at point b), above.

**Merit of representation 4:**

This representation contains merit and consideration. Based on the concerns raised, it is recommended that the datasheet and instruments be amended.

**Summary of representation 5:**

**103 Elizabeth Street, Launceston**

- a) All the properties have undergone significant frontage/facade changes and been modernised over the years. For example, the first level windows have been changed to doors, steel poles erected instead of wooden ones erected, galvanized fencing across all the properties, ground floor veranda has been changed from wooden decking boards to plastic-kind of boards. Further, the back of the properties have been changed to tin walls, wooden windows changed to new aluminium windows, new garages, industrial extension on the back with glass landing on the back (see 99 Elizabeth St).
- b) The intention in the near future for 103 Elizabeth Street is to build a sealed off garage similar to our neighbours at 99/101 Elizabeth Street to avoid people jumping into the property.

**Planner's response to representation 5:**

- a) Although alterations to the original built form have occurred over time, the presentation of the aesthetic values when viewed from the principal streetscape remain highly legible. Accordingly, the properties remain highly significant, both individually and collectively, as a rare group of Federation-era terraces. Built form elements to the rear are often much altered and are generally disregarded when assessing heritage significance. The new additions that have occurred to date are of a scale and massing that do not diminish the significance of the place.
- b) The inclusion of a property in a heritage listing does not prevent works or development from being undertaken. Rather, a planning permit would be required for any works that propose to develop or change the appearance of the heritage place, to ensure that the proposed works would not detract from the identified heritage values.

**Merit of representation 5:**

This representation contains merit and consideration, however does not warrant change to the recommendation for the amendment.

**Summary of representation 6:**

**12 Bell Street, Launceston**

- a) Does the listing include the entirety of the building or only the original structure?
- b) Built in 1887 the four main rooms and front verandah of the home are in original condition but the 1950's extension at the rear of those four rooms is weatherboard lined with asbestos containing materials. The intention is to remove those asbestos containing materials and rebuild the rear extension when funds permit.

c) Would a heritage listing prevent or unreasonably delay the remedial work we are planning?

d) Is it possible to replace rotten wood on the verandah or asbestos panels?

**Officer response to representation 6:**

a) The heritage mapping applies to the entire site, however the significance of the heritage place is limited to the values and characteristics identified in the datasheet, specifically the semi-detached late Victorian era built form.

b) In principle, works to non-original (later) additions that are not identified as elements of significance to the heritage place, can be considered.

c) A heritage listing does not currently apply to the property address. The local heritage code, along with its exemptions and development standards only apply should the amendment be supported by the Commission and come into effect. Until that time, only the provisions of the code and any relevant overlays apply. It is recommended to seek the advice of Council to confirm whether a planning permit would be required.

d) It is likely replacement of wood and panels would trigger the requirement for a planning permit based on legal advice.

**Merit of representation 6:**

This representation contains merit and consideration, with minor changes to the datasheet recommended.

#### **4. STATEMENT ON THE SATISFACTION OF THE LPS CRITERIA**

Section 40K(2)(d) of LUPAA requires a statement as to whether the draft amendment of an LPS meets the LPS criteria. An assessment of the draft amendment in response to Section 34 LPS Criteria was included as an attachment to the Council agenda on the 9 July 2026.

In review of the representations received, the draft amendment is considered to satisfy the LPS Criteria as previously discussed, with minor modifications made as recommended.

#### **5. RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS**

As identified above, the following modifications to the amendment are recommended.

- a. Instrument 'Introduce 35 new properties into the local heritage listing place overlay map':
  - i. Amend to change the table and map to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
  - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1; and
  - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston.

b. Instrument 'Create 35 new datasheets within Appendix A: Local Historic Code Datasheets':

- i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
- ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
- iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston;
- iv. Amend the datasheet associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to reference the correct folio of the register and update the description of the aesthetic characteristics and correct typographical errors;
- v. Include the datasheet for 63 Howick Street, South Launceston and amend the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the roof and front windows;
- vi. Amend the datasheet associated with 109 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the second storey verandah;
- vii. Amend the datasheet associated with 107 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics to include reference to the second storey verandah;
- viii. Amend the datasheet associated with 99 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to correct a typographical error; and
- ix. Amend the datasheet associated with 12 Bell Street to correct a typographical error.

c. Instrument 'Add 35 new properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places & Remove 3 properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places':

- i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
- ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
- iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston; and
- iv. Amend Instrument stating 'Remove 4 properties...' to 'Remove 3 properties...'.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The report meets all relevant requirements of s.40K. Consultation exceeding the requirements of The Act has been undertaken. Officers are still supportive of the amendment subject to the recommended changes.

## RISK IMPLICATIONS:

Not considered relevant to this report.

**ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT:**

The amendment to the Launceston Local Provisions Schedule has been assessed against the requirements of the Act. The Tasmanian Planning Scheme - Launceston, and the Launceston Local Provisions Schedule also contain provisions intended to implement the objectives of the Resource Management Planning System. The application has been assessed using these provisions and as such economic, environmental and social impacts have been considered.

