

URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL

REPORT

TUESDAY 7 SEPTEMBER 2021

1. **169-173 Campbell Street, 175 Campbell Street, 177 Campbell Street and 179 Campbell Street – PLN-21-471**

Attending: Peter Walker – Cumulus
Dean Coleman – Solutions Won Group Pty Ltd (via Teams)

The Panel met to discuss the proposal in detail and the advice below is provided for the consideration of the proponents and officers.

Description:

The site comprises three addresses located over four titles – 175 Campbell Street, 177 Campbell Street and 179 Campbell Street. The proposal is for the retention of the brick buildings at the front of 177 and 179 Campbell Street, demolition of the building at 175 Campbell Street, and the construction of interconnected residential buildings of 34 dwellings. The buildings features varying heights from three to six storeys, extending to a maximum height of 25.210m at the rear of the site. The overall development contains a basement car park level, commercial tenancies, a large central courtyard, 13 two-bedroom apartments, 9 three-bedroom apartments, 4 three-bedroom 'skyhomes' and 2 three bedroom townhouses and 6 two bedroom townhouses all with varying private open space areas.

More specifically the proposal includes:

- Retention of the two existing heritage listed buildings sited at the front of 177 and 179 Campbell Street. Use of these buildings are to be for café and consulting rooms respectively. These properties are listed in the planning scheme but not with the Tasmanian Heritage Council.
- Demolition of the non-heritage listed building at 175 Campbell Street.
- Basement Level: One level of car parking, accessed from Campbell Street. The basement will contain 37 car parks, waste and apartment storage.
- Ground Level: The ground level will comprise of two commercial tenancies with shopfront glazing accessible from Campbell Street and an internal walkway. A large internal courtyard and the lower level of the 5 two bedroom townhouses, a three bedroom apartment and 2 two bedroom apartments.
- Level 1: Upper level of the 5 two bedroom townhouses, a two-bedroom apartment, three town houses and 4 three bedroom apartments.

- Level 2: Upper level of the 3 townhouses, upper level of the 4 three-bedroom apartments and 4 additional apartments.
- Level 3: 7 two bedroom apartments and upper of level three-bedroom apartment
- Level 4: Communal Rooftop Terrace, four sky homes and 3 three apartments
- Level 5 – Upper level of the 4 skyhomes and the 3 three apartments plus plant, roof structure and lift overruns.
- Total apartments: 34
- The design features a ‘saw tooth’ roof taking inspiration from neighbouring warehouse roof forms and to provide an articulated form against the skyline.
- The key material is a ceramic tile/ brick in a mix of terracotta and grey tones with inclusion off form concrete, metal vertical batten screening and two polycarbonate seams for the lift/stairwell circulation areas.
- The proposal includes removal of a tree in the Brooker road reservation and additional planting

REPORT:

A previous early stage of the development, essentially a massing version, came before the Panel for pre-application advice at its meeting on the 28 April 2021. The Panel was broadly not supportive of that proposal, especially with regards to the impact on adjacent properties and the pattern this development would establish in exceeding the current Scheme requirements.

The proponent has developed the scheme further, particularly the architectural expression. The Panel appreciate the opportunity to review the proposal again and note the review was undertaken as a Pre-Application review. The proponent has provided 2 versions; one an original Development Application which the Panel were advised has been withdrawn, and another version which removed a level to reduce height of the proposal and other adjustments. The proponent spoke to both versions and the Panel has considered both in its review.

The Panel note the proposal substantially exceeds the current Scheme’s height requirements, and if required to comment on height in a formal Development Application review, the Panel would recommend refusal on the height of the proposal. The Panel acknowledge the precinct warrants a review of Scheme requirements and an increased density, especially for housing, is appropriate. Consistent with previous advice (April 2021), the Panel seek urban analysis on the appropriateness of exceeding the current Scheme requirements and the pattern this establishes for future development.

The proponents provided their research and analysis on the broader urban context to support this development. The Panel appreciated this work, though noted some

deficiencies which if addressed, should further assist the development approach, such as an increased appreciation of the original landform and how the heritage buildings on the site relate to this. The Panel would have liked to see more rigour in the analysis of the increased density pattern this proposal establishes in relation to the impact on and from adjacent sites.

The Panel remain concerned by the precedent established by the pattern which would be as a result of 'first in, best dressed' rather than as a proposal addressing amenity issues influenced by a precinct plan. The Panel is concerned that the width of the lots in the area would generate a typology that, if developed to similar height and bulk, will progressively overshadow each neighbouring lot. The Panel appreciated the proponents reason for introducing a varied roofline, to reflect the industrial buildings' roof-lights nearby, though felt they were being used as an architectural expression and could have assisted more in reducing the height adjacent to neighbours to allow more sunlight on adjoining properties.

The panel noted that while the proposal needs to be compatible with nearby buildings, it does not need to match.

The Panel noted that the proposal did seem to be addressing the Campbell Street streetscape by reducing the height. The Panel felt that the street frontage could maintain the form in the higher of the two versions shown, given the relationship to the existing buildings on the opposite side of Campbell Street. However, the Panel were also of the opinion that massing impacts are more significant to the neighbouring properties than tinkering with the streetscape. The panel raised the issue of bulk not just height, noting that height should be an outcome of location and form.

