

Rep 1

Mr Neil and Dr Elizabeth Roberts
Property address: 8 East Shelly Beach Road
Orford

Sunday April 16, 2023

General Manager,
Glamorgan Spring Bay Council,
PO Box 6, Triabunna,
Tasmania 7190

Dear Sir,

Development Application 155 Rheban Road Orford, CT 149641/2

We have carefully followed the planning issues associated with the requested re-zoning and subdivision of the subject land over the past six years. We are very concerned by the willingness of the Council to support the interests of the developers behind this application rather than the local residents and landowners. The Council should be supporting those who stand to be affected, especially given the very recent examination of the proposal by the Tasmanian Planning Commission which rejected it such a short time ago. The financial pressures on the municipality are well known and it is understandable that Council is enthusiastic to endorse any opportunity to expand its rate base, but this does not justify the rejection of sound planning in decisions such as these.

Notwithstanding these introductory comments, our submission details are as follows.

1. This proposal was quite recently the subject of a detailed and thorough review by the Tasmanian Planning Commission which sought commentary and analysis from both planning professionals and the affected public. The finding is adequately summarized on page 4 of the applicant's submission.
2. The Triabunna/Orford Structure Plan 2014 is the basis for the planning of the subject site and provides for "*• Rezone land south of Orford to residential in the long term (refer to Zonal Recommendations map).*" on the basis of perceived future needs, but not in the short term because of "*• a lack of demonstrated demand for the rezoning and proposed lots*". A considerable amount of work was done by the TPC to measure demand versus supply in making this finding.
3. The applicant's submission (and the Council itself) chooses to portray the TPC's finding and the 2014 Structure Plan as "out of date" and relies on the specially funded SGS report to support the need for a drastic reassessment of the residential allotment supply in the area. Given the recency of the TPC's examination, this is simply absurd and cannot be accepted in logic without rejecting the TPC's work out of hand.
4. No consideration in the applicant's submission has been given to issues of impact on the amenity of the residents who own the existing residential lots in the area. For example:
 - . what is the impact of the increased demand for access to the seafront by the residents of the new subdivision?
 - . what provision is made for extra demand for car parking on or adjacent the sea front?
 - . what constraints will prevent new buildings in the proposed subdivision from looming over the existing residential lots and reducing their amenity accordingly?
5. The application is an over development of the site. Chapter 4 of the applicant's submission seeks to justify the adoption of the maximum technical density possible for the site. While this clearly makes economic and financial sense to the applicant, it does nothing to soften the impact of the development as far as the area (and its residents) is concerned. The claim that the use of one of

the LDR zone sizes (1200 square metres) is inconsistent with the size of the residential lots in the area (600 square metres) is *not* supported by the facts. An examination of Figure 14 (page 20) clearly shows that the adjacent lots (i.e. the ones in East Shelly Beach Road) are significantly larger than this. The contrast with the smaller lots in the West Shelly Beach area is obvious, but the applicant's proposal *is not in the West Shelly Beach area!* We submit that the Council should never consider a lot size less than the permitted LDR size of 1200 square metres in order to reduce impact and match neighbourhood character. The existence of the proposed public open space/drainage area within the proposal is NOT a justification of a smaller lot size as this land would have to be excluded from residential development in any case.

6. The proposal makes quite inadequate provision for access to the seafront. The contrast with the good pedestrian access in the West Shelly Beach residential area is stark. Council ensured that excellent access lanes were provided in these subdivisions and this has reduced the need for vehicular access (and parking) for those residents seeking access to the seafront. Good planning is recognised and well regarded. This applicant's plan provides just *one access point* for the 90 residential lots proposed. As argued in paragraph 5 above, a lower density development – say 40 lots – would significantly offset this problem.
7. The size of the development (90 lots) will have a significant long term effect on the pattern of use in the area. It can be observed that where a large supply of lots suddenly becomes available, many purchasers cannot or will not undertake the construction of a dwelling in the short or medium term. Their lots are used as temporary holiday accommodation involving on-site caravans, sheds or other sub-standard structures. This large number of lots, suddenly available, will thus cause a loss of amenity and property value to existing owners. Again, see paragraphs 5 and 6, a reduced number of lots (of a higher lot value) significantly reduces this problem.
8. We note that this application deals with only one of the two portions of Rheban Road land considered in the 2017 application by the TPC. We submit that any decision made by the Council on this application will be a precedent for a future application by the owner of the land closer to Jetty Road. All of our submission on this occasion thus applies to that land as if it were currently before Council.

We are happy to make ourselves available to Councillors and Council Officers to discuss our submission.

Yours sincerely,

Neil and Elizabeth Roberts (0413 277 428)

Residential address:
30 Andrea Court
Healesville, 3777