
From: Gorete Lopes [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 16 August 2026 3:50 PM
To: Contact Us
Subject: Planning & Heritage Department

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Gorete Lopes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

16 /08 / 2026

SUBJECT: Formal Objection to Proposed Heritage Listing – [REDACTED] Street, Launceston

To the Planning & Heritage Department,

I am the owner of [REDACTED], Launceston, and I am writing to formally object to the proposed heritage listing of my property.

As you may recall, my son David and I attended the Council Meeting on 9 July 2026, where I voiced my strong opposition to this Agenda item. I was informed at that meeting that the proposal would be advertised in *The Examiner* on Saturday, 1 August 2026. This did not occur. Furthermore, I was not consulted at any point prior to the July meeting, entirely removing my ability to participate in the preliminary process.

Setting aside these procedural flaws, I strongly oppose the inclusion of [REDACTED] on the heritage register based on the following grounds:

- **Lack of Genuine Historical Significance:** The property does not meet the necessary criteria for heritage preservation. Its only known historical relevance is a drawing of a makeshift home utilized by the Presbyterian Church. Given that the church no longer exists and its historical use of the site was marginal, this tenuous link does not justify a heritage overlay.
- **Loss of Original Character:** The building is no longer in its original state. It has been extensively modified and internally subdivided into five separate residential dwellings. The original heritage fabric and aesthetics of the home no longer exist.
- **Lack of Public Visibility:** Heritage listings are typically designed to preserve streetscapes for public benefit. However, [REDACTED] is barely visible from the upper street and completely obscured from the lower street. Both access roads are narrow, single-lane streets with no public viewing areas.
- **Financial Hardship and Maintenance Burden:** I purchased this property in its current state as an investment to fund my retirement. The building requires extensive, ongoing maintenance. Imposing a heritage listing would introduce restrictive compliance measures, making routine upkeep and future works financially unviable. It also unfairly devalues the property, severely restricting its saleability and my fundamental right to utilize or develop the large parcel of land in the future.
- **Inconsistent Planning Precedent in the Immediate Vicinity:** Less than three years ago, the Council approved the demolition of the oldest property at the top of Welman Street (1 Tamar Street). In its place now

stands a three-story, black Colorbond house that is my immediate neighbor. This modern build is entirely incongruous with any historical character. Allowing the demolition of genuine historical properties while attempting to heritage-list a heavily modified, five-dwelling property next door represents a highly inconsistent application of planning principles.

Given the heavily compromised state of the building, the lack of historical significance, the restrictive financial burden it would impose, and the modern development precedent already permitted by Council right next door, a heritage listing for [REDACTED] is fundamentally unjustified.

I respectfully request that you review these points and provide written confirmation that 2 [REDACTED], Launceston, has been permanently removed from the list of proposed heritage properties.

I look forward to your prompt response.

Yours sincerely,

Gorete Lopes

From: Gorete Lopes [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 16 September 2026 2:13 PM
To: Contact Us
Subject: PSA-LLP0040 - Draft Planning Scheme Amendment - Heritage Listings

Categories: Tanya

Attention: Ian More

Senior Town Planner Policy & Projects

Launceston City Council

RE: 2 WELMAN STREET – Formal Legal Objection to Proposed Heritage Listing

Dear Mr. More,

I acknowledge receipt of your email dated 9 September. I refer you to my previous correspondence dated 16 August, and my formal representation at the LCC Meeting on 9 July 2026. This letter serves as my continued and absolute objection to the proposed heritage listing of [REDACTED].

Regarding your proposal for an on-site meeting, I formally decline. My property is a private residential complex currently occupied by five sets of tenants. Under the *Residential Tenancy Act*, I am legally obligated to ensure their quiet enjoyment of the premises. I will not authorize an invasion of their privacy by allowing unauthorized individuals to inspect their homes, particularly when the basis for this investigation is entirely unsubstantiated.

There is strictly no case for a heritage listing on this property. The push for this overlay is a gross administrative overreach into my private property rights, driven by individuals who lack the authority, qualifications, and evidence to dictate the future of my asset. My objection is based on the following planning and legal grounds:

- **Lack of Expert Evidence and Unqualified Proponents:** The individuals advocating for this listing possess no recognized qualifications in heritage architecture, town planning, or historical preservation. Their suggestions are based on personal opinion, not expert evidence. Council cannot base restrictive planning overlays on the unqualified assertions of third parties who have no legal or financial interest in the property.
- **Total Destruction of Original Heritage Fabric:** The building is unequivocally modern in its current configuration. It has been extensively remodeled and internally subdivided into five separate residential dwellings. The original heritage integrity, layout, and physical fabric of the home no longer exist. It therefore fails to meet the fundamental threshold of intactness required for heritage significance.
- **Absence of Public Benefit or Streetscape Contribution:** Heritage overlays are designed to preserve streetscapes for the public benefit. [REDACTED] is fully obscured by a high perimeter fence and is completely invisible from the street. The access roads are narrow, single-lane streets with no public viewing areas. There is zero public benefit in preserving a highly modernized building that the public cannot see.
- **Unjustifiable Financial Burden and Overreach:** Imposing a heritage overlay on a modernized rental property would result in severe and unjustifiable financial ramifications. It would mandate expensive, specialized compliance for standard future repairs and maintenance. The third parties pushing for this listing bear none of these financial liabilities. It is unacceptable for the Council to allow unqualified individuals to dictate how I repair and maintain my private, income-producing property.

Furthermore, I draw your attention to the Council's precedent regarding 112 Tamar Street in 2024. In that instance, the Council entirely dismissed heritage concerns to allow the construction of a three-storey Colorbond mansion, ruling it did not impact Launceston's heritage landscape. Applying a radically different standard to my invisible, heavily modified property is inconsistent, arbitrary, and highly objectionable.

I formally demand that [REDACTED] be immediately struck from the list of proposed heritage properties, as there is no legal or structural basis for its inclusion.

If Council intends to proceed despite these facts, I require a formal, written "Statement of Reasons" detailing exactly what qualified expert evidence is being relied upon, how the property meets the heritage threshold given its modernized state, and why Council is entertaining the demands of unqualified third parties.

Please place this correspondence on the public record as my formal objection.

Regards,

Gorete Lopes