

From: Ryan Robinson
Sent: 13 Aug 2020 16:38:52 +1000
To: Meander Valley Council Email
Subject: Response to 'subdivision and future options for the southern area of Westbury'

ATTN: General Manager

Please accept this email response to a letter I received requesting feedback on *subdivision and future options for the southern area of Westbury*.

Can someone please confirm that the email has been received and included in the responses to the TPC?

Thank you,

RyanRobinson

320 Marriott Street, Westbury

1. Do you think that subdivision should be allowed in this area?

Yes (with conditions)

Please tell us why

Scheme provisions should ensure that subdivisions do not impact upon the established rural lifestyle values of the area, and should ensure that residential uses are supported with sufficient utilities and road infrastructure.

For example; the majority of land in Westbury (south) is not serviced by reticulated water and wastewater networks, and many of the roads are underdeveloped for the level of vehicle and foot traffic that is increasing as a result of recent subdivisions and developments (past few years).

It is impractical to support an increase in population density through smaller subdivisions while residences rely on on-site wastewater systems and the collection of rainwater, particularly when annual rainfall is often insufficient to sustain household usage without supplementary cartage.

2. If you think subdivision should be allowed:

Do you have a view on what the lot size should be?

A core value and significant feature of Westbury (south) is large lot sizes supporting a well established rural lifestyle, which has attracted people to live in the area. As such, it seems very odd that the area isn't zoned Rural Living (or TPS Rural Living Zone A or B), for which the scheme provisions are generally better suited.

Due to the lack of utilities services, the current minimum lot size of 5,000m² presents limitations to people's ability to achieve the rural lifestyle established in the area, as sufficient space within each lot is required to ensure residences can collect rainwater; incorporate on-site wastewater systems; and provide for firefighting vehicle access. The inclusion of these features within a 5,000m² lot limits the amount of space remaining for features and activities associated with the established rural lifestyle (the keeping of sheep, goats, cattle, and horses; large vegetable gardens, and small orchards, etc).

The minimum lot size should be 10,000m², which happens to be consistent with the provisions of the TPS Rural Living Zone A.

Do you think battle-axe blocks should be allowed?

If the lots are large enough to maintain the established rural lifestyle in the area, battle axes are not a particularly significant issue.

Should subdivision rules be the same throughout the area or should specific areas provide for smaller lot sizes or larger lot sizes?

It makes sense to allow smaller lot sizes (5,000m²) on land that has access to reticulated water and sewerage services (such as those properties adjoining land subject to the General Residential Zone).

Land that does not have access to reticulated water and wastewater, and is otherwise lacking sufficient road and footpath infrastructure, should be reserved for larger lot sizes.

3. Are there any visual features of the area that you would like to see protected?

Views throughout the area towards the surrounding hills and mountains are certainly worth protecting. To this end development controls should be considered to have power lines located underground.

The hedgerows and various old trees throughout the area (hawthorn, elms and oaks for example) are also aesthetically appealing and historically notable features. Again, overhead power lines interfere with both the visual aesthetic, and the maintenance of hedges and trees.

Would you like your answers to be included as part of the Tasmanian Planning Commission process for the new planning Scheme?

Yes

Ryan Robinson
ryan.dh.robinson@gmail.com