



City of **HOBART**

Enquiries to:



Our Ref: PSA-21-3

24 December 2021

UTAS Properties Pty Ltd
C/- Matthew Higgs
Chief Executive Officer
Private Bag 51
HOBART TAS 7001

Via Email:

Dear Mr Higgs,

HOBART INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME – PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT PSA-21-3

I refer to the above planning scheme amendment application, submitted 6 December 2021.

Under Section 33A of the former provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA)*, you are required by Council to provide a copy of the additional information as specified in the attachment, and submit it in electronic format (PDF).

Please provide the additional information electronically through the City of Hobart online portal.

Please note that if the additional information is lodged by 5:15pm on a day that the Council is open for business, the information will be accepted on that day. In any other case, the information will be accepted on the next day the Council is open for business.

Please contact [REDACTED] if you have any queries in relation to this additional information requirement.

Yours sincerely



(Sandra Hogue)
MANAGER CITY FUTURES



City of **HOBART**

ATTACHMENT 1 – DETAILS ON REQUIRED INFORMATION

GENERAL

In relation to the proposed planning scheme amendment, we request the following information:

- Provide a feasibility study or report on the proposed built form. This report needs to demonstrate that the amendment to building height and footprint will be able to feasibly deliver what is planned for each precinct.
- Please provide an analysis of whether it is appropriate to locate a sports and recreation precinct adjacent to proposed and existing residential zones, in terms of potential for noise nuisance and land use conflict.
- Please provide a summary of the availability, and practicality in terms of achieving energy efficiency requirements, of glazing for buildings with 0-10% visible light reflectivity.
- Please provide a Landslide Risk Management Report as defined under clause E3.3.1 of the Landslide Code, addressing the landslide hazard areas in Precincts 2, 3 and 4. The assessment must determine if the intended future uses and developments envisaged by the Master Plan (including vulnerable uses) can occur with an acceptable, tolerable or intolerable level of risk.
- Provide information in relation to water quality:
 - Details for how the proposed land uses will not adversely impact water quality and will be developed under a water sensitive urban design approach, including the inclusion of any Specific Area Plan provisions that may support this (such as parameters around permeable/impermeable surface areas and treatment targets).
- Provide information in relation to open space provision:
 - Given the expansion of active recreation as an individual pursuit and the decline in sports club membership, provide an analysis of changes in public open space opportunities between the current site layout and that proposed.
 - Please provide amended Historic Heritage Code Place Figures for E13.1.14 and E13.1.15 that include any large trees (both exotic and native) that are part of the reason for listing.
 - Please provide justification for construction of a new road that would have a significant impact on a Heritage Place, Significant Trees and significant

threatened species habitat. Please also include an analysis of other suitable road locations that would minimise impact to significant values.

- In relation to heritage matters (that are general and not directly relevant to the heritage impact assessment or the conservation management plans):
 - Please be aware that there is a heritage listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register (Christ College) on the Sandy bay UTAS campus. Heritage Tasmania have indicated that they have an interest and wish to be involved in the amendment process. Please ensure any assessments of places by the heritage consultant indicates if they meet the threshold for inclusion on the Tasmanian Heritage Register and if so undertake appropriate consultation with Heritage Tasmania.

-SPECIFIC

The following requests further information based on specific reports and/or sections within the reports.

1. APPLICATION SUBMISSION REPORT (prepared by [REDACTED])

In relation to the planning scheme amendment report, please provide the following information:

- a. Confirm and amend the proposed extent of the scheme amendment area removing the small low density residential area that is not proposed to be rezoned within the southern boundary of the site area. All plans to be amended as relevant to reflect the scheme amendment area.
- b. Provide further details on the intended staging of the masterplan over the next 30 years, including provision of infrastructure, housing, and roads.
- c. Provide justification for the location of the zone boundaries as proposed in Proposed Zoning Plan.
- d. Please provide an analysis, by a suitably qualified person, of the appropriateness of the proposed Biodiversity Protection Area overlay extent from a biodiversity conservation perspective, having regard to the extent of the Priority Vegetation Areas overlay in the draft Local Provisions Schedule of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.
- e. Provide justification for the delineation of the five precinct boundaries, and include accurate scalable location of boundaries.
- f. Provide justification for the proposed zoning of Inner Residential in Precinct 3 noting that it adjoins areas of Low Density Residential to the east.
- g. Further to the above point, justify how areas proposed to be rezoned as Inner Residential in Precinct 3 meets the purpose of the Inner Residential Zone,

which is generally intended for inner urban areas in close proximity to the main activity centres and along the key transit corridors as elaborated under the HIPS and Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

