

# URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL

## MINUTES

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL  
HELD AT 10.30 AM ON WEDNESDAY 15 AUGUST 2018  
IN THE CITY DESIGN MEETING ROOM, COUNCIL CENTRE

### **6. 66 Burnett Street, North Hobart and Adjacent Road Reserve – Demolition and New Building for Multiple Dwellings, Visitor Accommodation and Food Services – PLN-17-1066**

The panel discussed the proposal in camera then met with the proponents, who explained the proposal and responded to questions. Finally, the panel again met in camera to discuss their position regarding the development.

During those discussions, the panel made a number of observations and raised a number of issues or concerns, as outlined below.

#### **USE**

- Proposed medium to high density residential use very appropriate for the site which has very good public transport access and is in close proximity to the North Hobart centre and even in walking distance to the city centre.
- A good mix of unit sizes is proposed, with a combination of serviced apartments and long-term residential use.
- The panel was interested in the management model and the breakdown of visitor accommodation of long-term residential.
- Concern that the developers could in future seek to increase the proportion of managed visitor accommodation, at the expense of housing opportunities.

#### **ACCESS**

- Burnett Street montage (fig 10) is inaccurate, in that the width and design of the proposed access is not identified and illustrated.
- Concern about the design of the Burnett Street access – doubts about safety and disappointment at lack of any entry ‘marker’.
- Parking shortfall, in itself, not a concern for the panel.
- The proposed Burnett Street access will not be very legible for pedestrians and will have poor amenity with pedestrians having to share the narrow laneway with 2 way vehicle movement. The building entrance is located down a laneway and with no identity and poor image at the street frontage. Potential future redevelopment of the adjacent property on Burnett Street would further hide the building entry from the street.
- Pedestrian access between Elizabeth Street and the building is proposed to only 4 residential units and as only a fire escape to the remaining 85 units. While the proposed café would provide some activation, a major pedestrian entry to all units in the building from Elizabeth Street would bring more activation to this section of the street. It might also be expected that Elizabeth Street would be the development’s ‘front door’; long-term residents of the development are likely to be frustrated having to walk further to enter and exit only via Burnett Street.

**URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL  
MINUTES  
15/08/2018**

- Queries re the movement of trucks (garbage, removals, etc) on the site.

### **PARKING**

- The proposed flexible on-site parking arrangements are supported in principle, as is the significant provision of bicycle parking.

### **DOCUMENTS LACKING**

- Absence of a longitudinal section in the application documents. Absence of a plan showing immediate context by insertion into an aerial or satellite photo.
- The provided cross-section doesn't indicate what currently exists on property boundaries.
- Boundary setbacks are not dimensioned.
- Also the link between the balconies of Unit 18 on level 3 of the Elizabeth Street apartment block is not shown as connected to Unit 14 in Section AA but is indicated on the Level 3 plan. Similarly for Level 2 – Unit 10.
- Because of all the foregoing, it would be difficult for neighbours to assess the proposal's impact on their property.

### **SETBACKS**

- Side boundary setbacks are very small relative to the height and nature of the proposed 'tower'. (The proposed building being 2 levels of carparking plus 5 levels of apartments, quite close to the boundary.)
- Boundary setbacks are not dimensioned, and appear to be minimal. The distance from many balconies to the side boundary, as scaled from the plans, is little more than 2 metres.
- The small side setbacks raise questions of privacy (re the existing apartments on Elizabeth Street, in particular) and overshadowing (Elizabeth Street and Tasma Street). Does the commercial nature of the zone mean that these impacts must be accepted?
- The small setbacks also raise questions about the possible effects on the amenity of the proposed apartments of any future multi-storey development on an abutting property. Is this something that should concern Council?

### **BUILT FORM**

- The height of the main bulk of building at the Burnett Street frontage is approximately 17m (not significantly more than the Acceptable Solution of 15m), although the height increases to approximately 21m at the southern boundary due to the fall in site levels of approximately 3 to 3.5m.
- Longer views to the site (including from the Glebe and from Church Street) as demonstrated during the meeting, raised some concerns.
- 'Slab-like' appearance from longer views, eg from Glebe.
- The 'articulation' (visual breaking-down of apparent mass by modelling, roof form, shadows, colours, textures, materials, etc) was discussed.

### **TRANSITION**

- Concern re the abrupt 'transition' to the much lower buildings on Elizabeth Street and Tasma Street.

**URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL  
MINUTES  
15/08/2018**

- Also concerns re the effect on the amenity of the residential parts of those properties.
- A change to the roof line could help improve the transition to adjacent buildings.
- Proposed location of heat pumps was clarified (none on roof)
- Elizabeth Street infill building considered to be too high in relation to its neighbours on that street.

**LANDSCAPING**

- Critical to the survival of this the proposed planting will be plant species selection, adequate waterproofing and drainage, light weight soil and provision of regular water supply - from collected onsite tank water?
- The terrace and raised gardens adjacent the lift and stairs may never receive sun.