



HUON VALLEY COUNCIL

40 Main Street, Huonville
PO Box 210, Huonville 7109
hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au
ph: (03) 6264 0300
ABN: 77 602 207 026

Mr Ramsay
Tasmanian Planning Commission
GPO Box 1691
HOBART TAS 7001

Our Ref: PSA-2/2017 & SUB-36/2017
Enquiries To: Planning

5 July 2021

Dear Mr Ramsay

**DRAFT AMENDMENT: PSA-2/2017 & DRAFT PLANNING PERMIT: SUB-36/2017
HUON VALLEY INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2015**

I refer to the directions in the Commission's letter dated 22 June 2021.

DIRECTION NO. 1

General Residential Zone - Clause 10.6.1 A1 and P1 Lot Design

Clause 10.6.1 P1 (a)

When the Application for a permit (SUB-36/2017) was assessed by the planning authority, the following statement in Annexure 15 was noted regarding the application of Clause 10.6.1 A1 of the *Huon Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2015* (Planning Scheme):

Lots 11, 12, 27, 34, 35, 49 and 50 are above the maximum lot size of 1000m² and hence will be designated for multiple dwellings, lots 26 and 54 are also designated for multiple dwellings but are both less than 1000m². According to the definition in the table itself, this designation excludes these lots from consideration....(Annexure 15; page 257)

It was also noted that the legend to Plan V704UH -5 (revision R) that formed part of the Application at that time, referred to lots 11, 12, 27, 34, 35, 49 and 50 as being designated for the construction of multiple dwellings. The assessment of the Application also noted advice from the applicant in regard to proposed multiple dwellings referred to on pages 329 and 330 of the Planning Assessment Report.

For these reasons, the size of lots 11, 12, 27, 34, 35, 49 and 50 were assessed as being compliant with Clause 10.6.1 P1(a) in accordance with the provisions in Table 10.1: Planning Assessment Report (page 330).

These lots are also designated for the construction of multiple dwellings under the most recent plan, Plan V704UH-5 (revision S).

It is also noted that in the attached correspondence from PDA Surveyors to the Commission forwarded today, the following is stated which is consistent with the advice from the applicant in the Application:

Per Clause 10.6.1 P1 (a), the lots greater than 1000m² in size shown on the proposed subdivision were designed /intended to be specified for multiple dwellings. A relevant control notation was anticipated to be placed on the title, reflecting this.

It is considered the size of the above lots can be approved for the above reasons.

Condition - Schedule of Easements

Whilst there is reference to the above lots being designated for the construction of multiple dwellings on the relevant plan (Plan V704UH-5, revision S), it is submitted a further permit condition be included requiring the developer to include a restrictive covenant in the Schedule of Easements for each of the respective lots designating that only multiple dwellings can be constructed on them in accordance with the Planning Scheme.

Clause 10.6.1 P1(b)

At the time of assessment of the Application there were no applicable Local Area Objectives or Desired Future Character Statements applicable under Clause 10.6.1 P1(b).

However, the Application was considered to be consistent with the Zone Purpose Statements: Planning Assessment Report (pages 327-328).

The submission from PDA Surveyors in regard to Clause 10.6.1 P1(b) in the attached letter has been noted.

DIRECTION NO. 2

General Residential Zone – Clause 10.6.1 P4 (b)

When the Application for a permit was assessed by the planning authority, the information from the applicant set out on pages 331 and 332 of the Planning Assessment Report was taken into account. This advice in relation to Clause 10.6.1 P4(b) was considered relevant in terms of the planning and development engineering considerations regarding subsection (b) for the layout of the subdivision.

The reasons put forward by the applicant were considered acceptable and enabled the planning authority to be satisfied that it was not “reasonably possible” for a new

road to be provided as part of the proposal to provide standard frontages for the relevant lots.

It is noted the advice in the submission forwarded today to the Commission by PDA Surveyors, that PDA Surveyors are still of the view for the reasons set out that it does not consider it to be reasonably possible to create a standard frontage without creating a cul-de-sac for the relevant lots.

It is also noted PDA Surveyors refer to Clause 10.6.2(P1)(e) to support its view that a further road (cul-de-sac) within the subdivision appears to conflict with the requirement in Clause 10.6.2(P1)(e) for cul-de-sacs within subdivisions to be *kept to an absolute minimum*.

However, if the Commission is of the view that it is not satisfied that the reasons put forward in support of it not being considered reasonably possible for the applicant to provide a new road to create standard frontages for the relevant lots, it is submitted that applicant be provided with an opportunity to amend the subdivision layout for the required new road infrastructure.

Please contact me on (03) 6264 0300 if you require clarification on any of the above matters.

Yours sincerely



MICHAEL BARTLETT
MANAGER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES