

Application Referral Cultural Heritage - Response

From:	Nick Booth
Recommendation:	Proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.
Date Completed:	
Address:	73 A NEW TOWN ROAD, NEW TOWN ADJACENT ROAD RESERVE
Proposal:	Demolition, 22 Multiple Dwellings, Front Fencing, and Associated Works
Application No:	PLN-22-282
Assessment Officer:	Michael McClenahan,

Referral Officer comments:

This application relates to 73a New Town Road, better known as the previous site of the 'New Town Catholic Tennis Club'. At present the site contains the remnants of two tennis courts including floodlights, along with ancillary buildings associated with its former operation, in this instance a club house and a storage shed. The proposal seeks the demolition of these buildings and the last remnants of the courts to facilitate the erection of a 3 storey residential development providing 22 dwellings with associated car parking, car maneuvering space, vehicular access ramp to Sunnyside Street and pedestrian access to New Town Road and Paviour Street, privacy boundary treatments, landscaping and shared community space within the site.

The site is not individually heritage listed but does form part of the Paviour Street Heritage Precinct (NT10) as set out in the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

This precinct is made up of properties on a section of the north side of New Town Road and those within Paviour Street. It is identified in Table E13.2 as being significant for reasons including:

- 1. The collections of largely intact Federation Bungalow and Federation Queen Anne residences contribute to the understanding of the pattern of development within New Town.*
- 2. A general uniformity of form, scale and orientation, together with a distinctive late nineteenth century/early twentieth century subdivision pattern, has created a consistent and strong streetscape.*

Representations

In total, some 31 representations have been received in the course of the consultation stage of the proposal, all of whom object to the development on various grounds. In relation to issues dealing specifically with heritage, these can be summarised and commented upon as follows-

- a) The proposal does not comply with various aspects of the 'Design criteria/Conservation policy' HOB-C6.2.8.11 which deals with the Paviour Street Heritage Precinct (NT10).

Response – It should be noted that the 'Design criteria/Conservation policy' HOB-C6.2.8.11, whilst displayed on the Councils website, is described as being intended to form part of C6.0 Heritage Code of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme State Planning Provision when the Statewide plan is formally adopted. As such, prior to the introduction of the Statewide Scheme,

HOB-C6.2.8.11 carries no weight in the consideration of applications under the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

- b) The proposal, as a high density development, is not in character with the low density of the heritage precinct.

Response – The density of development is not described as a characteristic of the Precinct and is not considered to be a heritage consideration in this instance.

- c) The proposed development, due to its height, bulk and modernist design is not sympathetic to the single storey scale or architectural style of the heritage precinct.

Response - The appropriateness of the style, scale, height and design with regard to the Heritage Precinct are discussed in the main body of this report.

- d) The proposed materials, such as Colorbond cladding and precast concrete are appropriate more to warehouses and factories than to dwellings and would not reflect the use of brick and weatherboard within the heritage precinct.

Response - The appropriateness of the proposed cladding materials with regard to the character of the Heritage Precinct are discussed within the main body of the report.

Paviour Heritage Precinct

It is noted that the site has an interesting physical and social history. The land formed part of a later addition to the early 'Belle Vue' Estate of prominent early European settler and influential merchant and sea captain, John Bell (1790-1841). Its distinctive form was created due to it being quarried for sandstone in association with works of improvement to the nearby New Town Road in the 1840's, which at the time had a reputation for flooding and required stone and rubble to create a solid base over the then marshy land. The land then remained largely unaltered and unused given its poor viability to provide an arable or residential use whilst the surrounding land was increasingly sub-divided and developed into the present street and townscape of today. In the late 1920's however, it was purchased and a small tennis club established, becoming the 'New Town Catholic Tennis Club' in the 1930's which operated continually on the site until relatively recently.

Notwithstanding the above however, it is notable that the site has not been considered for individual heritage listing either at the City or State level and is not specifically mentioned or remarked upon within the above identified characteristics of significance that contribute to the historic cultural heritage values of the Paviour Street Heritage Precinct. As these stated characteristics relate to the residential development of New Town, specifically the architectural style and conformity of the built form and the clear pattern of sub-divisions in terms of the associated streetscape qualities, it is considered that the site exhibits none of the above. It can therefore be argued that its principal contribution is merely to play a natural role within the wider Heritage Precinct, which it successfully does by virtue of the fact that it sits behind the surrounding built form, is set at a lower level to the surrounding streetscapes and contains only minor buildings of the small club house and storage shed. Indeed, it is noted that from the public realm, whilst some limited views of the site are afforded from Sunnyside Road which overlooks the site, from New Town Road and Paviour Street, the only visual evidence of the site is the very tops of the floodlighting polls and the vegetation that has grown up around the site.

Nonetheless, the site falls within the Paviour Street Heritage Precinct, and as such is subject to the relevant heritage policies. In this instance, these are considered to be –

E13.8.1 Demolition

Objective:

To ensure that demolition in whole or in part of buildings or works within a heritage precinct does not result in the loss of historic cultural heritage values unless there are exceptional circumstances.

Performance Criteria 1

Demolition must not result in the loss of any of the following:

(a) buildings or works that contribute to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct;

(b) fabric or landscape elements, including plants, trees, fences, paths, outbuildings and other items, that contribute to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct;

unless all of the following apply;

(i) there are, environmental, social, economic or safety reasons of greater value to the community than the historic cultural heritage values of the place;

(ii) there are no prudent or feasible alternatives;

(iii) opportunity is created for a replacement building that will be more complementary to the heritage values of the precinct.

E13.8.2 Buildings and Works other than Demolition

Objective:

To ensure that development undertaken within a heritage precinct is sympathetic to the character of the precinct.

Performance Criteria 1

Design and siting of buildings and works must not result in detriment to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct, as listed in Table E13.2.

Performance Criteria 4

New front fences and gates must be sympathetic in design, (including height, form, scale and materials), and setback to the style, period and characteristics of the precinct.

Demolition

Based on the above, it is considered that the site and the buildings associated with its former use of the site as a Tennis Club do not to play an active positive role within the Heritage Precinct. Whilst the proposal would remove what could be viewed as buildings that have played a notable social role within the community of New Town, along with small elements of established trees and shrubs to the boundaries of Sunnyside and Paviour Streets, it is considered that these elements play a neutral role and do not make an active positive contribute to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct as described above. As such it is considered that the proposed demolition would not result in the loss of historic cultural heritage values of the wider Precinct and would therefore comply with Performance Criteria 1 of E13.8.1 'Demolition'.

Proposed Development

The proposal, by virtue of its size, associated vehicular access, parking and elements of landscaping would represent a significant increase in the built form of the site. In all considerations of impact to the visual impact of proposals upon the cultural characteristics of Heritage Precincts however, the degree to which works and the final built form would be visible from the public realm is paramount. In this instance, the site and the proposed development would be visible within the public realm from three distinct areas; from the roadside of New Town Road; from the roadside of Paviour Street and from the roadside of Sunnyside Street.



