

1 KNOPWOOD ST, BATTERY POINT – PLN-21-719 Revised plans of 23<sup>rd</sup> Sept 2022. Submission to City Planning Committee R Rex 24 10 22.

I do not believe the current revised plans meets planning scheme guidelines and should be refused for the following reasons.

1. The proposal does not meet the acceptable solution or the performance criteria with respect to clause E13.8.2A1 or P1 of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 because the design and setting of the buildings results in detriment to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct as described in Table E13.2.

The objective of E13.8.2 is “To ensure that the development undertaken within a heritage precinct is sympathetic to the character of the precinct.” Clause E13.8.2P1 states: “The design and siting of the buildings must not result in detriment to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct, as listed in Table E13.2.

DETRIMENT is “damage or loss to such values or thing.”

The original proposal and amended will introduce a bulky and out of scale set of two buildings that are of a design, height and scale that will overpower properties in Battery Point such as 9 – 21 James Street, 105 – 111 Hampden Road and 5 Knopwood Street (Preachers) and will result in detriment to the significance of the Battery Point Heritage Precinct, BP1.

2. The proposal does not meet the acceptable solution or the performance criterion with respect to clause E13.8.4A1 of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 because the site area per dwelling of the proposed detracts from the pattern of development that is characteristic of the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct in the vicinity of the site as describer in Table E13.2.

Clause E13.8.4P1 states: Site area per dwelling may be less if the development does not detract from the pattern of development that is a characteristic of the cultural heritage significance of the precinct in the vicinity of the site.

The site area per dwelling is ABOUT 58 Square meters and therefore it does not satisfy the Acceptable Solution and must be assessed against the above clause.

The pattern of development that is at a characteristic of the cultural heritage significance of the precinct in the vicinity of the site, is large substantial homes (eg Narryna at 103 Hampden Road) and small workers cottages (eg. the terraces at 105 – 111 Hampden Road) as well as Colonial Georgian cottages to Victorian (eg 13 – 15 and 17 -21 James Street) as well as post war examples of single and attached small houses.

While there are larger developments opposite, they are not in and do not represent the character of Battery Point historic precinct.

This proposal clearly detracts from the historic pattern of development in the block bounded by Knopwood, Montpeliers, Hampden Road and James Street and the area to the East where the mix of larger substantial homes and smaller worker cottages continues.

The Proposal does not satisfy E13.8.4P1

3. The proposal does not meet the acceptable solution or the performance criterion with respect to clause E13.8.4A3 or P3 of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 because the building height is obtrusive in the streetscape and detracts from the pattern of development that is characteristic of the precinct in the vicinity of the site as described in Table E13.2.

Clause E13.8.4 P3 states:

“The height of development must neither be obtrusive in the streetscape nor detract from the pattern of development that is a characteristic of the cultural heritage significance of the precinct in the vicinity of the site.”

The objective states: “To ensure development undertaken within a heritage precinct is sympathetic to the character of the precinct”.

Preachers has a height of 4.4 meters (James St height) and 9 – 11 James Street a Street front height of 3.8 meters. The maximum height of 13 – 21 James Street at street frontage is 6.1 meters and 9 – 11 James Street 3.8 meters.

The buildings 105 – 111 Hampden Road have a street height of 3.0 to 3.8 meters.

The proposed development building number 2 has a Street height in James Street of 9.7 meters plus landscaping of 0.8 meters for a total height of 10.5 meters and a height of 10.8 meters at the Preachers junction with landscaping making a total height of 11.6 meters. The proposed development has a solid street frontage of 24 meters to James Street.

The current highest development in the block bounded by Hampden Road, James Street, Knopwood Street and Montpelier Retreat is Portsea Terrace with a Street front height ranging from 6.6 to 7.8 meters.

This particular building is an inviting property characteristic of the Victorian Era.

This development is OBTRUSIVE to the streetscape and DETRACTS from the pattern of development that is a characteristic of the area.

Very clearly clause E13.8.4P3 is not satisfied.

4. Clause E13.8.4P3 states:

“The building must not detract from the pattern of development that is a characteristic of the cultural heritage significance of the Precinct in the vicinity of the site”.

The site coverage exceeds 40% and the height of both proposed buildings are far greater than those in the precinct in the vicinity.

Portsea Terraces are the tallest buildings in this block – two stories (Street height of 6.3 to 7.8 meters). The proposal will dominate and detract from buildings in the Battery Point heritage precinct and therefore cause detriment.

The proximity of buildings of a traditional type and out of keeping of scale creates a visual detriment.

This is regardless of the cladding or fenestration patterns of the proposal.

The proposal DOES NOT satisfy E13.8.2P1, E13.8.4P1, E13.8.4P4 and E13.8.4P6.

The Urban Design Advisory Panel made the following comment.

The Panel noted the property is an important entry to the Battery Point Heritage Precinct and as such should reflect the Battery Point townscape scale and character, not simply dealing with the Knopwood Street and Kirtsway Place junction.

The Panel felt that the projected view coming up Montpelier Retreat would not readily infer that there is a heritage precinct starting at that point.

It is at odds with the precinct to have something of this bulk and height as the gateway to the heritage precinct.

REPEAT: The proposal does not comply with the performance criteria E13.8.2P1, E13.8.4P1, E13.8.4P3, and E13.8.4P6.

The proposal should be refused on this basis.

#### OVERSHADOWING

Take a story off along the edge to 9 James Street to reduce overshadowing. Alternatively, reduce the 3BR +3BA to a 2BR + 2BA to facilitate a setback and reduce overshadowing.

The proposed development has no top story setback unlike on the Morris Nunn proposal which had setback.

Furthermore, this proposal has a .5-meter overhang (TP204) which reduces the boundary setback from the ground level 1.8 meters to 1.3 meters. (The Morris Nunn proposal had asset-back!!!)

How much more does the developer make from a 3 BR to a 2 BR.

TP201 shows a three-story structure but TP101 shows ground level but TP 101(ground level) and with TP102, TP103 and TP104 makes four story??

Does this mean that the ground floor is basically below ground level in James Street?

It appears that the height of the proposed development at the corner of Montpelier Retreat and Knopwood Street is 18 meters and compared to Portsea Terrace which is 7.8 meters.

Talk about out of character with the area!!!!

#### IN SUMMARY

The amended proposal does not meet the objectives of E13.8.2 of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 which is that “the design and siting of the buildings MUST NOT result in detriment to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct”.

This proposal introduces bulky and out of scale buildings that will overpower existing properties in Battery Point.

The amended proposal does not meet the acceptable solution or the performance criterion with respect to clause E13.8.4A3 or P3 of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015.

Clause E13.8.4P3 states “The height of the development MUST neither be obtrusive in the streetscape NOR detract from the pattern of development that is a characteristic of the cultural heritage significance of the precinct in the vicinity of the site”.

I detail herewith the heights to guttering in the vicinity to footpath level.

9 – 11 James Street (Adjacent to site).	3.8 meters
13 – 21 James Street (Five 2 story dwellings).	6.1 meters
105 – 111 Hampden Road (4 single story dwellings).	3.0 – 3.8 meters
Portsea Terrace (highest current buildings in block)	6.6 – 7.8 meters
The current proposal of building one has a height	12 – 15 meters
The current proposal of building two has a height	9.7 – 10.8

meters plus landscaping of 0.8 meters making a total 10.5 – 11.6 meters.

So, the height is obtrusive, (from double to 3 times) and out of character.

It is unsympathetic to the character of the precinct.

The proposal would dominate and detract and therefore causes detriment.

The proposal is out of keeping with the traditional style of the area, out of scale as per above and a visual detriment.

For the walkway to the Battery Point precinct it would be an eyesore.

The proposal does not comply with the performance criteria E13.8.2P1, E13.8.4P1, E13.8.4P3 and E13.8.4P6 and should be rejected for these reasons.

These criteria are not my criteria they are your criteria and they need to be adhered to by us all under guidance of the City Planning Committee.

A development there needs to be but it needs to be sympathetic to the area in height, bulk structure.

In general Battery Point is a village atmosphere and it is not a place for big buildings.

This is not in the Sullivans Cove precinct.

Of additional concern is the excavation of the site into dolerite or bluestone that will send shock waves to the surrounding National trust heritage buildings with just sandstone foundations. Eg Narryna

The height of these structures will create a lack of light and sunlight to the surrounding properties.