

From: Howard Wilcockson
Sent: Tue, 17 Nov 2020 18:57:09 +1100
To: Huon Valley Council
Subject: Development Proposal Channel Hwy Cygnet
Attachments: Re development proposed.docx

Please find attached a submission expressing concern about the proposed development on Channel Hwy, Cygnet:

Re proposed Planning Scheme Amendment for land: Lot 1 Channel Hwy, Cygnet (CT: 167891/1) and 7368 Channel Hwy Cygnet (CT 136624/

Regards

Howard Wilcockson



howard@mediasupportservices.com.au
www.mediasupportservices.com.au

Tel: 03 6297 8145

Mr Emilio Reale,
General Manager,
hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au

Re proposed Planning Scheme Amendment for land:
Lot 1 Channel Hwy, Cygnet (CT: 167891/1)
and 7368 Channel Hwy Cygnet (CT 136624/1)

May I express some concern over the proposed development:
Whilst I understand that every landowner within close proximity of the townsite has the right to propose a subdivision development and I am certainly not wanting to curtail what is inevitable development and town expansion, might I submit the following:

- A) The size of this development is somewhat ahead of time as there are a number of vacant lots and infilling that could be used to meet current demand.
- B) Cygnet's infrastructure is already inadequate and does not meet the needs of the current population: I would submit that these aspects of Cygnet need attention before we proceed with developments of this nature.
The reason I say this is that:
 - a) On many occasions parking within the town is at a premium and difficult to find within a reasonable walking distance of shops
 - b) It is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs in the main street of Cygnet as the pedestrian / vehicle clash is extremely high. I have seen near misses with elderly people and children crossing the road to get from the car park and library area to the shops on the other side. I would submit that the Council must do something about lightening the traffic flow through the centre of Cygnet via a bypass before the population increases much further.
 - c) Amenities such as medical services are stretched to the limit. Obtaining a medical appointment within 2-3 weeks is extremely difficult and I question whether schools etc are currently equipped to cope with many more children at this stage.
 - d) There isn't even an ambulance based in Cygnet. Provision for this should surely be in place because it takes far too long for an ambulance to come from Huonville or Kingston to attend to people living in Cygnet, let alone those living south of the townsite such as Gardners Bay, Garden Island Creek, Verona Sands and so on.
- C) Another area of concern with respect to this development is the narrowness of the edges (shoulders) of Channel Hwy – far too narrow for a footpath let alone the possibility of widening.
- D) I suspect also that there is going to be a problem with the entry of the development onto Channel Hwy. The level of traffic on Channel Hwy is surprisingly heavy now and should 61 lots be developed – (that equates to roughly 100 – 120 cars being ensconced in the development) there is going to be a clash unless a great level of attention is given to access onto the highway.

- E) Finally, I have one further concern: 61 lots in that very attractive locality overlooking the estuary is somewhat of a downgrading of the area. I appreciate that the developer wants his development to be financially viable – but 61 lots is going to seriously detract from a very attractive vision right on the doorstep of Cygnet. Would it be possible for the proposal to be sent back to the developer with a suggestion that the density be decreased – possibly by at least a third so that the lots are more spacious and the view not be so encumbered?

Mr Reale I would like to stress that I am in principle not against development.

Like it or not it is going to happen, and it is ridiculous to put one's head in the sand and oppose development just so we in the locality can preserve exactly what we have. However, developments can be good or bad and ideal or doubtful for their time.

I genuinely feel that the infrastructure and amenities of Cygnet need to be improved first before we get much of an increase in population – and I guess much of that, particularly with respect to the main street congestion is a Local Government Authority responsibility.

Would it not be possible for the developers of this site to be given an indication that whilst the concept in principle is admissible, it is ahead of its time for Cygnet and some re-thinking on some aspects mentioned need to be done before it can proceed?

Howard Wilcockson
31 Lowes Road,
Garden Island Creek