View of subject site from Sunnyside Road. Source: Council image



View of subject site from Sunnyside Road. Source: Council image

Taking each in turn, with regard to New Town Road, due to the existing built form of single storey residential properties set reasonable close to each other, views through to the site are markedly reduced. However, despite the proposal sitting within a former quarry and thus low within the immediate landscape, due to its three storey height, the upper elements of proposed buildings would be partially visible from the public realm, especially through the gaps between the existing houses on New Town Road. However, it is acknowledged that the development would be viewed against the context of residential properties that occupy the higher ground of Paviour Street and Swanston Street, primarily in the form of roof slopes and typical residential features such as chimneys and mature trees within garden settings. In response, the proposed development has adopted a contemporary interpretation of a traditional roof form interspersed by flat roofed alternatively coloured finished parts, breaking up the visual appearance of the built form, or at least in a superficial way, into a regular pattern of distinct elements. This has the result from New Town Road of making the proposed development appear more reflective of the surrounding townscape than its scale would suggest. Given also that it would sit at some distance back from the existing built form of New Town Road, and would read as a separate element of townscape to these existing residential properties, it is considered that it would appear as a relatively sympathetic addition to the townscape and would not detract from the character of the Heritage Precinct.

With regard to views from the public realm of Paviour Street, again, despite the three storey scale of the proposed development, due to its setting within a former quarry, only the upper parts of the development would be visible. From Paviour Street, although not exclusively, the development would primarily be viewed in the context of views out of the Heritage Precinct, across to Mount Stuart, Lenah Valley and beyond to kunanyi/Mount Wellington. Again, from this location, only the upper parts of the built form would be visible in the public realm, although in this instance it would stand relatively close to the boundary of the site. As stated above, the

proposed development has adopted a contemporary interpretation of a traditional roof form, in this instance a series of gabled elements interspersed by flat roofed, recessed and or alternatively coloured finished parts, which again breaks up the visual appearance of the built form into a regular pattern of distinct roof forms. Whilst not wholly successful in appearing as clearly separate buildings and being far smaller than the actual sub-division pattern of the precinct, nonetheless it does have the impact of breaking up the built form and providing a pleasing articulation. This part of the site would also be enclosed by appropriately scaled paling fencing and provided with new planting that would soften and eventually partially obscure the proposed built form. As such, it is considered that from Paviour Street, it would appear as a relatively sympathetic addition to the townscape given its scale and would not detract from the character of the Heritage Precinct. However, it is acknowledged that much would depend on the appropriateness of the proposed materials and their colouration to the roof and upper levels of the development for the proposal to be fully successful.

With regard to the visual impact from Sunnyside Street, it should firstly be noted that the boundary of the Heritage Precinct runs along the boundary of the site and as such, Sunnyside Street does not form part of the Heritage Precinct. Nonetheless, views into Heritage Precincts have been judged to be relevant in the determination of such proposals.

Unlike the other two locations, the proposal would be far more visible from the public realm of Sunnyside Street, due in part to the lack of enclosing built form and that the vehicular access ramp would be from Sunnyside Street. The proposed boundary treatment would be a mixture of 1.8m wooden paling fencing and lower unfinished concrete block containing the individual post boxes for each property. Whilst this fencing would reduce visibility into the interior of the site to a degree, views directly in front of the proposed ramp would provide largely unhindered views across the site, allowing the scale, form and associated land treatment of the development to be fully readable. Indeed, from this location, the general uniformity of the development would be notable. Whilst the use of different colouration of materials successfully breaks up the form from New Town Road, from this perspective it would not have the same impact and any sense of implied articulation of the inward facing elevation of the development would be largely lost. Given that one of the characteristics identified as being significant within the Heritage Precinct is 'A general uniformity of form, scale and orientation together with a distinctive late nineteenth century/early twentieth century subdivision pattern', it is considered that the proposal would clearly not conform to this definition.

With regard to the above, as noted within the representations received, it is the opinion of representors that the proposed development, due to its height, bulk and modernist design is not sympathetic to the single storey scale or architectural style of the heritage precinct. It should be noted that the term 'sympathetic' is not specifically defined within the terms and definitions of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015*. However, it is generally taken that it means to be designed in a sensitive or appropriate way. Whilst each proposal and sites have individual attributes, it generally does not require that development simply replicate all aspects of the existing townscape. It is considered that it could be argued that given the clear discrepancy between the characteristics of the site in its present form, in particular the significant difference in the general ground level between the site and the surrounding Paviour and Sunnyside Street, it would be largely impossible to create a built form that would strictly comply with the characteristics as set out above unless the quarry was effectively infilled. This is coupled with the difficulties in creating a streetscape presence in the form of separate driveways and traditional gardens. It is noted that the proposed design does attempt to respond to the built form and sub-division pattern notwithstanding the physical attributes of the site in a manner that at least shows a sympathetic understanding of the surrounding townscape. It is also noted that from certain positions, it successfully achieves the breaking up of its visual form and provides a sense of articulation. This articulation into a regular pattern responds, if not strictly replicates the residential sub-division of the precinct, and is most notable from New Town Road and Paviour Street, As discussed above, this could also be reduced in impact from Sunnyside Street by an increase in the boundary height facing onto the street.

As stated above, it is considered that the existing buildings and physical attributes of the site does not represent a positive contribution to the character of the Precinct, but rather acts as a neutral component. To state that the proposal does not meet Performance Criteria 1 of E13.8.2, it must be demonstrated that the resulting development would be to the detriment of its historic cultural heritage significance. Given that 'sympathetic' means to be designed in a sensitive or appropriate way and not solely as a direct copy, and that the visual impact of the proposal from the public realm is limited and can be further reduced by way of increasing the boundary treatment in Sunnyside Street, it is considered that whilst finely balanced, the development in principle would broadly comply with the intent of E13.8.2 'Buildings and Works other than Demolition' and would not result in development that could clearly be argued to result in detriment to the historic cultural significance of the precinct. However, it is considered that the colouration of appropriate facing materials would play an important role in allowing the development to sit comfortably within the immediate streetscape.

With regard to the above, it is noted that the development makes significant use of Colorbond sheeting in a variety of colours as its cladding to both roof and walls. Whilst the use of Colorbond to roofs is well established within the precinct, its use as a wall cladding is not. Indeed it is noted that no building within the precinct appears to utilise what is more commonly viewed as a roofing material in such a way, and that front facades all are either constructed in red brick or weatherboard with the occasional use of rendered sheeting to small elements. This has been raised as a matter of concern within the representations received. Similarly, unfinished concrete blocks are generally not used as boundary treatments.

As such, it is considered that the final pallet of external materials, finishes and colours to both the building and boundary treatments should be appropriate and in keeping with those of the surrounding Heritage Precinct. As such, it is considered reasonable to require this finalisation of materials by way of condition to the satisfaction of the Council should planning permission be granted.

Additional Considerations

With regard to the history of the site and its important role in the social history of New Town and the wider Hobart area, it is considered that an opportunity exists to acknowledge and explain its historical background and widen understanding of its role in the development and life of the City. It is considered that this could be undertaken in a number of ways, including interpretation panels, landscaping treatments such as the inclusion of quarried boulders or the choice of the name given to the site. As such, it is therefore considered reasonable to seek by way of condition the inclusion of features that highlight the history of the site at suitable locations within the site to the satisfaction of the Council.

Conclusion

It is considered that given the particular limitations and physicality's of the site, achieving development that strictly accords with the described characteristics of the Paviour Street Heritage Precinct would be difficult to achieve. Nonetheless, the proposal attempts to provide some degree of articulation, rhythm and utilises a contemporary take on the traditional roof forms found within the streetscape. It also proposes the use of landscaping to the Paviour Street boundary to soften its appearance and it is acknowledged that the proposal would be partially obscured from views from the public realm.

Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that the form, scale, cladding materials and the relatively functional treatment to the shared spaces within the site would not wholly reflect the characteristics of the precinct as described. As such, it is considered that the acceptability of the proposal is finely balanced. However, given the individual circumstances of the site, it is considered that subject to a suitable conditions relating to the increase in height of the Sunnyside Street boundary treatment from 1.8 to 2.0m, use of materials more akin to those used within the Precinct, and the inclusion of features that help to explain and widen

understanding of the development and social history of the site, it would be difficult to categorically argue that the proposal would cause detriment to the characteristics of the Precinct to warrant the refusal of the proposal in this instance.

Given the above, it is therefore considered that subject to condition the proposal would comply with Clauses E.13.8.1 P1 and E.13.8.2 P1 and P4 of the HIPS.

Nick Booth
Heritage Officer
18 January 2023

reviewed
SW
SCHO
20 Jan 2023

Application Referral Development Engineering - Response

From:	Stefan Gebka - Development Engineering
Recommendation:	Proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.
Date Completed:	
Address:	73 A NEW TOWN ROAD, NEW TOWN ADJACENT ROAD RESERVE
Proposal:	Demolition, 22 Multiple Dwellings, Front Fencing, and Associated Works
Application No:	PLN-22-282
Assessment Officer:	Michael McClenahan,

Referral Officer comments:

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:

• E5.0 Road and railway access code - DOES APPLY

- Clause E5.5.1 Existing road accesses and junctions - Not Applicable
- Clause E5.5.2: Existing level crossings - Not Applicable
- Clause E5.6.1: Development adjacent to roads and railways - Not Applicable
- Clause E5.6.2: Road accesses and junctions - **Acceptable Solution**
- Clause E5.6.3: New level crossings - Not Applicable
- Clause E5.6.4: Sight distance at accesses, junctions and level crossings - **Performance Criteria**

Criteria

The sight distance at access and junctions must satisfy either Acceptable Solutions or Performance Criteria for each clause of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HIPS 2015)*.

Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date does not comply with the Acceptable Solution; therefore assessment against the Performance Criterion is relied on for clause E5.6.4.

Acceptable solution - A1: - **NOT MET**

Sight distances at:

- (a) an access or junction must comply with the Safe Intersection Sight Distance shown in Table E5.1; and
- (b) rail level crossings must comply with AS1742.7 Manual of uniform traffic control devices - Railway crossings, Standards Association of Australia. - **N/A**

In this case, the required SISD is 80 metres, noting that the vehicle speed has been assumed to be equal to the posted speed limit of 50-km/h.

The available sight distance generally exceeds the required 80 metres except during times when cars are parked adjacent to the site.

Based on the available sight distances exceeding the minimum Planning Scheme requirements except during times when cars are parked adjacent to the site, the

access does not comply with Acceptable Solution A1 of Clause E5.6.4.

Performance Criteria – P1: - MET

The design, layout and location of an access, junction or rail level crossing must provide adequate sight distances to ensure the safe movement of vehicles, having regard to:

(a) the nature and frequency of the traffic generated by the use;

- All traffic generated by the proposed development will be residential in nature.

(b) the frequency of use of the road or rail network;

- Sunnyside Road is a minor collector road that has a relatively low traffic volume near the site. It provides access to a residential catchment that is relatively stable and closed in nature. The general urban speed limit of 50-km/h applies to Sunnyside Road. This speed limit is appropriate for the residential nature of the development.

(c) any alternative access;

- No alternative access is possible for the proposed development.

(d) the need for the access, junction or level crossing;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The current development site has no vehicular access.

The development will create a new vehicular access onto Sunnyside Road, that will be a standard concrete kerb crossover and comply with LGAT standard drawing TSD-R09-V1 for an urban road driveway.

The entry of this vehicular access ramp will be six metres wide and provide for two-way traffic movements through a passing bay layout; the ramp will be designed to accommodate the swept path of B99 vehicles entering and leaving Sunnyside Road, servicing the 12 on-site parking spaces for the tenants."

(e) any traffic impact assessment;

- A Traffic Impact Assessment was submitted.

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The new access off Sunnyside Road will provide for two-way traffic movements and motorists leaving the development site will have available sight distance of 80 metres in both directions, which satisfies the planning scheme requirement for Safe Intersection Sight Distance for a 50 km/h speed limit.

This development will comply with the acceptable solution for Safe Intersection Sight Distance, and motorists will be able to enter Sunnyside Road in a safe manner, without disrupting the current road users."

(f) any measures to improve or maintain sight distance; and

- The available sight distance generally exceeds the required 80 metres except during times when cars are parked adjacent to the site.

"The speed limit along Sunnyside Road is the urban 50 km/h speed limit.

The available sight distance from the proposed development access has been measured on site, and a driver leaving the site has at least 100 metres of sight distance to the left, and 80 metres to the right."

(g) any written advice received from the road or rail authority.

- No written advice was requested by the road authority (Council) relating to the access.

Council's traffic engineer and Development Engineering has concluded based on the documentation submitted to date and given the above assessment, the sight distance is accepted as meeting the *Performance Criteria P1:E5.6.4* of the Planning Scheme.

• **E6.0 Parking and Access Code - DOES APPLY**

- Clause(s) E6.6's: Are all to do with parking number assessment - Performance Criteria
The parking number assessment must satisfy either Acceptable Solutions or Performance Criteria for each clause of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HIPS 2015)*.
Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date does not comply with the Acceptable Solution; therefore assessment against the Performance Criterion is relied on for clause E6.6.1 (a).

Acceptable solution - A1: - **NOT MET: The proposal includes twelve (12x) on-site car parking spaces, which is twenty seven (27x) less than required by Table E6.1.**

The number of on-site car parking spaces must be:

(a) no less than and no greater than the number specified in Table E6.1;

- **Table E6.1 requires: Multiple dwelling containing 1 bedroom or studio (including allrooms capable of being used as a bedroom) = One (1x) on-site car parking space per dwelling.**

- **Table E6.1 requires: Multiple dwelling containing 2 or more bedrooms (including allrooms capable of being used as a bedroom) = Two (2x) on-site car parking space per dwelling.**

- **Table E6.1 requires: 1 dedicated visitor parking space per 4 dwellings (rounded up to the nearest whole number).**

Dwellings (1 bedroom);

A (dwellings) x B (Table E6.1 requirement) = AB car parking spaces

11 (dwellings) x 1 (Table E6.1 requirement) = Eleven (11x) car parking spaces required

and

Dwellings (2 bedroom);

A (dwellings) x C (Table E6.1 requirement) = AC car parking spaces

11 (dwellings) x 2 (Table E6.1 requirement) = Twenty two (22x) car parking spaces required

Visitor;

A (dwellings) divided by D (Table E6.1 requirement) = AD visitor car parking spaces required

22 (dwellings) divided by 4 (Table E6.1 requirement) = 5.5 therefore, rounded up to six (6x) visitor car parking spaces required

A total of thirty nine (39x) car parking spaces required for the development.

Performance Criteria - P1: - **MET**

The number of on-site car parking spaces must be sufficient to meet the reasonable needs of users, having regard to all of the following:

(a) car parking demand;

- **The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;**

"The planning scheme specifies that 38 parking spaces are required for the 22 units. The development is providing 12 on-site parking spaces. As demonstrated in this assessment the parking demand for one and two bedroom social housing units is significantly reduced, the 12 spaces being provided by this development is expected to meet the reasonable demand generated by the tenants."

