

Rep 3.

tonyibbott@gmail.com . R.A. & M.F. Ibbott

13 Broadwaters Parade

Sandy Bay, TAS. 7005.

(28 East Shelly Beach Road,

Via Orford, TAS. 7190)

6 February, 2019

David Metcalf

General Manager

Glamorgan Spring Bay Council

P.O. Box 6, Triabunna, TAS. 7190

< Planning @ Freycinet.tas.gov.au >

Re: Glamorgan Spring Bay interim Planning Scheme 2015 – Draft Planning Scheme Amendment

2018/07a and 2018/07b

Representation

The purpose of this representation is threefold, namely :-

- (1) To inform discussion among members of the Planning Authorities prior to decision making
- (2) To represent and advocate for the silent majority, including children and flora & fauna
- (3) To highlight some key issues for consideration by the Planning Authority

The outcome this Representation seeks to achieve is not self- interest of the authors but rather the development and maintenance of high class, active and healthy beachside leisure living in a harmonious neighbourhood and natural environment capable of being managed in a sustainable manner. That is a continuation of the aspirations started by those who settled in the 1940's - 1960,s.

Firstly, I would like to put on record just how difficult it is for lay members of the community to navigate their way around the State and Local Government planning and development systems. This means it is not a level playing field when it comes to community participation in the planning and development process.

Secondly, notwithstanding that, I would like to acknowledge the GSBC Planning and NRM staff who made time in their busy schedule to meet with me and did their best to clarify some of the complications of the planning system. For that I would like to thank them sincerely and acknowledge their professionalism.

As a result of this briefing and from my personal research it would appear that the Development Proposal probably largely adheres to the Interim Planning Scheme 2015, however the Interim Planning Scheme 2015 does not always appear to be adequately informed by the Council Strategic Plan and other Council Plans.

The result is that the Development Proposal without some relevant amendments is likely to become a missed opportunity to set a high standard of seaside living and recreation lifestyle in a natural and safe environment for children and families to live or stay away from the concrete jungle of the city.

In the context of the above comments, the following items represent challenges for the Planning Authorities.

Lot Design (10.6.1)

When East (circa 1940-1950) and West (circa 1950-1960) Shelly Beach were subdivided the then Spring Bay Council aspired to create a visionary beachside subdivision including foreshore vegetation and large lots of land where families could play cricket, volleyball, totem tennis, and children could ride bikes etc under parental supervision (all consistent with the GSBC current Strategic Plan's Healthy lifestyle aspirations). As currently proposed Lots 74 & 75 which back onto number 28 East Shelly Beach Road are approximately half the size of that block, but without any public recreation space.

We acknowledge The Lot size requirements in Table 10.1, however if these smaller Lot Sizes are to be applied, any 'reasonable person' would cater for child, family, and neighbourhood physical activity by providing a flat village green space from the 5% (or thereabouts) public open space requirement from a subdivision approval, in addition to the mandatory riparian reserves required by LUPA.

We recommend either the Lots are larger, or a village green (or similar) should be required from the public open space requirement.

Waterway and Coastal Protection Code (E11.0)

I first moved to the East Coast in 1950 as a 5 year old and travelled to Orford on the school bus from Rheban. Consequently I saw both creeks that form part of this subdivision flood the Rheban Road on a number of occasions. While rainfall on the East Coast in recent years has sometimes been sparse, interestingly, once in 100 year floods have become more frequent.

Hence, I strongly support the riparian reserves along both creeks to cater for flood events, and the maintenance of the water holes (from which I have seen water bombing helicopters refill when fighting fires at Spring Beach). In addition, the development of walking tracks and trails in these reserves is an excellent proposal.

We recommend planting appropriate endemic species along the creeks to mitigate against erosion while also providing wildlife corridors, and waters hole(s) for fire protection.

Roads (10.6.2)

The roads as proposed in the Traffic Plan would appear to meet the Performance Criteria (a) to (j) providing (e) – ‘cul-de-sacs are kept to an absolute minimum’ and (f) – ‘connectivity with neighbouring road network is maximised’ – does not include the public riparian reserve along the creek between Number 22 and 24 East Shelly Beach Road.

According to the maps this would appear to be a walking and cycle connector only to the foreshore, the foreshore walking track, and beach. We fully support this approach in the interests of traffic reduction, ‘hooning avoidance’, and child safety in accordance with Performance Criteria (h) and (i).