The Panel noted the heritage constraints of the site and appreciate the Council's heritage officer's assessment is based on the Scheme's requirement for new development to be "subservient" to the heritage properties. The Panel also felt that the treatment of the heritage buildings on site likely impacted the design in a detrimental way, leaving a building behind that was trying not to be tall. The Panel questioned whether the amended plans neither provided a "subservient" relationship to the heritage buildings, nor provided a rationale for a considered design solution in respect of the Scheme's requirement for a subservient relationship. The Panel felt there is more opportunity in addressing the relationship between the heritage buildings set down low from the street, and their relationship to the original landform including the former rivulet along its Brooker Highway edge, the subsequent pattern of development through infill of the Brooker Highway, and more recent and likely future development in the precinct.

The Panel notes a number of technical issues that are unresolved that may have future impact on urban design considerations. It is suggested that landscape architectural input is concurrent with hydraulic engineering and architectural design to provide for more nuanced site design solutions. These include the work associated with the storm-water drainage, provision of a pedestrian connection to the highway to improve informal surveillance both along the Brooker as well as within the lower areas of the site and the Panel noting the apparent lift-only access from the lower level car-parking to the ground floor,.

On a strict interpretation of the planning scheme provisions for height and heritage, the Panel concluded that the proposal does not comply. While there are meritorious elements of the proposal, overall they are not yet so significant as to warrant supporting the proposal, notwithstanding the non-compliance with the scheme.

URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL

REPORT

WEDNESDAY 28 APRIL 2021
LADY OSBORNE ROOM

2. 175-179 CAMPBELL STREET – PRE-APPLICATION

Attending: Dean Coleman – Solutions Won Group Pty Ltd (via teams)
Matthew Clark – JMG Engineers & Planners
Peter Walker – Cumulus Studios
Andrew Foster – Cumulus Studios

Description:

The proposal is to retain the two existing buildings at 177 and 179 Campbell Street, demolish the existing building on 175 Campbell Street, and construct 35 new dwellings across the three properties.

The proposal appears to comprise the following:

- Change of use of the existing buildings at 177 and 179 Campbell Street to commercial/retail.
- A new three-storey building behind the existing buildings at 177 to 179 Campbell St for four dwellings.
- A new three-storey building to the south of the existing buildings at 177 to 179 Campbell St, in the location of the current 175 Campbell Street, for commercial/retail on the ground floor, and four houses above.
- A new five storey building along the rear and partially the southern side boundary for the remaining 27 dwellings.

The proposal appears to be at an early stage of development, and specific details regarding height and materials are not provided.

Comments:

The site is 175, 177 and 179 Campbell Street, located on the north-eastern side of Campbell Street, between Campbell Street and Brooker Avenue. The site is located within the Urban Mixed Use Zone. The site is in the area of archaeological potential. In addition, 177 and 179 Campbell Street are heritage listed in the Hobart Interim

Planning Scheme 2015, but not with the Tasmanian Heritage Council. The site is not in a heritage precinct.

The site is adjacent to potentially contaminated sites, and is subject to the Attenuation Code (the code applies because the site is within 200m of a late night music venue). The site is within the area controlled by the Royal Hobart Hospital Specific Area Plan which requires buildings in the Inner Area to be no higher than 64.5m AHD. The site is also flood prone. There are no other relevant overlays.

The Panel wishes to note that the comments reflect the early nature of the proposal and are appreciative of the opportunity to comment at this stage.

The Panel notes the proposal has considered some contextual connections to Campbell Street, but considers that the proposal needs to consider the context well beyond the immediate streetscape. For example, more needs to be shown about the way it addresses and is viewed from the Glebe. The Panel would like to see an accurate long section taken through the site and acknowledging the Glebe and the natural rise toward Trinity Hill.

The Panel would like to see more planting on the proposed site with respect to the Brooker Avenue. They felt concern that there was a reliance on screening from trees on a public nature strip that have limited life span left. The Panel also reiterated comment on the previous proposal regarding concerns with parking on the lowest level needing to be set back to preserve trees on the public space alongside the Brooker Avenue.

The proposed front fence was presented with very limited information, alluding to an arbour screen. The Panel were therefore unable to provide specific comment on this aspect in particular, though did not discount its validity with further design rigour, including its siting relevant to the two heritage buildings and the new buildings. The panel did however discuss the need to ensure that any street frontage treatment not be to the detriment of the scale and sociability of the street as both public space and neighbourhood.

The early design proposal features a pixilation effect to break down the scale of the proposed massing. Whilst recognising the design skill demonstrated in its early stages on the façade treatment, the Panel were unanimous in seeking a more thorough analysis of and considered urban design response to the broader context. The proposed form needs to be considered in the scale of the urban precinct within the city, not just the relationships at a site or street scale. This is particularly the case given the height / massing to the southern edge of the property and the precedent this sets for adjoining properties.

The Panel found it difficult to comment on the proposal in the absence of a precinct plan. In seeking to make this a different scale of development to its surrounds, the Panel notes the proposal must achieve a high quality result and be rigorously tested to achieve a positive outcome to what could be a leader to further larger development in this precinct.