- h. Provide justification as to why the amendment to the Significant Tree Code is required. Note that Council is unlikely to be supportive of alterations to the Code standards that apply different criteria to trees on this site compared to all other sites.
- i. Provide justification as to why visitor accommodation is permitted (on the basis that it has frontage to Sandy Bay Road) in the proposed Recreation Zone.
- j. Provide justification as to why a Particular Purpose Zone is sought for the Mount Nelson Ecotourism Area, and why other existing zones have not been considered.
- k. Include discussion of the following strategies, including demonstration of how the proposed PSA and project is aligned with the objectives of these strategies:
 - City of Hobart Heritage Places and Precincts
 - Local Retail Precincts Plan
 - Draft affordable housing strategy (as tabled in November 2021 Council meeting).
 - Hobart 2025 A Strategic Framework.
- l. In relation to car parking, the planning scheme already has a performance criteria to assess any reduction in car parking spaces that do not meet the acceptable solution for all inner residential and general residential zones proposed in the PSA. Please provide further justification as to why the amendment reduces the number of car parking spaces in the proposed zones when adjacent areas of the same zoning in the same suburb are not subject to such reductions. It is noted that reduced parking may affect the amenity of future users/owners and leaseholders on the site compared to surrounding land within the same zone and suburb, and that conversely these adjacent zones are likely to be subject to comparatively increased development costs of providing parking.
- m. Provide a table showing the essential elements of the Masterplan that are necessary for intended implementation of the SAP that must flow into the PSA and detail where and how they are addressed in the PSA / SAP. If this then requires further amendment to the PSA / SAP to ensure these elements are adequately described and presented, please update.
- n. Provide a proposed zoning plan that overlays the proposed site layout.
- o. Provide a proposed zoning plan that overlays the current aerial imagery.

- p. Provide a plan showing the intended future development precincts relative to the Landslide Hazard Area overlay specified in Map E3 of the Landslide Code of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.
- q. Cross check all plan and appendix references within the report and update as relevant.
- r. Other specific information requests are detailed in the below table:

| Page | Reference | Request |
|-------|---|--|
| p.11 | Figure 6 – Planning Scheme Zoning | The PPZ3 boundary is incorrectly defined in the map. Please amend. A small section of land adjacent to the final Mount Nelson bend, where the University own several detached dwellings, is currently zoned Low Density Residential. |
| p.22 | Section 4.5 | Provide the area (in hectares) of each precinct, and area (ha/m ²) that is intended to be occupied by dwellings within each precinct. Add an additional Precinct in this section which refers to the bushland reserve, area (ha/m ²) and purpose/intention. |
| p.27 | Figure 13 – Masterplan Urban Structure Plan | Add legend to figure. |
| p. 40 | Section 6.2 | Update the reference to the proposed zoning plan at Appendix B. Appendix B to the Amendment appears to be letters from Tas Water and Tas Networks |
| P. 41 | Figure 14 | Update figure to include legend. Update figure to remove existing Low Density Residential area within southern boundary. |
| p. 41 | Section 6.3 – 6.8 | Provide stronger justification to the identification of particular areas for the proposed zones. Current commentary focusses on the purpose of the zone and the vision future development within the zone. Comment on implications/cohesiveness with adjacent zones. |
| p. 43 | Section 6.8 | In regard to reference of 32(4) what is the particular area of land, how is it delineated and what are the particular environmental; or economic; or social; or spatial qualities of the land? |

| Page | Reference | Request |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Figure 5.4 | Sandy Bay Masterplan Connectivity Plan | Amend to show walking and bicycling connections extending from Churchill Avenue to Olinda Grove. |
| Table E13.1 | Heritage Places | Locate the identified areas on the site plan to better understand context. Perhaps include road names etc. |
| Biodiversity Code | Proposed Amended Biodiversity Protection Area | Ensure the amended BPA is reflected within the boundaries of the proposed zoning plan and if not, justification to be provided. |
| F5.4.4 | Use Table Recreation Zone | Provide justification as to why visitor accommodation is proposed as a permitted/discretionary use given it is prohibited under the standard scheme provisions. |

2. STRATEGIC PLANNING REPORT (prepared by [REDACTED])

In relation to the strategic planning report, please provide the following information:

| Page | Reference | Matter |
|------|--|---|
| p.1 | Section 1.2 | Amend comment regarding zoning of current site being only zoned PPZ. The subject site of the PSA is zoned PPZ with a small section currently zoned Low Density Residential. |
| p.1 | Section 1.2 | Confirm rezoning site area after consideration of above comment. |
| p.1 | Section 1.2, 3 rd paragraph | <i>"The PSA involves the rezoning of 105-ha site.....with the inclusion of a new specific area plan applying to part of the site"</i> . Clearly state which is the PSA area and which is the SAP area. The maps within the PSA area show that the intended SAP area is the area of the whole project. |
| p.2 | Section 1.4 | Provide details on staging on masterplan over 30 years. |
| p.5 | Section 1.7 | Provide a proposed zone map with precincts identified. |
| p.8 | Section 2.2.1 | Provide more robust justification as to why the PSA is necessary to support the scale of development proposed, in particular referencing the economic impact assessment and market assessment report. |
| p.17 | Section 3.4.5 | Provide more robust justification as to why an ecotourism precinct is proposed and necessary as part of the PSA. |
| p.39 | Section 5.3 | The response for how the proposal intends to provide "Affordable Housing/Urban Renewal" is very weak. The response does not describe how the future development will provide for 'affordable housing'. Please provide additional measures and comment on how this will occur. |
| p.40 | Section 5.6 | Provide further justification as to how the proposed PSA responds to Goal 4 of the Sustainable Hobart Action Plan. |
| p.49 | Section 6.3.4 | Provide further details about the intended social housing on the site. |

| Page | Reference | Matter |
|------|--------------|--|
| p.59 | Section 6.11 | Include a summary of the Low Density Residential Zone. |

3. SUPPORTING REPORTS

a. Civil engineering assessment (prepared by GHD)

- i. Provide further information with regard to flood risk:
 - The site is subject to the Inundation Code. Please provide mapping showing the inundation risk through the site for a 1% AEP + climate change event.
 - Further information on how the land that is at risk of inundation can support the proposed land uses.
 - Further information on how the risk of inundation will be managed at all stages of the site over time as different precincts develop at different times.
- ii. Provide further information with regard to infrastructure ownership:
 - The trunk stormwater infrastructure through the site was historically vested in the Crown and has been under the operational responsibility of UTAS for many decades. In order for the Council to determine whether the proposed land uses are able to be serviced, please provide a plan of all known stormwater infrastructure within the site, specifying which infrastructure will remain under UTAS ownership and which is intended to be transferred to City of Hobart ownership.
 - For all assets to be transferred to City of Hobart ownership, please provide a proposed handover strategy. This should address at a minimum, condition assessments, defect rectification strategy, and supply of any existing construction/as-built drawings and maintenance histories.
 - For any infrastructure located under or in proximity of buildings and/or trafficable areas, please provide high resolution copies of any relevant building plans and/or construction drawings. Consideration must be given to whether infrastructure conveys drainage from upstream catchment areas, land other than UTAS owned land (eg. roads), and any precincts that have a potential for future subdivision.
- iii. Provide further information in relation to infrastructure capacity:
 - Please provide hydraulic analysis of the stormwater infrastructure through the site and downstream of the site, demonstrating sufficient capacity for the proposed land uses, including consideration for different precincts developing at different times. (Sufficient capacity

is a 5% AEP event when the catchment, including the upstream catchment is fully developed.)

- Please provide any details around required new public network extensions in order to service the proposed land uses, including connection points to the existing public stormwater system, and impact to the existing public stormwater system, as well as impacts on land, biodiversity, and other infrastructure.

b. Conservation management plan (volume 1) (prepared by Paul Davies Pty Ltd)

In relation to the Conservation Management Plan, Volume 1, please provide the following information:

- i. Further details of the significance of the landscapes identified in Section 2.4 (p.35) and details of the proposals/policies for management of that landscape.
- ii. Provide a site plan that shows and numbers all buildings that are referenced throughout. Ensure the numbering system is consistent across all documentation and all site plans and figures use the numbering system.
- iii. A comparative analysis of other university campuses, with a focus on built features but also landscape and 'urban' design elements.
- iv. For the views analysis in 2.5, please provide supporting mapping and additional photos.
- v. Please provide a full assessment of significance for each item which is proposed to be protected by the Historic Heritage Code.
- vi. Undertake an assessment of significance for individual features on the campus using the criteria (a) to (h) as defined under clause 16 (2) of the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995 and as required under Table E13.3.1 of the Historic Heritage Code.
- vii. Undertake an assessment of significance for individual features on the campus using the definition of local historic heritage significance under C6.0 of the Local Historic Heritage Code of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.
- viii. Clarify if any landscape elements are to be recommended for inclusion in the Historic Heritage Code or the Local Historic Heritage Code.
- ix. Clarify if any of the features/places are assessed as having State historic cultural heritage significance and therefore are to be recommended for being entered onto the Tasmanian Heritage Register.
- x. For 3.6 Setting (Curtilage), please support this part of the plan with a full assessment and mapping.
- xi. The bibliography at 6.0 is blank.
- xii. Table 18 – Attachment 1 is not complete.
- xiii. Figure on p.98 is not numbered and figure numbering is out of sequence.

