



CITY OF HOBART

MINUTES ATTACHMENTS

CITY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

OPEN PORTION OF THE MEETING

TUESDAY, 15 JUNE 2021

AT 5:00 PM

VENUE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7.1.2	98 Argyle Street, Hobart and Adjacent Road Reserve - Demolition and New Building for 20 Multiple Dwellings	
A.	Wayne Priddle - Deputation Supporting Information - 98 Argyle Street.....	2
B.	Bevan Rees - Deputation Supporting Information - 98 Argyle Street.....	8

Deputation to HCC Planning Committee 15.06.2021

98 Argyle Street PLN -20-706

Good evening

would be

This development ~~is~~^{is} the first building in the zone to increase the height to 19.8 meters (6 floors) and sets an unacceptable precedent. The majority of the 223 objections highlight this key issue.

In addition, the design and bulk of the development is not compatible or harmonious with adjacent and nearby buildings.

The remainder of the site (the former Lexus showroom) will most likely be further developed with an equally high, bulky and incompatible building if a precedent is set.

Approval is being sought and recommended by the Council Planning Officer using discretionary provisions. Approval will be flawed and not be consistent with the discretions permitted under the Planning Scheme. Discretions are permitted for amendments to developments which substantively comply with the Planning Scheme.

This development does not substantively comply with the Planning Scheme. Neither the developer nor the Planning Officer have made an adequate case for approval using discretionary provisions. It

①

must therefore be rejected. If approved the approval will change the Planning Scheme and is therefore outside the scope of the discretionary provisions.

Existing buildings in the area conform with the Planning Scheme. For example residential units at 40 Brisbane Street conform with the height, bulk and design requirements of the Planning Scheme including open communal space. In order to achieve this, 1 bedroom units are included in the mix of units.

This development does not include any 1 bedroom units even though single people comprise a significant and growing percentage of the housing market. The height and bulk of the development could be reduced by including 1 bedroom units.

The development will have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity for current and future residents in the precinct.

— (Show  Pic~~s~~ on screen here).

Units in the development facing Brisbane Lane will have direct lines of sight into units at 40 Brisbane Street including bedrooms.

Similarly, these units will have direct lines of sight into units in the development facing Brisbane Lane.

2

The development does not include any measures to protect privacy through screens or balconies which are set at an angle away from these direct lines of sight.

pic
2 A key element of residential amenity is visual quality of outlook. The development does not respect the transition of buildings from the core CBD to the historic Domain and Penitentiary zone. It will overwhelm the nationally significant Penitentiary Clock Tower which is the defining element of the transitional zone. It will also overwhelm the Fire Brigade Buildings on the opposite side.

The Planning Officer's claim that 'the development's impact on the streetscape is not considered likely to be so detrimental to the streetscape as to warrant a refusal of the application' is an outrageous claim and unjustifiable. (page 26)
ol 67

The development will block lines of sight in the zone and significantly degrade the streetscape. Recent buildings including the new Fire Brigade Building on the corner of Argyle and Melville Streets respect the key elements in this zone and enhance the streetscape. Any development at 98 Argyle Street should do likewise.

The development itself does not meet acceptable community standards for residential amenity with inadequate and poor quality open space for residents. Balcony space is far too small and


3

unsuitable for families with young children especially the narrow spaces on the sides of the development. Advice from the Urban Design Advisory Panel recommended design changes but their advice has not been incorporated in the final application.

Approval of this development would not, in my opinion, satisfy scrutiny of legal or Tribunal proceedings for the reasons I have briefly outlined. It certainly would not pass the "pub test". ~~Approval would be considered to have an appalling stench surrounding it and I would like to think that you have more integrity than that to make better decisions. I~~ urge you to reject it.

Only a development of 3 floors maximum (same height as the Hutchinson' building next door) should be approved. 3 floors maximum is compatible with the height, scale and design of the adjacent and surrounding buildings. Such a building would respect the high heritage values of the buildings in the transitional zone and retain the essential residential amenity of the area for current and future residential buildings.

Thank you.

 15.06.2021
Wayne Priddle
11/40-42 Brisbane St
Hobart Tasmania 7000







98 ARGYLE STREET, HOBART – PLN-20-706
DEPUTATION TO CITY PLANNING COMMITTEE 15 JUNE 2021



The Argyle Street streetscape between Melville and Brisbane Streets is a significant part of the recognised community valued character of Hobart. This streetscape's unique character results from an eclectic collection of buildings. On the east side, a unique material homogeneity embodying the heritage listed 1925 Hobart Fire Station. By contrast, on the west side a building diversity; the heritage listed 1844 Ocean Child Hotel, two 1860s cottages of single and two storey, Minty's c1950 three storey glass curtain wall building, and a single storey contemporary corner showroom. This eclectic streetscape collection evidences over 200 years of urban form evolution, but significantly achieves coherence through the building heights being a maximum of three stories.

The proposal at 98 Argyle Street is for a six storey (19.6 m high) building hard to the street alignment on both the Argyle and Brisbane Lane streetscape frontages. At six storeys the building is not compatible with the scale of nearby buildings. It is twice the height of the adjacent Minty's building (9.6m high). There are no buildings exceeding three storeys within 100 metres of the site. Further, the design does not allow for any transition in height between adjoining buildings.

This proposed height of 19.6m exceeds that of 18.0m, the maximum height recommended by Leigh Woolley and the City of Hobart's professional planning staff. Leigh Woolley's recommendations for building heights emerge from his careful reading of the city's relationship to its distinctive surrounding landforms. Landform is not the main issue in relation to height in this case. The main relevant determinant of architectural form is height in contextual relationship to townscape, streetscape and existing built form.

The application and assessment documents provide little or no analysis and opinion in relation to townscape, and particularly not in relation to the Argyle streetscape. The architect drawings do not assist and the architect statement limits comment to the proposal being "**at appropriate scale with the streetscape.**" There is no evidence that the architect has explored other urban form options. The ERA Planning report makes little streetscape mention, containing two irrelevant streetscape photographs, these being of Melville Street a full block away, around the corner.

This deficiency and shortfall in documentation is raised by the Urban Design Advisory Panel who note that ***"details of the proposal in relation to scale and relationship with adjoining buildings was requested at the pre-application meeting but were not provided."*** They go on to note that ***"this would have been beneficial to assessment of the building within the streetscape context, and the amenity of the narrow private open space to apartments on the side facade."***

The design assessment role of the Urban Design Advisory Panel requires that they normally consider

- The quality of the architecture and its contextual relationship to Hobart
- The relationship of the proposed development to street, public spaces and adjacent buildings and to the character of surrounding areas

In their summation the Panel ***"expressed some misgivings regarding the proposal"*** and have also expressed a ***"desire for changes to be made to the proposed design"***, but they have ***"stopped short of recommending that Council refuse the application"***.

The decision of planning officers and the Urban Design Advisory Panel has been hampered by the application documentation deficiency and shortfall in relationship of the proposed development to street, public spaces and adjacent buildings and to the character of surrounding area. In this light their decision to recommend approval must be questioned.

In the interest of the character of Hobart, the application should be refused.