"Based on the Queensland social housing standard, the proposed New Town site could be considered as site category A, due to the proximity to a high frequency bus route, and local community facilities. Based on this standard, the 22 units could generate a parking demand of 14 spaces."

"In addition to the Queensland standard for social housing, the RTA also has parking standards for high density residential units located in close proximity to a high frequency public transport route, the RTA Guide indicates the following parking requirements.

- 0.6 parking spaces per one bedroom unit*
- 0.9 spaces per two bedroom unit*
- 1.4 spaces per three bedroom unit*
- 1 space per five units (visitor parking)*

Based on the RTA guide, this development could generate a parking demand of 17 parking spaces for the tenants, not including visitor parking."

A substantial number of consultant traffic engineers engaged by developers seek the use of the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) guide as a refuge to justify car parking deficiency against the Planning Scheme. One must remember this is a guide and is not meant to be a standard that is rigidly applied, also the RTA guide should be viewed as a minimum desirable position.

- Council's traffic engineer stated the following;

"I support the TIA's estimated peak parking demand rates calculated from the Queensland social housing standard of 14 spaces. I also support the conclusion that the parking demand does not require the need to satisfy the Planning Scheme requirements as the development is located close to a frequent bus service on New Town Road and the intercity cycleway which accommodates all levels of riders and therefore there are alternate transport options available.

The TIA outlined that 12 of the 14 spaces expected to be generated from the development can be accommodated on-site and the remaining 2 parking spaces can be absorbed within the on-street parking. Usually the preference is that parking demand is contained within the site, however, given a parking survey indicated that there are spaces available on-street and the previous tennis court development was operating without spaces and relied on on-street parking, the shortfall parking could be accommodated on the street without having a negative impact on amenity."

- No objections were notated by the former Senior Development Engineer who was allocated the development for assessment originally and attended pre application discussions.

~~Also no representations were received during the advertising period. Council is unaware of issues with respect to parking within the surrounding area.~~

(b) the availability of on-street and public car parking in the locality;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"A recent parking supply and demand survey of Paviour Street and Sunnyside Road found there is 96 spaces available, within 200 metres of the development site. The patrolled

parking survey found these spaces have a low occupancy rate of less than 20 percent, mainly because the surrounding residential properties have suitable off-street facilities, and along the western side of Paviour Street there is only a few property accesses, as these properties have their access off New Town Road. The survey found there is sufficient supply of on-street parking spaces to meet any overflow or visitor demand likely to be generated by this development. The development site has 70 metres of road frontage, this length of road frontage can accommodate 8 to 10 vehicles, and these vehicles would not adversely impact surrounding properties."

"To evaluate the impact of visitor parking on surrounding properties, it is important to understand the supply and demand for on-street parking spaces along the surrounding streets, that could be used to assist with any visitor parking demand. A parking supply and demand survey was conducted on the two adjacent streets to the development site, Sunnyside Road, and Paviour Street, with the results of the surveys shown in table 5.1. The survey found along the two adjacent streets to the development site, there is sufficient kerb space to accommodate up to 96 parallel parked vehicles. The survey found the demand for these parking spaces to be low, less than 20 percent, based on three patrolled survey times, at 9:00am, 12 noon and 5:00pm (weekday)."

- Council's traffic engineer stated the following;

"Usually the preference is that parking demand is contained within the site, however, given a parking survey indicated that there are spaces available on-street and the previous tennis court development was operating without spaces and relied on on-street parking, the shortfall parking could be accommodated on the street without having a negative impact on amenity."

(c) the availability and frequency of public transport within a 400m walking distance of the site;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"METRO Tasmania runs a high frequency bus service between Glenorchy and Hobart via New Town Road, with a bus operating every ten minutes between 7:00am and 7:00pm, Monday to Friday. With bus stops located within 250 metres of the development site, this provides the unit tenants with a convenient and viable alternative transport mode."

"The development site is located adjacent to a high frequency public transport route, which is very important, as public transport is usually a significant transport mode for social housing tenants, reduces the reliance on private motor vehicles and parking demand. METRO Tasmania runs a high frequency bus service from Hobart to Glenorchy along New Town Road, with a bus operating every ten minutes between 7:00am to 7:00pm, Monday to Friday, every twenty minutes on Saturday, and every thirty minutes on Sunday. A southbound bus stop is located on New Town Road within 50 metres of Sunnyside Road, and a northbound bus stop located within 250 metres. This development site is well positioned to take advantage of the high frequency public bus service, and provides tenants with an accessible, convenient, and viable alternative transport mode."

- Council's traffic engineer stated the following;

"I also support the conclusion that the parking demand does not require the need to satisfy the Planning Scheme requirements as the development is located close to a frequent bus service on New Town Road and the intercity cycleway which accommodates all levels of riders and therefore there are alternate transport options available."

- No objections were notated by the former Senior Development Engineer who was allocated the development for assessment originally.

(d) the availability and likely use of other modes of transport;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The development site is located within three kilometres of the Hobart CBD, and this makes bicycle riding a viable option, particularly with on-road cycle lanes operating along Argyle Street, extending into New Town Road. The intercity cycleway is also located within 1.2 kilometres from the development site, providing a flat and easy cycling path between Hobart and the northern suburbs."

"The development site is located in the vicinity of the intercity shared cycleway, which is an off-road facility that operates between Hobart and the northern suburbs, using the old railway corridor, the route is flat and accommodates riders of all skill levels.

In addition, there are on-road cycle lanes operating along Argyle Street that can be easily accessed from the development site, with these lanes connecting to Hobart.

Overall, the development site is well located to formal cycling facilities, which provides excellent connectivity to both Hobart and Glenorchy, providing a real alternative transport mode, reducing the reliance on private motor vehicles."

- Council's traffic engineer stated the following;

"I also support the conclusion that the parking demand does not require the need to satisfy the Planning Scheme requirements as the development is located close to a frequent bus service on New Town Road and the intercity cycleway which accommodates all levels of riders and therefore there are alternate transport options available."

(e) the availability and suitability of alternative arrangements for car parking provision;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The development is located within an inner residential suburb, there are a range of commercial and retail businesses within walking distance, including a range of medical services, supermarkets, and other community facilities, reducing the need for car ownership."

(f) any reduction in car parking demand due to the sharing of car parking spaces by multiple uses, either because of variation of car parking demand over time or because of efficiencies gained from the consolidation of shared car parking spaces;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"There is evidence provided in section 4 of this assessment that social housing units located in close proximity to a high frequency bus route and community facilities, reduces the car ownership. Based on Queensland Government design standard of new social housing units, the tenants of these one and two bedroom units are expected to generate a parking demand of 14 vehicles."

(g) any car parking deficiency or surplus associated with the existing use of the land;

- Not applicable.

(h) any credit which should be allowed for a car parking demand deemed to have been provided in association with a use which existed before the change of parking requirement, except in the case of substantial redevelopment of a site;

- Not applicable.

(i) the appropriateness of a financial contribution in lieu of parking towards the cost of parking facilities or other transport facilities, where such facilities exist or are planned in the vicinity;

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"No financial contribution is considered necessary, as the level of on-site parking spaces will more than meet the needs of the development, without any adverse impact to the surrounding road network."