- xiv. For Policy 5.1.17, please provide further definition of the 'significant views to and from the site.'
- xv. Please provide policies that clearly define the development opportunities and constraints for the campus. This should extend to demolition, height controls, no build zones, views vistas, landscape, more definition with respect to use, roads, access, archaeology and any other elements which might need to be assessed against the provisions of the Historic Heritage Code. Clarify if there are to be recommendations for controls for the retention/extent of places nominated for retention but not listing.
- xvi. Please provide a grading of significance site plan.
- xvii. Please provide clear colour coding for all tables and also provide keys and numbering of buildings for all plans and maps.
- xviii. Provide documentation and heritage assessments of all identified memorials, artworks and sculptures as referenced in footnote 6 on p.37.
- xix. Correct all references to Heritage Conservation Area to Heritage Precincts.

c. **Conservation management plan (volume 2)** (prepared by Paul Davies Pty Ltd)

In relation to the Building Data Sheets presented in CMP Volume 2:

- i. It is suggested that Building Datasheets include a heading 'Grading of Significance' linked back to the gradings reference in the CMP, page 55 and the HCHA 1995 criteria (a) to (h). The narrative currently contained within the Datasheets is then supported by a clear attribution.
- ii. Currently the narrative around significance employs variable language such as 'limited significance' or 'low or minimal'. Please provide further details of this analysis and ensure consistency.
- iii. Provide a site plan that shows and numbers all buildings that are referenced throughout. Ensure the numbering system is consistent across all documentation and all site plans use the numbering system.
- iv. Please include details of "integrity" in all building datasheets.
- v. Some datasheets state that a buildings is not of heritage significance, but neither the datasheet nor Volume 1 outlined why, beyond the threshold matrix mentioned above. Please clarify for each building.
- vi. Datasheets for some buildings in the Table of Contents appear to be excluded. Please clarify and include for each building.
- vii. Datasheets for some buildings do not include photographs. Please provide.
- viii. There are no datasheets for landscape or 'urban' elements. Please provide.

d. **Economic impact assessment** (prepared by Deep End Services)

In relation to the economic impact assessment, please provide the following information:

- i. A copy of the Market Assessment Report referred to in Section 1.3, including the Highest and Best Use Assessment prepared by Macroplan in 2019.
- ii. Relevant data in relation to the amount in hectares of undeveloped residential land areas and potential lot yields existing in City of Hobart and Greater Hobart for equivalent zones, so that current availability can also be considered in projected site numbers.
- iii. The report indicates that current COVID-19 impacts have resulted in population decline in comparison to previous growth and not returning to Pre-COVID levels until 2024. Please provide justification/comment to support this assumption.
- iv. The percentage share of dwellings in Table 4 (p.33) do not sum up to 100% as stated.
- v. Both Table 1 and 4 refer to number of total dwellings, however the numbers do not correlate to the same number.

e. **Heritage impact assessment** (prepared by Paul Davies Pty Ltd)

- i. Clarify the purpose of this document.
- ii. Clarify the Executive Summary regarding the 10 buildings nominated for retention but not listing.
- iii. Clarify what are the controls for the 10 buildings which are deemed to not require listing but are recommended for retention?
- iv. Page 41 paragraph 3 states that a range of buildings will “largely be unsuitable for future adaptive re-use.” Please provide further details and analysis.

f. **Landscape and visual impact assessment** (prepared by Orbit)

In relation to the landscape and visual impact assessment, please provide the following information:

- i. Photo montages to be shown at average eye level approx. 1.7m. Please advise at what height the current photo montages are taken.
- ii. The viewpoints as selected for photomontages are very limited. Provide additional viewpoints from other parts of Hobart City and Greater Hobart (i.e Battery Point, Glebe, Eastern Shore) looking into the proposed project area that may be appropriate and the resultant photomontages.
- iii. A better understanding of the visual impact of building height transition interfaces needs to be clearly shown (ie Precinct 1 should have a southern looking view to understand the implications of the five story built form on the existing single story residential).
- iv. Plans should show the masterplan over the top of the aerial to understand potential vegetation retention/removal.