**STRATEGIC DOCUMENT REFERENCE:**

*Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*  
Tasmanian Planning Scheme - Launceston

**BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Not considered relevant to this report.

**DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS:**

The Author and Executive Leader Community Assets and Design have no interests to declare in this matter.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. PS A- LL P 0040 - 40 K - Instrument - Datasheets [**11.3.1** - 20 pages]
2. PS A- LL P 0040 - 40 K - Instrument - LA U- Table [**11.3.2** - 2 pages]
3. PS A- LL P 0040 - 40 K - Instrument - Mapping [**11.3.3** - 3 pages]

### 11.3. PSA-LLP0040 - Local Heritage Places (35 Individual Listings)

**FILE NO:** PSA-LLP0040

**AUTHOR:** Iain More (Senior Town Planner - Policy and Projects)

**APPROVER:** Chelsea van Riet (Executive Leader Community Assets and Design)

---

#### **DECISION STATEMENT:**

To make a recommendation to the Tasmanian Planning Commission subsequent to the public exhibition period for the draft planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 to the Launceston Local Provisions Schedule of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

#### **PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION:**

Applicant: City of Launceston  
Address: 18/28 St John Street, Launceston Tas 7250  
Existing Zones: Multiple zonings  
Existing Use: Residential

#### **RELEVANT LEGISLATION:**

*Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*  
Tasmanian Planning Scheme - Launceston  
Northern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy

#### **PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:**

Council - 9 July 2026 - Agenda Item 11.2: Council determined to initiate the amendment that is the subject of this item.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

1. pursuant to and in accordance with 40K of *the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, considers the merit of any representations received during public exhibition of the planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 and the introduction of 35 new properties onto the local heritage register;
2. recommends to the Tasmanian Planning Commission that the draft planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 to be approved as initiated, with the following amendments:
  - a. Instrument 'Introduce 35 new properties into the local heritage listing place overlay map':
    - i. Amend to change the table and map to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;

- ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1; and
  - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston.
- b. Instrument 'Create 35 new datasheets within Appendix A: Local Historic Code Datasheets':
  - i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
  - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
  - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston;
  - iv. Amend the datasheet associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to reference the correct folio of the register and update the description of the aesthetic characteristics and correct typographical errors;
  - v. Include the datasheet for 63 Howick Street, South Launceston and amend the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the roof and front windows;
  - vi. Amend the datasheet associated with 109 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the second storey verandah;
  - vii. Amend the datasheet associated with 107 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics to include reference to the second storey verandah;
  - viii. Amend the datasheet associated with 99 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to correct a typographical error; and
  - ix. Amend the datasheet associated with 12 Bell Street to correct a typographical error.
- c. Instrument 'Add 35 new properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places & Remove 3 properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places':
  - i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
  - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
  - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston; and
  - iv. Amend Instrument stating 'Remove 4 properties...' to 'Remove 3 properties...'

---

**Richard Jamieson (Senior Leader City Development), Iain Moore (Senior Town Planner - Policy and Projects) and Sophie Appleby (Place and Heritage Officer) were in attendance to answer questions in respect of this item. A table of questions asked by Councillors during debate is provided after the decision.**

**Councillor Joe Pentridge withdrew from the Meeting at 3:13 pm  
Councillor Joe Pentridge re-attended the Meeting at 3:21 pm**

**DECISION: 15 October 2026**

**MOTION**

Moved Councillor Krista Preece, seconded Councillor Alex Britton.

That Council:

1. pursuant to and in accordance with 40K of *the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, considers the merit of any representations received during public exhibition of the planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 and the introduction of 35 new properties onto the local heritage register;
2. recommends to the Tasmanian Planning Commission that the draft planning scheme amendment PSA-LLP0040 to be approved as initiated, with the following amendments:
  - a. Instrument 'Introduce 35 new properties into the local heritage listing place overlay map':
    - i. Amend to change the table and map to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
    - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1; and
    - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston.
  - b. Instrument 'Create 35 new datasheets within Appendix A: Local Historic Code Datasheets':
    - i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
    - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
    - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston;
    - iv. Amend the datasheet associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to reference the correct folio of the register and update the description of the aesthetic characteristics and correct typographical errors;
    - v. Include the datasheet for 63 Howick Street, South Launceston and amend the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the roof and front windows;
    - vi. Amend the datasheet associated with 109 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics of the second storey verandah;

- vii. Amend the datasheet associated with 107 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to update the photograph and the description of the aesthetic characteristics to include reference to the second storey verandah;
  - viii. Amend the datasheet associated with 99 Elizabeth Street, Launceston to correct a typographical error; and
  - ix. Amend the datasheet associated with 12 Bell Street to correct a typographical error.
- c. Instrument 'Add 35 new properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places & Remove 3 properties to the local heritage listings within LAU-Table C6.1 Local Heritage Places':
- i. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 65 Howick Street, South Launceston to CT157260/1;
  - ii. Amend to change the table to the correct folio of the register associated with 12 Bell Street, South Launceston to CT124619/1
  - iii. Amend to change the address of 86 Bathurst Street, Launceston to 83 Bathurst Street, Launceston; and
  - iv. Amend Instrument stating 'Remove 4 properties...' to 'Remove 3 properties...'.

**CARRIED 10:0**

**FOR VOTE:** Mayor Councillor Matthew Garwood, Deputy Mayor Councillor Hugh McKenzie, Councillor Alan Harris, Councillor Tim Walker, Councillor Joe Pentridge, Councillor Andrew Palmer, Councillor Lindi McMahon, Councillor Alex Britton, Councillor Krista Preece and Councillor Ross Marsden

**AGAINST VOTE:** Nil

| COUNCILLOR             | QUESTION                                                                                                                                                  | RESPONSE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Councillor Alan Harris | Did the six representations raise anything significant that Councillors or the public should be aware of regarding the proposed listing of 35 properties? | <b>Senior Town Planner - Policy and Projects</b><br><i>Council is seeking to place properties with heritage value on the register so they can be protected. This is the second batch of listings, with more to follow. Officers have met with property owners who raised concerns are refining the process as errors are identified. Owners will have a further opportunity to raise concerns through hearings held by the Tasmanian Heritage Council. Council aims to engage owners earlier and address concerns while protecting heritage properties into the future.</i> |