

From: ..
Sent: 17 Nov 2020 12:23:42 +1100
To: Planning @ Meander Valley Council
Subject: Draft Amendment to the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme
2013- Specific Area Plan over land 10/12 Neptune Drive Blackstone Heights
Attachments: Council Rezoning November 2020.doc

To the Meander Valley Council

Attached please find my correspondence re the above rezoning of Blackstone Heights.

Kind regards
Patsy Parker

Patsy Parker

Meander Valley Council
26 Lyall Street
WESTBURY TAS 7303

Subject: Draft Amendment to the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2013-Specific Area Plan over land 10/12 Neptune Drive Blackstone Heights

I write in response to correspondence dated 23 October in relation to the above matter.

The proposed development conflicts with the Schedule 1 objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania. This development will have a negative impact on the residents of Blackstone Heights and does not provide for their current level of social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.

It is the vision of the developer, that this development represents the community and the development is going to be for the betterment of the community. This proposal creates the type of high-density housing that most residents have chosen not to live in, and the community have specifically indicated that they want the area developments to reflect the current feel of the area. I believe this development is aimed to an older demographic and given the proximity to services I and am unable to see how this will be beneficial given the lack of services to the area.

Consideration to the proposal as to the impact this will have to residents adjoining the boundary from a noise perspective, heavy equipment use, operational hours (which must be restrained) along with extra congestion to road use. Other elements to be considered are the heighten possibility of fire, emergencies services and access points. I would also like to highlight the natural beauty of our fauna and flora within this designated area and throughout the Blackstone Community.

A community meeting held Saturday, 7 November to discuss key strategies and objectives of the proposal. Mr Harrison was present and provided a greater understanding of his vision for the development. With interest the plans presented were updated plans and not that as listed on Council website. This raises further issues that should this development be passed will the developer incorporate further changes and resubmit and then the required process of Meander Valley Council (MVC) to notify community members? Another question raised were the buildings plan be that of a single or dual dwelling. Mr Harrison advised it could be “what we wanted” with the majority present wanting single dwellings. Also raised to Mr Harrison was there a possibility of purchasing

land adjoining residential boundaries to which Mr Harrison advised no-this was a disappointing response.

Mr Harrison was asked if he would attend a further meeting to capture community members unable to attend on Saturday which was scheduled for 9 November with a high percentage of the same questions raised.

The changes to approval processes for different developments should not be altered as part of the re-zoning as they are in direct conflict with current zoning regulations.

The developer is not bound by the current plan and as a result, if the changes were permitted, leaves existing residents with a high risk of developments occurring that are not compatible with the adjacent or current zoning.

The Structure Plan for the area states the following:

Develop a Specific Area Plan for the area identified for future cluster residential development in Blackstone Heights, in partnership with land holders. The Specific Area Plan should reflect the following principles:

Housing densities should respond to the character of the local area, considering the interface with existing residential areas of Blackstone Heights.

Medium density housing should only be promoted within proximity to services such as public transport and the proposed activity centre. Lower density housing should be promoted further away from services.

Development should respond to the natural environment in the area, including topography and landscape values.

These objectives have not been considered as:

The high-density housing directly backs onto existing low-density housing, is visually impacting the low-density areas, increases traffic and will create a noise level that impacts in low density areas.

The high-density area is proposed to be at the opposite part of the development, away from the activity centre. By covering the skyline, destroying existing bush, and creating a high-density housing area the development is in direct conflict with the existing natural environment. The proposed development and rezoning will impact the value of properties who are closest to the re-zoned areas. Their properties are zoned low density and it has been the expectation (and a reasonable expectation) that only low-density housing will be permitted in the surrounding area, as per the current zoning and planning.

Building high density housing in very close proximity will devalue their properties significantly.

The significant increase in traffic proposed to pass along Glover Ave and Neptune Dr will result in loss of value for these residents.