- v. Trees which are deemed to shield views from low lying areas should be identified within the plan.
- vi. Contours should be shown on masterplan options.

g. Market assessment report (prepared by Deep End Services)

- i. Please provide comment in relation to short-term / long-term impacts of Covid-19 on changes if any to projected demand for Residential and Commercial office space.

h. Natural values assessment (prepared by North Barker)

- i. Please provide an opinion, from a suitably qualified person, of the likelihood of impacts to DOV vegetation and swift parrot habitat being controlled actions under the EPBCA, if undertaken incrementally.
- ii. Please provide an opinion, from a suitably qualified person, of the likelihood of the isolated habitat trees in existing developed areas being utilised by swift parrots for foraging and nesting.
- iii. Please provide a Natural Values Assessment of the potential impact to the natural values of Rifle Range Creek from intended future development (including proposed bushfire hazard management areas), particularly in terms of water quality, aquatic species and riparian vegetation.
- iv. With regard to the BACs in section 2.3 of the Natural Values Assessment, and the demotion to BAC 4 where potential nesting habitat is proven not to support nests, please provide a statement of opinion (from a suitably qualified person) as to whether no nests currently being present in these areas is indicative that the areas are unlikely to be used for nesting in the future.
- v. Please provide clarification as to whether the trees identified as being retained in Table 11/Figure 12 has considered the need to remove trees to create canopy separation for bushfire hazard management areas.
- vi. Please provide a better explanation of what 'likelihood of constraint' means and why it has been used in the North Barker Ecosystem Services analysis. If the lowest level of constraint means that the vegetation community is threatened under the Nature Conservation Act 2002, does this mean that development across the entire site is significantly constrained by legislation? Please also provide an explanation of why the colours are different between the page 9 table and the page 28 Figure.
- vii. Please provide a statement of opinion, from a suitably qualified person, as to whether the proposed amendment and intended future development would be consistent with the threatened species management profile which states that 'protection of the species requires the conservation and restoration of all remaining foraging and nesting habitat' (<https://www.threatenedspecieslink.tas.gov.au/Pages/Swift-Parrot.aspx>).

i. Traffic impact assessment & transport strategy (prepared by GTA Consultants/Stantec)

- i. Section 5.1 (p.34) – provide clarification on the number of car spaces proposed. The Transport Impact Assessment submitted 06 Dec 2021 notes 5,016 car spaces are proposed, where Figure 5.1 shows 4,796 car spaces in 5 precincts.
- ii. Section 5.1 (p.34) – demonstrate how the 604 car spaces proposed in Precinct 1 can physically fit within the nominated area.
- iii. Section 5.2 (p.35) – clarify car park spaces. Table 5.1 gives statutory requirement of 7,803 car parking spaces, paragraph below states 8,500 required.
- iv. Section 5.2 (p.35) – clarify as further below it is stated that it is 3,394 spaces less than the statutory requirement. The figures for car parking spaces are not consistent.
- v. Section 5.3 (p.40 & 41), with relation to the assessment of the proposed car parking provisions:
 - 5.3.5 Sharing of Car Parking Provisions due to Variations of Demand – it is unreasonable to assume that car spaces can be shared on the basis that peak parking demands for different land uses would mean that parking spaces are not occupied and residential parking spaces must be guaranteed? Please demonstrate where shared car parking use has previously worked in similar circumstances.
 - 5.3.6 Existing Car Parking Deficiency – the report notes “The masterplan does not seek to rely on any car parking on surrounding residential streets”, however it details a deficiency of over 3000 car parking spaces. Please provide additional information considering the impact of parking overflow from the site on the amenity of the surrounding residential streets.
 - Under combination of factors 5.3.7, states visitor parking at 1 space per 10 dwellings. This opposes the car parking rates that were sought after for guidance from RTANSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments and the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments of 1 space per 5 dwellings. Please demonstrate where on street car parking within the surrounding road network will absorb the 1000 (approximately 5.4 km of road network) car spaces for visitors.
 - It is stated that the parking rates are in the context of the development reaching its full capacity in 20-30 years and the rates for this parking are used to estimate the required parking demand. Please demonstrate statistical justification for these reduced rates.

