

From: "Stephanie Smith" [REDACTED]
Sent: Mon, 20 Jul 2026 11:36:24 +1000
To: "Contact Us" <contactus@launceston.tas.gov.au>
Subject: Representation regarding Draft Amendment PSA LLP0018

You don't often get email from stephanie.smith@utas.edu.au. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Chief Executive Officer,

I am the owner and resident [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] **I wish to make a representation opposing Draft Amendment PSA LLP0018**, which proposes to rezone 23 Racecourse Crescent from the Recreation Zone to the Commercial Zone.

While I appreciate that land use planning must evolve over time, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that rezoning this site is in the long-term interests of the Launceston community.

The planning submission places considerable emphasis on the site's proximity to the existing Smart Plaza commercial precinct and the opportunities that rezoning would create for future commercial development. It also identifies a demand for additional retail floor space and argues that the Recreation Zone no longer serves its intended purpose because the land is privately owned and detached from the NTCA precinct.

In my view, these arguments demonstrate a commercial rationale for the rezoning, but they do not adequately demonstrate a community rationale.

The site currently forms part of an established recreation hub. In addition to Lift 24/7 Gym, the surrounding area includes the adjacent tennis facilities and sporting grounds, creating a precinct where a range of complementary recreational activities occur in close proximity. This concentration of facilities contributes to the identity of the area and provides an important community asset. While the planning submission refers to the site being detached from the NTCA precinct, I do not believe this accurately reflects how the site functions within the broader recreational landscape. From a community perspective, it clearly forms part of an established recreation precinct.

Importantly, this is not simply vacant recreation land awaiting a higher value use. It is land that is actively being used for recreation by a well utilised fitness facility that supports physical activity, health and wellbeing within the community. As a health psychology researcher, I am acutely aware that community health is strongly shaped by the availability of local facilities and spaces that make physical activity accessible and convenient. The current use of this site is already contributing to these outcomes, and I believe this community benefit should be given

significant weight when considering whether commercial development represents a preferable future use of the land.

The applicant also argues that only a relatively small proportion of recreation zoned land would be lost as a result of this proposal. In my view, this is not the appropriate way to assess the significance of the site. The issue is not simply how much recreation zoned land would remain across Launceston, but what role this particular site plays within the local community. This site is not an isolated parcel of recreation land. It forms part of an established recreation hub alongside the adjacent tennis facilities and sporting grounds, and currently accommodates a well-used fitness facility. Its value therefore lies not only in its size, but in its contribution to an existing cluster of recreational uses.

I also note that the applicant states that the future use of the site is not yet known and that the current application seeks rezoning only. In my view, this provides a further reason to retain the existing zoning rather than remove it. The gym may well continue operating for some years. However, leases eventually expire and can also be renegotiated or bought out. My concern is not that redevelopment will necessarily happen in the near future, but that rezoning the land removes the long-term planning protection that currently exists for its recreational use. Once the Recreation Zone is removed, future commercial redevelopment becomes substantially easier regardless of the eventual proposal.

I also question whether a compelling public interest case has been established for this change. The planning submission clearly identifies the benefits of providing greater flexibility and planning certainty for the landowner, as well as facilitating the coordinated future expansion of the adjoining commercial precinct. However, it is less clear what corresponding long term benefit this rezoning provides to the broader community. If the intention is for the site to continue operating as a recreation facility, then I question why the Recreation Zone is no longer appropriate. If the intention is to facilitate future commercial redevelopment, then I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated why that outcome should be preferred over preserving an existing and well utilised recreational asset.

[REDACTED] am also concerned about the likely impacts on residential amenity if commercial activity were to expand further into the area. Racecourse Crescent already experiences substantial traffic associated with the existing shopping centre, including heavy vehicle movements servicing the commercial precinct. Additional commercial development has the potential to increase traffic volumes, noise and parking demand. Many of the houses opposite the site have limited or no off-street parking, meaning that increased commercial activity is likely to place further pressure on residential street parking and reduce amenity for nearby residents.

Perhaps most importantly, I believe the proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the strategic direction Council has recently adopted for Launceston. The City of Launceston Strategic Plan 2025 to 2035 recognises that residents of Launceston experience poorer health than the Australian population overall and commits to improving health and wellbeing by promoting physical and social activity. It also identifies a goal that community members should have access to diverse and inclusive open spaces and facilities that enable active lives and seeks to broaden participation in sport and recreation as a means of improving health and wellbeing. In my view, retaining the Recreation Zone for this site which currently accommodates a well-used recreation facility is far more consistent with these strategic objectives than expanding commercial zoning in an area that already contains a substantial commercial precinct.

I respectfully request that Council reject the proposed amendment. While there may well be demand for additional commercial land in the future, I do not believe it has been demonstrated that this particular site should be rezoned. The proposal appears to provide a clear commercial benefit to the landowner, but it has not demonstrated a corresponding community benefit sufficient to outweigh the long-term value of preserving an established recreation hub that contributes to the health, wellbeing and liveability of Launceston.

Yours faithfully,
Stephanie Smith
Dr Stephanie Smith BPsych(Hons), PhD
Lecturer