The proposal for re-zoning is in direct conflict with the requirement that the re-zoning, as far as practicable, avoids the potential for land use conflicts with use and development permissible under the planning scheme applying to the adjacent area.

The proposal for rezoning is also in conflict with the broader community as the council have not properly assessed the requirement that the use and development permissible under the amendment will have on the use and development of the region as an entity in environmental, economic and social terms, especially regarding proposed traffic volumes and impacts on property values.

The traffic assessment count undertaken on the 3rd January and the 30th January is inaccurate as it clearly has been undertaken at a time to understate traffic movements:

1. January is a peak holiday period with many people on holiday from work
2. January has no school movements
3. The timing the assessment was undertaken also misses the school period movements and morning work peak. As the proposal indicates, the community is a family-based community.

With the timing of the year and the timing of the day the assessment was undertaken means that any conclusions drawn on the potential impact of the increased traffic movements would appear to be significantly understated.

The traffic assessment assumes 500 lots, the re-zoning details a possible 650 lots.

Page 12 of the submission details that at the 2016 census, Blackstone Heights had a population of 1270 persons, including 348 families. Housing stock consisted of 478 dwellings, with an average household size of 2.8 persons, which is above the Tasmanian average.

It does not appear that the traffic assessment has fully understood or assessed the impacts of the proposed development on the residents.

I would therefore propose that any traffic movements associated with the development and specifically, tourism developments should be access through the proposed new development road infrastructure with more land to be developed proposed on Panorama Rd.

The traffic assessment undertaken to support the re-zoning does not appear to take this into account to provide a comprehensive and cumulative view on the impact of proposed developments on traffic movements in the area.

Blackstone Heights has one main access route. There are no other alternate routes. So as different from many other developments, all traffic is funnelled from Blackstone Heights down Blackstone Rd, Pitcher Parade, Casino Rise and Country Club Avenue.

The current traffic movements result in an efficiency of movement that will be impacted significantly, especially at peak times, by the proposed development/s.

The traffic assessment does not appear to consider the cumulative impact of traffic

Movements. The survey is flawed in the context it does not assess the whole area to be re-zoned, was undertaken at an inappropriate time of the year therefore cannot be relied upon for decision making purposes.

The Structure Plan identifies access risks in Blackstone Heights-there were high awareness of the safety issues associated with having a single road access into Blackstone Heights especially during emergencies such as bush fires.

Investment in new road infrastructure will make it safer and easier to move around the area. New road infrastructure will be essential to delivering adequate capacity and guaranteeing safety for residents in Blackstone Heights and Prospect Vale.

Also noted is an increase in traffic movement within Neptune Drive due to interest of the new development on the corner of Blackstone Road and Panorama Road. This will be another impact on traffic flow to the area.

TasWater and TasNetworks have indicated that infrastructure will be able to respond to the increase population in the area. In the case of Tas Water there may be need for investment in new and improved sewerage and water infrastructure to cater to new developments.

Although the developer has incorporated a sewage infrastructure within his planned development. How will this be incorporated into the mainstream infrastructure?

This development is considered to be within a bushfire prone area due to proximity of bushfire prone vegetation being identified within the report. With our every changing environmental consideration to the use of fire-retardant materials within the proposed development should be considered.

Table 4.3A identifies fire hydrant requirements must be designed and constructed in accordance with TasWater supplement to Water Supply.

What fire safety measures will be incorporated in construction phase and will there be sufficient water pressure in the event of a fire to protect existing residential homes?

In addition, MVC minutes dated 13 October 2020 197/2020 Lot 1 Panorama Road development note 10: If any Aboriginal relics are uncovered during works: a) all works must cease within a delineated area sufficient to protect the unearthed and or other relics from destruction-will this also apply to this planning scheme?

As the Structure Plan is dated January 2015 when will any of the strategies highlighted within this report be implemented?

I am not totally apposed to the development but there are motions that must be adhered to by the Meander Valley Council and Council's integrity upheld.

Therefore, until objectives are met, I am not in support of this proposal.

With regards

Patsy Parker