



Dianne Cowen, Senior Consultant
Gray Planning
224 Warwick Street
West Hobart TAS 7000

11 June, 2018

Ms Marietta Wong
Tasmanian Planning Commission
GPO Box 1691
HOBART TAS 7001

Dear Ms Wong,

**Glamorgan Spring Bay Interim Planning Scheme 2015
Draft amendment AM 2018/07(a) and permit SA 2017/04 - rezone CT 149641/2 -
Rheban Road, Orford from Rural Resource to General Residential and 91 lot subdivision
And
Draft amendment AM 2018/07(b) – rezone CT 149641/1 and CT 117058/2 – Rheban Road,
Orford from Rural Resource to General Residential**

Further to your correspondence dated 23 May, 2019, please accept the following response to the further submission lodged by Mr & Mrs Ibbott dated 14 May, 2019 prepared by Gray Planning on behalf of the applicant.

Purpose and objectives of the Scheme

The submission raises concern in relation to assessment of the purpose and objectives of the Scheme and whether the draft amendment satisfies these requirements. In response to the example provided, the subdivision proposal demonstrates that the area with environmental values is to be retained as public open space. As such, this avoids the necessity for the removal of vegetation to make way for development and provides opportunity for protection of these areas, which is the outcome discussed at the hearing.

Assessment against the objectives of Schedule of LUPAA is also provided within the report submitted to Council by Town & Country Planning Pty Ltd. It is considered sufficient information is contained within these assessments, in addition to the content of the reports in general, to inform the Commission on this matter. Additionally, assessment of the subdivision application against the relevant Zone and Code provisions provides a sound indication of the effects of such a proposal on the subject land and surrounding locality.



Purpose of the rezoning

As noted in the submission, “Orford is primarily a retirement/holiday/recreational locality with an increasing tourism function”. With particular reference to increasing tourism, the demand for such accommodation is creating the demand for increased numbers of residential dwellings. The proposed subdivision is responsive to this demand. The Zone and Code provisions of the Scheme are in place to guide subdivision within the proposed General Residential zone. Where the land is found to be suitably zoned as General Residential, it should be developed to that standard required by the Scheme for efficiency purposes. Given that the site is capable of being serviced by reticulated infrastructure and the significant costs associated with establishing such services, subdivision of the land should maximise the use of the infrastructure.

The proposal has taken into consideration the surrounding land-use pattern and provides access to the beachfront through the public open space at the northern end of the subject site. The zone is also consistent with General Residential zoning along East Shelley Road, with a connective walkway providing direct access from the site to this locality.

The subject site has also been identified in the Triabunna/Orford Structure Plan as earmarked for future urban development. This is considered to give significant weight to the appropriateness of the rezoning.

Need for the rezoning

As outlined in Gray Planning’s submission dated 5 June, 2019, it is demonstrated that there is capacity for additional dwellings for residential purposes to be approved within the 10% threshold, based on ABS statistics dating back to 2006. It is noted that reference is made to the Solis development in the submission and what it “would” be able to achieve, however, in reality the development was approved 14 years ago and has not progressed any further to date. The submission also points to the fact that it is focussed on the holiday/retirement market, which is a different type of development to that of permanent residential housing. In any event, it is reasonable to question whether it will ever transpire.

Overall design and layout

Comments provided in relation to the overall design and layout were considered at the hearing and discussions identified that the applicant is willing to make concessions wherever possible to assist with the aesthetics of the subdivision. This has been dealt with by way of amendments to the draft permit conditions submitted 5 June, 2019. It is also important to point out that a considerable area of public open space (and greater than required) is proposed as part of the subdivision and provides good connectivity throughout the site for both residents of the subdivision and adjoining property owners.



Future development of the lots will be in accordance with the relevant Scheme requirements which is the same situation throughout the southern region. Whilst the issue of protected vegetation and habitats of critically endangered fauna have been raised for this site, absence of the Environmental Management Zone for this portion of land indicates there is sufficient argument for the area to be considered for public open space for the proposal. Again, the applicant has indicated a willingness to ensure that vegetation is protected and managed as part of the development, with ownership going to Council for future management upon completion of the subdivision. It is also noted that there is State legislation for this purpose also in play that is able to be utilised where required.

Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)

As discussed at the hearing, again the applicant is happy to work with a stormwater proposal that meets the Stormwater treatment utilising Water Sensitive Urban Design Principles. This is reflected in a condition on the amended draft permit. Most importantly, any design needs to account for public safety and the stormwater design will be considerate of this requirement.

Open space

The representation raises concerns about the management of the area to be utilised for public open space. As outlined earlier in this correspondence, characteristics of the portion of land to be utilised for public open space do not warrant application of the Environmental Management Zone. In conjunction with the proposed stormwater works, the applicant has agreed to rehabilitation works being carried out within the waterway as identified by way of a condition on the amended draft permit.

Traffic

Concerns raised in relation to traffic are noted however, the draft amendment and associated subdivision application was accompanied by a report prepared by Milan Prodanovic, a qualified person in the field of traffic assessment. As such, the Commission can be satisfied that sufficient evidence has been provided in support of traffic management. Although the submission raised concern about the lack of cycleways and pedestrian linkages between the development and Orford, there is no requirement under the Scheme to require this.

Conclusion

On the whole, a number of the issues raised in the submission are capable of being dealt with through amendments to the draft permit conditions as discussed at the hearing. The applicant indicated throughout the hearing, a willingness to address the concerns raised where possible and reasonable. Accordingly, it is requested that the Commission consider this information in their assessment of the proposal.



Thank you for the opportunity to make further comment in relation to Mr & Mrs Ibbot's submission and it would be appreciated if you could consider the matters raised in this correspondence.

Yours faithfully,



Dianne Cowen BUrbRegPlan RPIA
Senior Consultant, Gray Planning



03 6288 8449
0439 342 696



danielle@grayplanning.com.au
224 Warwick St, West Hobart, Tas, 7000



grayplanning.com.au
ABN 99148920244