(j) any verified prior payment of a financial contribution in lieu of parking for the land;
- **The City's current position is not to support a financial contribution in lieu of parking for developments.**

(k) any relevant parking plan for the area adopted by Council;
- **Not applicable.**

(l) the impact on the historic cultural heritage significance of the site if subject to the Local Heritage Code; and
- **Not applicable.**

(m) whether the provision of the parking would result in the loss, directly or indirectly, of one or more significant trees listed in the Significant Trees Code.
- **No impact.**

Council's traffic engineer and Development Engineering has concluded based on the documentation submitted to date and given the above assessment, the parking provision is accepted as meeting the *Performance Criteria P1:E6.6.1* of the Planning Scheme. This is particularly due to the actual parking demands that will be generated by the development.

- Clause E6.7.1: Number of vehicle accesses - **Acceptable Solution**

- Clause E6.7.2: Design of vehicle accesses - **Performance Criteria**

The design of the vehicle access must satisfy either Acceptable Solutions or Performance Criteria for each clause of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HIPS 2015)*.

Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date does not comply with the Acceptable Solution; therefore assessment against the Performance Criterion is relied on for clause E6.7.2 (a).

Submitted plans indicate 2m x 2.5m sight triangle abutting the driveway (western side) is not kept clear of obstructions to visibility due to proposed ramp wall.

Acceptable Solution - A1: - NOT MET: Sight distance: 2m x 2.5m sight triangle (western side) - This area is to be kept clear of obstructions to visibility and as such, shall be assessed under Performance Criteria.

Design of vehicle access points must comply with all of the following:

(a) in the case of non-commercial vehicle access; the location, sight distance, width and gradient of an access must be designed and constructed to comply with section 3 – "Access Facilities to Off-street Parking Areas and Queuing Areas" of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-street car parking.

Performance Criteria - P1: - MET

Design of vehicle access points must be safe, efficient and convenient, having regard to all of the following:

(a) avoidance of conflicts between users including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians;
- **Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive.**

(b) avoidance of unreasonable interference with the flow of traffic on adjoining roads;
- **Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive.**

(c) suitability for the type and volume of traffic likely to be generated by the use or development;
and

- **Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive.**

(d) ease of accessibility and recognition for users.

- **Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive.**

- **The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;**

"Along the northern side of Sunnyside Road, the existing concrete footpath terminates prior to reaching the development site due to the steep embankment, with no existing footpath along the development site.

The development will provide a new footpath along the northern side of Sunnyside Road, and the new vehicle ramp will cross the new footpath. The design will incorporate a pedestrian sight triangle of 2.5 x 2 metres on the left hand side of the ramp, ensuring suitable sight distance between drivers leaving the ramp and pedestrians approaching on the footpath."

"The development is providing new footpaths where practicable, having consideration to the cutting of the quarry face. A central stairwell is being provided within the development to provide connection between all floors and Pavior Street. There are also stairs connecting the development with Sunnyside Road."

"The current development site has no vehicular access.

The development will create a new vehicular access onto Sunnyside Road, that will be a standard concrete kerb crossover and comply with LGAT standard drawing TSD-R09-V1 for an urban road driveway.

The entry of this vehicular access ramp will be six metres wide and provide for two-way traffic movements through a passing bay layout; the ramp will be designed to accommodate the swept path of B99 vehicles entering and leaving Sunnyside Road, servicing the 12 on-site parking spaces for the tenants."

"The speed limit along Sunnyside Road is the urban 50 km/h speed limit.

The available sight distance from the proposed development access has been measured on site, and a driver leaving the site has at least 100 metres of sight distance to the left, and 80 metres to the right."

"In both directions, the available sight distance is expected to exceed the Safe Intersection Sight Distance prescribed in the planning scheme for a 50 km/h speed limit, and is sufficient for vehicles to enter the road in a safe manner, without causing traffic disruption to current users."

"A new development in urban areas can be concerning to local residents, and it can be difficult to argue that a traffic increase is reasonable. The RTA Guide to Traffic Generating

Developments has considered this matter and provided an environmental performance standard, that can be used to evaluate the likely impact on residential amenity. Table 8.4 is an extract from the RTA Guide and relates to urban environment, providing maximum peak hour goals.

For Sunnyside Road being a local residential street, the maximum peak hour goal is 300 vehicles per peak hour (two-way traffic flow). Combining the current maximum two-way peak hour traffic flow of 80 vehicles, with the expected increase of six vehicles generated by the development, the new two-way peak hour traffic flow is expected to be substantially less than the environmental goal. This indicates that the traffic generated from this development, is not expected to create any adverse amenity impact to the surrounding residential properties."

- No objections were notated by the former Senior Development Engineer who was allocated the development for assessment originally and attended pre application discussions.

Council's traffic engineer and Development Engineering has concluded based on the documentation submitted to date and given the above assessment, the sight lines are accepted as meeting the *Performance Criteria P1:E6.7.2* of the Planning Scheme. Given the location of the access and driveway, and the volume of traffic on the road from which the property gains access.

- Clause E6.7.3: Vehicle passing area along an access - Performance Criteria
Vehicle passing must satisfy either Acceptable Solutions or Performance Criteria for each clause of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HIPS 2015)*.

Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date does not comply with the Acceptable Solution; therefore assessment against the Performance Criterion is relied on for clause E6.7.3.

Acceptable solution - A1: - NOT MET: (ai) and (aia)

Vehicular passing areas must:

(a) be provided if any of the following applies to an access:

(i) it serves more than 5 car parking spaces; - **YES**

(ii) is more than 30 m long; - **YES**

(iii) it meets a road serving more than 6000 vehicles per day; - **N/A**

(b) be 6 m long, 5.5 m wide, and taper to the width of the driveway; - **YES**

(c) have the first passing area constructed at the kerb; - **YES**

(d) be at intervals of no more than 30 m along the access. - **Not feasible**

Performance Criteria - P1: - MET

Vehicular passing areas must be provided in sufficient number, dimension and siting so that the access is safe, efficient and convenient, having regard to all of the following:

(a) avoidance of conflicts between users including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians;

- **Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive.**

(b) avoidance of unreasonable interference with the flow of traffic on adjoining roads;

- **Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive**

(c) suitability for the type and volume of traffic likely to be generated by the use or development;

- Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive

(d) ease of accessibility and recognition for users;

- Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment. Council's traffic engineer is also supportive

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The access ramp will reduce to a single lane as it reaches the ground floor, passing bays will be provided at both ends of the ramp to ensure vehicles can pass efficiently. The passing bays will be a minimum of 5.5 metres wide and six metres long, and are shown in diagram 9.14.

A traffic mirror adjacent to parking space numbered 1 will be provided, this mirror will enable motorists leaving the parking spaces to ensure the ramp is clear before proceeding up the ramp. Otherwise, the driver should wait within the ground floor passing bay area for the entering vehicle to clear the ramp. Vehicles entering the ramp from Sunnyside Road should have priority over vehicles leaving, and a traffic sign could be installed on the ground floor to reinforce this priority.

The parking spaces are expected to generate a low turnover, and users will become familiar with the arrangement, with no adverse impact expected."

- No objections were notated by the former Senior Development Engineer who was allocated the development for assessment originally and attended pre application discussions.