The Development application makes reference to kerb and gutter standards. By far the majority of residents adjacent to the proposed subdivision do not want city kerb and gutter standards. They do not allow for vehicles and boats on trailers to pull off on to the nature strip, hence occupying the roadway (sometimes on both sides), creating a traffic safety hazard (especially for children on foot and/or bikes. The dish drains as used by the Mornington Peninsula Council in Victoria on their beachside subdivisions are much more flexible and appropriate for beachside living.

Ways and Public Open Space (10.6.3)

The Objectives of this item are necessary but not sufficient. Not only must the Ways provide for pedestrian and cycle tracks and trails, but also address the open space – lot size issues outlined in Lot Design (10.6.1) above (EG. Lot size and/or village green open space for for kids to kick a footy, play cricket, bash a tennis ball etc). In addition the Open Space provided for such neighbourhood activity as required by LUPA is in addition to the required riparian reserves to cater for flooding creeks referred to in Waterway and Coastal Protection Code (E11.0) above.

Stormwater Management Code (E7.0)

Recent years have seen both private lots and public authorities increase the areas of impervious surfaces dramatically (Eg. Concrete driveways, paved decks, hardstand areas, parking and standing aprons, courtyards etc) as defined in E7.3. This has lead to vastly increased stormwater run-off during high rainfall events, and wasted limited rainfall into drying soil at other times.

Hence the Performance Criteria (P1) at E7.7.1 Stormwater Drainage and Disposal are strongly supported, especially on- site lot collection and re-use, and subdivision collection for emergency use including firefighting.

In the meantime, the Acceptable Solutions at A2 seem overly generous given the seriousness of this issue and consideration should be given to providing incentives to reduce the areas of impervious surfaces (EG gravel rather than concrete driveways, and trees and shrubs rather than dry baked summer lawns.

Biodiversity Code (E10.0)

The Purpose of this Code (E10.1) is strongly supported in the context of continuing degradation and loss of habitat, despite the existence of the GSBC Vegetation Management Plan 2015-2019.

Reference to this document if applied to the appropriate sections of the GSB Interim Planning Scheme 2015 would support the creation of the creek bed riparian reserves as a habitat for a number of endemic plants and animals.

Threatened Fauna sighted in the last year from 28 East Shelly Beach include:-

Blue-tongued lizard

Eastern –barred bandicoot

Echidna

Masked Owl

Swift Parrot

White-bellied Sea Eagle

We fully support the GSBC Vegetation General Action Plan and the Weed Action Plan

Frontage fences for all dwellings (10.4.7)

Recently there has been a trend to build front fences that are of a height and style which do not adhere to the Objective, Acceptable Solutions, or Performance Criteria of the GSB Planning Scheme 2015.

These are unsafe (entering and exiting driveways), ugly (paling and/or iron) and leave properties open to robbery behind tall fences when there is no-one at home.

We recommend Council enforces the Planning Scheme Standards for front fences.

Orford Sewage Treatment Plant Odour Assessment (Taswater)

The Report by Dr Steve Carte dated 15 July 2018 is OK as far as it goes, however it has followed a methodology that tested for Odour arising from the Sewage Treatment Plant.

The Sewage Odour that has been complained about by East Shelly Beach residents for years and is as yet unresolved appears to arise not from the Sewage Treatment Plant to the south of Rheban Road, but from a pumping Station on the foreshore in front of number 23 East Shelly Beach Road.

There may well be illegal stormwater into the sewage system somewhere around East Shelly Beach resulting in this pump station or somewhere adjacent to it flooding after heavy rains. This needs investigation by Taswater.

In conclusion, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to submit this Representation and trust it will be given serious consideration in the Planning and Development process by the relevant Planning Authorities at State and Local Government.

We repeat that the intent of this Representation is not to stop development in self-interest, but rather to achieve an active, healthy and harmonious community, in a safe and natural beachside neighbourhood, which makes Orford an aesthetically pleasing, environmentally sustainable, and desirable place to be.

We trust that the intent of this Representation will not be lost or sidelined by the application of undue regulation, interpretation, or application of bureaucratic rules as it would be unreasonable to expect lay members of the community to do any more than we have in attempting to adhere to the public response period of a Development Application.

Again, we would like to thank the GSBC for their assistance and advice in understanding the process we needed to follow, and trust we have not made your task too difficult.

We wish you all well with your deliberations.

Tony and Margaret Ibbott

28 East Shelly Beach Road

(Mobile) 0409 433 898