- Please demonstrate how car parking space condition (e.g. free parking, paid timed parking, number of private: public parking spaces) and how these conditions may impact the amenity of the surrounding residential streets.
 - Please provide details of who will own/operate and service Autonomous vehicles/hydrogen vehicles and what safety considerations will be implemented with regard to extremely steep area gradients and type of road networks required.
 - Please provide crash data for Churchill Avenue, Regent Street, Alexander Street and the intersection of all three.
 - Please provide details of age demographics and what transport options they may use considering:
 - Ability to use new tech
 - Ability to ride a bike
 - The availability of other transport options.
- vi. Proof / evidence that the proposed sporting facilities in 'Precinct 1' will not host statewide / national events that draw major crowds. Trip generation and parking rates for the proposed sporting facilities were not provided within the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), with little acknowledgement of the potential transportation and parking impacts of these facilities. If these facilities are proposed, please amend the TIA to address the additional impacts.
- vii. The expected impact on the Earl Street / Sandy Bay Road intersection, given that Earl Street will be connected to Churchill Avenue as part of the proposed Masterplan. How will vehicle volumes change in Earl Street and what are these expected volumes? Will Earl Street be able to function with Sandy Bay Road without significant detriment? How will the Earl Street / Sandy Bay Road intersection operate with the proposed nearby signalised intersection of Sandy Bay Road / Marieville Esplanade? We would like to see a concept design for any changes (if required) to this intersection, in addition to evidence that the intersection would operate satisfactorily.
- viii. Expected volumes for all proposed internal roads / accesses, including at existing UTAS campus accesses. This includes evidence that the existing accesses of the following can operate satisfactorily without the need for upgrades/changes:
 - Grace Street / York Street;
 - Alexander Street / Grosvenor Street / Grosvenor Crescent; and,
 - Proctors Road / Baintree Avenue
- ix. We would like to see concept designs for any changes (if required) to these intersections.

- x. Comments on whether the existing pedestrian bridge across Churchill Avenue will be maintained as part of the Masterplan. If not, comments on how these existing pedestrian movements will be accommodated for.
- xi. Comments on whether the existing pedestrian tunnel under Churchill Avenue will be maintained as part of the Masterplan. If not, comments on how these existing pedestrian movements will be accommodated for.
- xii. A concept design of the proposed roundabout at the New Access Road / Olinda Grove.
- xiii. An outline of the legal protections on the rights of the public to use the proposed internal access ways. Will these spaces be declared statutory public highways, or will a 'right of way' arrangement be in place to ensure that public access cannot be closed without a legal process being followed?
- xiv. For the Transport Strategy, please demonstrate the number of employment, shopping and recreation numbers to justify the 25% of trips to be based within the site, factoring in a supermarket that is already in the site and two more that are within 800 metres.

| Page | Reference | Request |
|--|--|--|
| APPENDIX C – PROPOSED PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT | | |
| Sheet 1 of 5 | Draft Instrument of Certification | Update scheme amendment area to remove the Low Density Residential Zone within the southern boundary |
| | Clarify naming of new PPZ 3 | Clarify inconsistencies between reference of Mt Nelson and Mount Nelson |
| | PPZ 3 boundary and plan reference | Clarify plan reference for application of Clause 34 PPZ. Figure 5.1 refers boundary of SAP not application of clause boundary |
| F5.1 | Purpose | Respond to the City of Hobart's Draft Affordability Housing Strategy, which states " <i>Collaborate with the University of Tasmania to identify and support opportunities for affordable and social housing inclusion within city and Sandy Bay campus accommodation developments</i> " and detail any specific measures to ensure that affordable/attainable housing is provided. |
| Figure F5.1 | Boundary of Sandy Bay Masterplan Specific Area Plan | Plan should be amended to remove Low Density Residential Area and any other area within the site area that does not require varied controls (i.e Bushland reserve). |
| Figure 5.2 | Precinct Plan | If the total amendment area is to be retained within the SAP, the Bushland Reserve area should be identified. |
| Figure 5.3 | Sandy Bay Masterplan Building Height and Siting Plan | Add legend to plan, and overlay precincts. |
| Figure 5.4 | Not currently proposed | Illustrated as Fig 5.6.9 within the SAP text. Consider bringing this forward with the other plans relevant to the SAP |
| Figure 5.4 | Sandy Bay Masterplan Connectivity Plan | Amend to show all publicly accessible roads with reserve widths in accordance with LGAT Standard Drawing TSD-R04-v3 Urban Roads, Typical Section and Pavement Widths and City of Hobart departures from LGAT Standard Drawings which can be found on the Council's website. |