Council's traffic engineer and Development Engineering has concluded based on the documentation submitted to date and given the above assessment, the vehicle passing areas are accepted as meeting the *Performance Criteria P1:E6.7.3* of the Planning Scheme. Given the driveway configuration, and the low volume of traffic.

- Clause E6.7.4: On-site turning - Not Applicable

- Clause E6.7.5: Layout of parking areas - Performance Criteria

The layout of the parking area must satisfy either Acceptable Solutions or Performance Criteria for each clause of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HIPS 2015).

Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date does not comply with the Acceptable Solution; therefore assessment against the Performance Criterion is relied on for clause E6.7.5.

Acceptable Solution A1: - NOT MET: (aisle width manoeuvring area)

The layout of car parking spaces, access aisles, circulation roadways and ramps must be designed and constructed to comply with section 2 "Design of Parking Modules, Circulation Roadways and Ramps" of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-street car parking and must have sufficient headroom to comply with clause 5.3 "Headroom" of the same Standard.

Performance Criteria - P1: - MET

The layout of car parking spaces, access aisles, circulation roadways and ramps must be safe and must ensure ease of access, egress and manoeuvring on-site.

- Acceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment

• Car Parking Space Dimensions (AS2890.1 Fig 2.2 = 2.4x5.4m Class 1A):

- Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment

• Car Parking Space Design Envelope (AS2890.1 Fig 5.2 300mm clearance on side):

- Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"As specified in table 1.1 of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 the user class of the parking spaces will be designed as user class 1A, for residential use. Section B4.8 of the above standard allows for user class 1A, that the aisle width can be reduced to 5.8 metres, and vehicles may need to use a 3-point turn when entering or leaving the spaces. This concession assists where space is limited and recognises that such developments will have a low turnover and users are generally prepared to accept some inconvenience when entering and leaving the spaces. Vehicles larger than a B85 vehicle may need to make a 5-point turn.

The on-site parking spaces will have the following attributes:

- *• Parking bays will be user class 1A for residential parking, allowing for 3-point turn entry and exit into ninety degree parking spaces.*
- *• Parking bays will be a minimum of 2.6 metres wide and 5.4 metres long.*
- *• All parking spaces to be ninety degrees to the parking aisle with wheel stops.*
- *• At the end of the blind aisle, there will be an extension to the aisle to aid with vehicle manoeuvrability.*
- *• The length of the parking aisle will be short in length, limiting operating speeds to an acceptable level of less than 30 km/h."*

• Headroom: (AS2890.1 Fig 5.3 = 2.2m clearance):

- Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The Australian Standards 2890 section 5.3 specifies for both cars and light vans, the height between the floor and an overhead obstruction shall be a minimum of 2.2 metres.

The underside of the vehicle access ramp will house four parking spaces, and a minimum 2.2 metre headroom height will be provided to meet this standard. Part of the footpath along Sunnyside Road will be cantilevered over the parking area and this structure will have a minimum headroom clearance of 2.2 metres. The other eight parking spaces within the ground floor parking area will not be covered by an overhead structure."

• Parking Space Gradient (5%):

- Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement

- Aisle Width (AS2890.1 Fig 2.2 = 5.8m Class 1A):

- **Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement however, assessed under Performance Criteria**

- **The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;**

"The on-site parking spaces have been designed for tenant use only, swept path diagrams for a B85 vehicle entering and leaving each space is shown in appendix A of this assessment, demonstrating that vehicles can enter and leave each of the spaces, some vehicles may require to undertake a 3-point turn.

Overall, the swept path diagrams demonstrate there is adequate area within the ground floor layout to accommodate vehicle manoeuvring, and also allows for a B85 vehicle to turnaround"

- Garage Door Width & Apron (AS2890.1 Fig 5.4 = 2.4m wide => 7m wide apron):

- **N/A**

- Parking Module Gradient (manoeuvring area 5% Acceptable Soln, 10% Performance):

- **Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment**

- Ramp Gradient & Width (AS2890.1 Section 2.6 = 25% and 3m):

- **Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment**

- **The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;**

"The ramp has been designed to comply with section 3.3 of AZ/NZS 2890.1:2004. The ramp will have a downgrade from Sunnyside Road; across the footpath the grade will be 5 percent, then increase to 7 percent for the first 2 metres (transitional ramp), then increasing to a maximum gradient of 15.4 percent, and transitioning back to 7 percent by a 2-metre-long transitional ramp. This means the maximum change in gradient for both crest and sag curves will be 8.4 percent, and this is not expected to create any adverse scraping or bottoming of vehicles using the ramp."

and

"The access ramp will reduce to a single lane as it reaches the ground floor, passing bays will be provided at both ends of the ramp to ensure vehicles can pass efficiently. The passing bays will be a minimum of 5.5 metres wide and six metres long, and are shown in diagram 9.14.

A traffic mirror adjacent to parking space numbered 1 will be provided, this mirror will enable motorists leaving the parking spaces to ensure the ramp is clear before proceeding up the ramp. Otherwise, the driver should wait within the ground floor passing bay area for the entering vehicle to clear the ramp. Vehicles entering the ramp from Sunnyside Road should have priority over vehicles leaving, and a traffic sign could be installed on the ground floor to reinforce this priority.

The parking spaces are expected to generate a low turnover, and users will become familiar with the arrangement, with no adverse impact expected."

- Transitions (AS2890.1 Section 2.5.3 = 12.5% summit, 15% sag => 2m transition):

- **Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment**

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The entrance to the ground floor parking area will not be gated. There is sufficient length and width of the ramp to accommodate two vehicles entering at a time. Given the parking area supports 12 spaces, the risk of vehicles queuing on Sunnyside Road waiting to enter the ramp would be very low."

- Vehicular Barriers (AS2890.1 Section 2.4.5.3 = 600mm drop, 1:4 slope):

- Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date is able to meet this requirement by accepting the analysis / statements provided by the applicant's traffic engineer contained within the Traffic Impact Assessment

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"Vehicle barriers are being provided to both sides of the access ramp.

Within the ground floor parking area, parking spaces are located adjacent to a pedestrian walkway, with wheel stops and bollards to provide adequate separation between the vehicles and pedestrian movement."

- Blind Aisle End Widening (AS2890.1 Fig 2.3 = 1m extra):

- N/A

- "Jockey Parking" (Performance Assessment):

- N/A

- No objections were notated by the former Senior Development Engineer who was allocated the development for assessment originally and attended pre application discussions.

Development Engineering has concluded based on the documentation submitted to date and given the above assessment, the layout of parking areas is accepted as meeting the *Performance Criteria P1:E6.7.5* given the driveway configuration.

- Clause E6.7.6: Surface treatment of parking areas - **Acceptable Solution**
- Clause E6.7.7: Lighting of parking areas - By planner
- Clause E6.7.8: Landscaping of parking areas - By planner
- Clause E6.7.9: Design of motorcycle parking areas - Not Applicable
- Clause E6.7.10: Design of bicycle parking areas - Not Applicable
- Clause E6.7.11: Bicycle end trip facilities (Planner assessment) - Not Applicable
- Clause E6.7.12: Siting of car parking (Planner assessment based on DE no.'s) - By planner
- Clause E6.7.13: Facilities for commercial vehicles - Not Applicable
- Clause E6.7.14: Access to a road - **Acceptable Solution**
- Clause E6.7.15: Access to Niree Lane Sandy Bay - Not Applicable

• E7.0 Stormwater - DOES APPLY

- Clause E7.7.1 - 1: Stormwater drainage and disposal - **Acceptable Solution**

- Clause E7.7.1 - 2: Stormwater drainage and disposal - **Performance Criteria**

The stormwater drainage and disposal must satisfy either Acceptable Solutions or Performance Criteria for each clause of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (HIPS 2015).

Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date does not comply with the Acceptable Solution; therefore assessment against the

Performance Criterion is relied on for clause E7.7.1 (P2).

Acceptable Solution A2: - NOT MET: Water Sensitive Urban Design - WSUD not proposed

A stormwater system for a new development must incorporate water sensitive urban design principles R1 for the treatment and disposal of stormwater.

- Unacceptable, Development Engineering has concluded the documentation submitted to date indicates the proposed stormwater treatment is unable to meet this requirement

A stormwater system for a new development must incorporate water sensitive urban design principles R1 for the treatment and disposal of stormwater if any of the following apply:

(a) the size of new impervious area is more than 600 m²;

- Yes

(b) new car parking is provided for more than 6 cars; and

- YES

(c) a subdivision is for more than 5 lots

- No

Performance Criteria – P2: - MET: (Mechanical treatment)

A stormwater system for a new development must incorporate a stormwater drainage system of a size and design sufficient to achieve the stormwater quality and quantity targets in accordance with the State Stormwater Strategy 2010, as detailed in Table E7.1 unless it is not feasible to do so.

Referred to the Waterways Unit for determination and conditioning.

Waterways Unit has concluded based on the documentation submitted to date and given the above assessment, the stormwater disposal is accepted by Development Engineering as meeting the *Performance Criteria E7.7.1 (P2)* of the Planning Scheme.

- Clause E7.7.1 - 3: Stormwater drainage and disposal - **Acceptable Solution**

- Clause E7.7.1 - 4: Stormwater drainage and disposal - **Acceptable Solution**

COMMENTS:

In a council related engineering context, the proposal can be supported in principal subject to the following conditions and advice however, due to the scope of the proposal, the application has been referred to the Council's Manager Bushland, Biodiversity & Waterways, Manager City Infrastructure, Manager City Mobility. The delegated officers' responses, including recommendations are inserted in the respective referral reports.

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

ENG1

ENG 2a

ENG 2b: Both sides of the access ramp

ENG 2c

ENG 3a: RARE documentation received by the Council on the 5th December 2022

ENG 3c

ENG 4

ENG 5: The number of car parking spaces approved to be used on the site is twelve (12)

ENG 5b: The number of motorcycle parking spaces approved to be used on the site is two (2)

ENG 6: The bicycle parking area (to accommodate six bicycles within the common area) generally compliant with the Australian Standards AS/NZS 2890.3:2015 and must be constructed on the site in accordance with the Hubble Traffic documentation received by the Council on the 9th May 2022 prior to the first occupation

ENG 8: The use of the car parking spaces is restricted to User Class 1A (residential) in accordance with Australian Standards AS/NZS 2890.1 2004 Table 1.1.

ENG r3: (Roads Imposed)

ENG r1: (Roads Imposed)

Part 5 r1: (Roads Imposed)

ENG tr2: (City Mobility Imposed)

ENG sw1: (Waterways Imposed)

SW 7: (Waterways Imposed)

SW 9: (Waterways Imposed)

SW 13: (Waterways Imposed)

ENV 2: (Waterways Imposed)

ADVICE:

- Dial before you dig
- Fees and charges
- Building Permit
- Plumbing Permit
- Occupation of the Public Highway
- Driveway surfacing over highway reservation
- Condition endorsement engineering
- Work in the highway reservation
- New Service Connection

REPRESENTATIONS:

Multiple - To be directed to each responsible referral unit for a detailed response, e.g. Traffic, Roads, Waterways.

Representations have been received regarding traffic generation, parking, road infrastructure and waste.

Development Engineering response to representations regarding traffic generation, parking and road infrastructure:

- The applicant's traffic engineer stated the following;

"The planning scheme specifies that 38 parking spaces are required for the 22 units. The development is providing 12 on-site parking spaces. As demonstrated in this assessment the parking demand for one and two bedroom social housing units is significantly reduced, the 12 spaces being provided by this development is expected to meet the reasonable demand generated by the tenants."

"Based on the Queensland social housing standard, the proposed New Town site could be considered as site category A, due to the proximity to a high frequency bus route, and local community facilities. Based on this standard, the 22 units could generate a parking demand of 14 spaces."

"In addition to the Queensland standard for social housing, the RTA also has parking

standards for high density residential units located in close proximity to a high frequency public transport route, the RTA Guide indicates the following parking requirements.

- 0.6 parking spaces per one bedroom unit
- 0.9 spaces per two bedroom unit
- 1.4 spaces per three bedroom unit
- 1 space per five units (visitor parking)

Based on the RTA guide, this development could generate a parking demand of 17 parking spaces for the tenants, not including visitor parking."

"The new access off Sunnyside Road will provide for two-way traffic movements and motorists leaving the development site will have available sight distance of 80 metres in both directions, which satisfies the planning scheme requirement for Safe Intersection Sight Distance for a 50 km/h speed limit.

This development will comply with the acceptable solution for Safe Intersection Sight Distance, and motorists will be able to enter Sunnyside Road in a safe manner, without disrupting the current road users."

"A recent parking supply and demand survey of Paviour Street and Sunnyside Road found there is 96 spaces available, within 200 metres of the development site. The patrolled parking survey found these spaces have a low occupancy rate of less than 20 percent, mainly because the surrounding residential properties have suitable off-street facilities, and along the western side of Paviour Street there is only a few property accesses, as these properties have their access off New Town Road. The survey found there is sufficient supply of on-street parking spaces to meet any overflow or visitor demand likely to be generated by this development. The development site has 70 metres of road frontage, this length of road frontage can accommodate 8 to 10 vehicles, and these vehicles would not adversely impact surrounding properties."

"To evaluate the impact of visitor parking on surrounding properties, it is important to understand the supply and demand for on-street parking spaces along the surrounding streets, that could be used to assist with any visitor parking demand. A parking supply and demand survey was conducted on the two adjacent streets to the development site, Sunnyside Road, and Paviour Street, with the results of the surveys shown in table 5.1. The survey found along the two adjacent streets to the development site, there is sufficient kerb space to accommodate up to 96 parallel parked vehicles. The survey found the demand for these parking spaces to be low, less than 20 percent, based on three patrolled survey times, at 9:00am, 12 noon and 5:00pm (weekday)."

"METRO Tasmania runs a high frequency bus service between Glenorchy and Hobart via New Town Road, with a bus operating every ten minutes between 7:00am and 7:00pm, Monday to Friday. With bus stops located within 250 metres of the development site, this provides the unit tenants with a convenient and viable alternative transport mode."

"The development site is located adjacent to a high frequency public transport route, which is very important, as public transport is usually a significant transport mode for social housing tenants, reduces the reliance on private motor vehicles and parking demand. METRO Tasmania runs a high frequency bus service from Hobart to Glenorchy along New Town Road, with a bus operating every ten minutes between 7:00am to 7:00pm, Monday to Friday, every twenty minutes on Saturday, and every thirty minutes on Sunday. A southbound bus stop is located on New Town Road within 50 metres of Sunnyside Road, and a northbound bus stop located within 250 metres. This development site is well positioned to take advantage of the high frequency public bus service, and provides tenants with an accessible, convenient, and viable alternative transport mode."

