

**UTAS DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR 83 MELVILLE STREET, HOBART TAS 7000**  
**PLN-22-790 Alterations to Previously Approved Development for Pedestrian Bridge.**

*(Probably the only item that is questionable under the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme is "passive surveillance"  
Here is the link to the DA info*

<https://apply.hobartcity.com.au/Pages/XC.Track/SearchApplication.aspx?id=269594>

*Lots of pages but you only really need to look at the drawings and architectural report (pages 1-9, 24-41) in the second document. Also the Planning Report pages 10-23 if you're interested.*

*PLN-22-790 - 83 MELVILLE STREET HOBART TAS 7000 - Advertised Documents\_Landscape and Structural Plans - Planning Report and Heritage Report)*

**SOME DOT POINTS**

- The pedestrian bridge is proposed to rectify errors and omissions in the design proposed in the original DA for the project (PLN-21-869).
- The original DA for 83 Melville St did not provide access for people with disabilities from Brisbane St as required by the Disability Discrimination Act and the National Construction Code.
- Concerns were raised at that time with regards to passive surveillance and personal security of persons using the laneway as proposed in the original DA.
- The original DA for the Forestry Building was approved subject to compliance with the requirement for passive surveillance. As the proposed pedestrian bridge will not satisfy these requirements, the previous DA for the rest of the Forestry Building will also not comply.
- The proposed pedestrian bridge does not comply with the requirements for Passive Surveillance (Clause 22.4.4 of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015).
- With regard to item A1 (a) of the above, the claim is made that "*...the main pedestrian entrances to the site will be clearly visible from the street*".
- With regard to item A1 (d) of the above, the claim is made that— "*...the proposal avoids the creation of concealed spaces and the courtyard space, bridge and landscaping has been designed to avoid the creation of entrapment spaces.*"
- These statements are not correct, and the various drawings included in the DA do not support these claims.
- The drawings show that sightlines from the boundary with Brisbane St to the pedestrian entrances of the building will be blocked by the angled boundary wall, the columns supporting the bridge above, the proposed landscaping and the vertical timber fins at the sides of the bridge.
- The proposed bridge is open underneath so there will also be concealed spaces underneath the bridge.
- There is a high potential for entrapment in these concealed areas, especially after hours.
- The perspectives and views shown on the drawings are highly selective and are views from well within the site, and not from Brisbane St. The sightlines from Brisbane Street are not shown.
- The plant selection identified on the drawings includes a number of trees and tall ferns located under the bridge. These will add to the blocking of sightlines from the street to the pedestrian entry.
- The DA states that the building is to be open for 'extended hours' to staff and students - final open hours will vary depending on the university calendar "
- These "extended hours" are not defined, so it is highly likely that the building itself will not be accessible to the public on weekends, after hours and during semester breaks. However, the bridge and laneway, as designed, will still be accessible to the public at those times, and the lack of through traffic at those times will make it an unsafe area.
- Given the lack of passive surveillance and the concealed spaces inherent in the proposed bridge and laneway design, there is real potential for issues with the safety of staff and students entering the building after hours, as well as the safety of members of the public who access the bridge and laneway.
- There will be little, if any, surveillance of the bridge and walkway from adjacent buildings. There are virtually no windows in the buildings to the east and there is also no guarantee that there will be UTAS staff looking through the windows of the Forestry Building.
- The Hobart City Council should also be aware that if any incidents occur due to the lack of passive surveillance, creation of enclosed spaces, and potential for entrapment, the Council may be liable for damages due its approval of the current proposal.