

**From:** Geoffrey Foster  
**Sent:** Fri, 13 Nov 2020 10:44:50 +1100 (AEDT)  
**To:** hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au  
**Subject:** Section 43A Application-Draft Amendment (PSA-2/2017)  
**Attachments:** Subdivision Submission.pdf

Comments re above application attached. Please confirm receipt of document.

Regards

Geoff Foster

7380 Channel Highway Cygnet

0438 021 677

7380 Channel Highway  
CYGNET TAS 7112

12 November 2020

General Manager,  
Huon Valley Council,  
40 Main Street, Huonville 7109

[hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au](mailto:hvc@huonvalley.tas.gov.au).

**Huon Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2015  
Section 43A Application-Draft Amendment (PSA-2/2017)**

Dear Sirs,

Please consider the comments relating to the above application,

**Combined Rezoning / Planning Permit Application.**

I support the proposed rezoning of the site but believe that this should proceed before finalising the planning permit. This will give some certainty to the developer but will allow additional time for residents to negotiate improvements to both the proposed lot & road layout as well as the draft planning permit conditions.

The foreword to the Southern Tasmania Land Use Strategy advises

- Regional planning also allows us to recognise and develop the advantages of each municipal area. Each locality has its own strengths to build upon, its own place within the region.
- We can also reduce adversarial public debate and angst that currently occurs in the planning system through strategic land use planning. Far better results may be achieved when debate over 'what should happen where' is conducted within a strategic planning process, in an atmosphere where there are no specific development proposals on the table and where reason, not emotion, is free to drive the outcomes.

Proceeding with rezoning and planning permit approvals concurrently is completely inconsistent with the above

**Lot Layout**

The proposed lot layout will produce a "cookie cutter" standard development that can be seen in any new estate anywhere in Tasmania . Cygnet has a distinct village feel and to proceed with this layout would be a lost opportunity to provide a far better outcome. The development will be entry to Cygnet township and should present as something distinct.

- A landscaped entry feature would improve the presentation to the estate and could assist with marketing of the estate as well as enhancing the approach to Cygnet.
- There should be a second road outlet to Esplanade Road to provide safe egress in the event of fire or traffic accident etc.
- Clause 7 of the Taswater submission requires upgrade of the existing 50mm watermain to 100mm in Esplanade Road to provide a loop main and second point of supply for water. This main would be better located in the new road reserve rather than Public Open Space. A new road connection would also better convey overland flows from a 100 year ARI storm,
- Lots 33 to 36 and lots 9 to 14 are poorly laid out. These groups of lots should be consolidated into medium density lots to be developed under separate planning permit and with much improved urban design. Consolidation would also allow for incorporation of a attractive entry feature.
- The standard 15 lots/ha approach is not consistent with the village feel of Cygnet. Density could be somewhat retained by increasing the yield of the medium density lots but allowing for wider lot frontages elsewhere.

### **Stormwater & Water Sensitive Urban Design**

- Dealing with WSUD by provision of and end of line Spel Ecoreceptor is a lost opportunity. WSUD targets could be met by mandating the use of plumbed in rainwater tanks and provision of appropriately located raingardens and bio-retention tree pits. Widened lot frontages as recommended above would assist in providing areas for raingardens although raingardens can be located in nature strip areas by careful location of driveway crossings.



- I note that the stormwater pipe network is to be design with a 20 year ARI capacity. In my experience, this will require high capacity inlets to capture runoff and ensure that pipes can run full. This aspect should receive particular attention during detail design.

### **Building Control Guidelines**

The developer of the council should consider establishing and administering Building Control Guidelines to manage the subsequent development of the estate. This could ensure a minimum standard of construction and allow for requirements to improve the environmental outcomes by requiring such measures as plumbed in rainwater tanks ad solar panels.

### **Planning Permit Conditions.**

A permit condition should be added requiring fencing at developer's cost to the rear shared boundary all existing properties fronting Smith Street and Esplanade Road and the side boundary of 7357 Channel Highway.

Please confirm receipt of this submission.

Geoff Foster  
[foster1905@bigpond.com](mailto:foster1905@bigpond.com)  
Tel: 0438 021 677