"The development site is located within three kilometres of the Hobart CBD, and this makes bicycle riding a viable option, particularly with on-road cycle lanes operating along Argyle

Street, extending into New Town Road. The intercity cycleway is also located within 1.2 kilometres from the development site, providing a flat and easy cycling path between Hobart and the northern suburbs."

"The development site is located in the vicinity of the intercity shared cycleway, which is an off-road facility that operates between Hobart and the northern suburbs, using the old railway corridor, the route is flat and accommodates riders of all skill levels.

In addition, there are on-road cycle lanes operating along Argyle Street that can be easily accessed from the development site, with these lanes connecting to Hobart.

Overall, the development site is well located to formal cycling facilities, which provides excellent connectivity to both Hobart and Glenorchy, providing a real alternative transport mode, reducing the reliance on private motor vehicles."

"A new development in urban areas can be concerning to local residents, and it can be difficult to argue that a traffic increase is reasonable. The RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments has considered this matter and provided an environmental performance standard, that can be used to evaluate the likely impact on residential amenity. Table 8.4 is an extract from the RTA Guide and relates to urban environment, providing maximum peak hour goals.

For Sunnyside Road being a local residential street, the maximum peak hour goal is 300 vehicles per peak hour (two-way traffic flow). Combining the current maximum two-way peak hour traffic flow of 80 vehicles, with the expected increase of six vehicles generated by the development, the new two-way peak hour traffic flow is expected to be substantially less than the environmental goal. This indicates that the traffic generated from this development, is not expected to create any adverse amenity impact to the surrounding residential properties."

- Council's traffic engineer stated the following;

"I support the TIA's estimated peak parking demand rates calculated from the Queensland social housing standard of 14 spaces. I also support the conclusion that the parking demand does not require the need to satisfy the Planning Scheme requirements as the development is located close to a frequent bus service on New Town Road and the intercity cycleway which accommodates all levels of riders and therefore there are alternate transport options available.

The TIA outlined that 12 of the 14 spaces expected to be generated from the development can be accommodated on-site and the remaining 2 parking spaces can be absorbed within the on-street parking. Usually the preference is that parking demand is contained within the site, however, given a parking survey indicated that there are spaces available on-street and the previous tennis court development was operating without spaces and relied on on-street parking, the shortfall parking could be accommodated on the street without having a negative impact on amenity."

"Usually the preference is that parking demand is contained within the site, however, given a parking survey indicated that there are spaces available on-street and the previous tennis court development was operating without spaces and relied on on-street parking, the shortfall parking could be accommodated on the street without having a negative impact on amenity."

"I also support the conclusion that the parking demand does not require the need to satisfy the Planning Scheme requirements as the development is located close to a frequent bus service on New Town Road and the intercity cycleway which accommodates all levels of riders and therefore there are alternate transport options available."

Council's traffic engineer and Development Engineering has concluded based on the

documentation submitted to date the development meets the relevant Performance Criteria of the Planning Scheme.

Development Engineering response to representations regarding waste:

Council's Waste Services Officer has provided the following comment:

"I would say we would only supply a maximum of 11 waste and 11 recycle, its fine they have room for more bins (FOGO for instance would be an opt-in choice).

No issues with the bins being kerbside as there is plenty of room.

It would only be an issues if bins weren't returned to the property within 24hours of being placed out (place out night before collection and then taken in the next day)."

Application Referral Enviro - City Amenity - Response

From:	MM and JS
Recommendation:	Proposal is acceptable without conditions.
Date Completed:	
Address:	73 A NEW TOWN ROAD, NEW TOWN ADJACENT ROAD RESERVE
Proposal:	Demolition, 22 Multiple Dwellings, Front Fencing, and Associated Works
Application No:	PLN-22-282
Assessment Officer:	Michael McClenahan,

Referral Officer comments:

CODE	Applicable	Exempt	Permitted (If acceptable solutions are met)	Discretionary (Identify the relevant performance criteria)
E7.0 Stormwater Management Code	Y	N	A1, A2, A3, A4	P2
E11.0 Waterway and Coastal Protection Code	N			
E15.0 Inundation Prone Areas Code	N			
Protection of Infrastructure	N			
Subdivision (LG(BMP) / Zone provisions)	N			

Please advise REEU at any stage if:

- Changes to the original proposed development are made
- Requested reports are submitted

Stormwater Management Code

Clause E7.7.1	Discussion
A1/P1 – Disposal	New stormwater connection into public main proposed.

A2/P2 – Treatment	Treatment proposed
A3/P3 – Capacity	Detention proposed
A4/P4 – OFP	Stormwater report submitted to demonstrate overland flow path in case of 1% AEP

Assessment Notes:

JS 24/10/2022

22 Multiple Dwellings, Front Fencing, and Associated Works

Drainage easement 5ft wide in laneway. No stormwater infrastructure in drainage easement.

detention doesn't state event durations modelled (or adequate volume in others), insufficient climate change loading applied

2019 street view suggests the vdrain in the pathway to the NW does not currently exits, and the neighbors floor levels are below the land

Landscaping plan doesn't show much permeable

Stormwater report shows Ex. Granular 975 (C=0.9) and Ex vegetated 975 (C=0.3), however most the land is covered by 2 tennis courts and some roof structures as seen from aerial imagery. Needs clarification.

Driveway ramp into Sunny side road - no rise up above spoon drain height. DN225 drains to kerb upstream of this driveway.

JS 20/12/2022

Above ground detention tank proposed for roofed area and below ground in form of DN450 pipe for carpark. Stormwater management report shows no ponding in case of 5% AEP event and has demonstrated safe overland flow path in case of 1% AEP event.

JS 06/01/2023

Representation received regarding stormwater:

DA-23-36 representation from 67 New Town Road

Only conquest from 67 New Town related to SW was from 2010:

<http://conquest/Link.aspx?Connection=Conquest&RequestID=98659>

Reported that gutter flows were leaking through cracks in the kerb. Kerb was repaired. I do see that it is kerb and then retaining wall into private property, and a spot where it appears the kerb was repaired.

The applicant was already advised to raise the level (to match with level of kerb) of the driveway to fall towards the road, so that road run off stays in road and kerb and gutter capacity is not reduced. Roads was requested to add clause to condition ENG R3 regarding driveway crossover that " Proposed driveway crossover must be designed and constructed in such a way as to convey flows safely and adequately within the road reserve with no decrease in capacity."

If they are not able to achieve the required outcome of ENG R3 as explained above the only option left will be to capture flows upstream (by laying a new public stormwater infrastructure) into piped system. Advice added to this condition.

Sunnyside Road lacks piped stormwater infrastructure and all stormwater flows above ground near this site from the upstream catchment.

Proposed development does not drain towards Sunnyside Road and it not contributing to

existing flows on this Road. Applicant has submitted a plan to convey 1%AEP flows through the site safely and the overland flow would be contained within the overland flow path, discharging through the laneway towards New Town Road as per the submitted stormwater report, thus protecting neighboring properties from any nuisance flows.

Assessment and conditions remains same.

Recommended Conditions:

ENG1, ENGSW1, SW7, SW9, SW13, ENV2, ENGr3

Recommended Advice: