3 July 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

100 PINNACLE ROAD, MOUNT WELLINGTON &
30 McROBIES ROAD, SOUTH HOBART
CABLEWAY AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS
APPLICATION NO. PLN-19-345

I refer to the above planning permit application received on 12 June 2019.

Under section 54 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, you are required by the Council to provide the following additional information and submit it in electronic (PDF) format:

*Please note that this fourth further information letter includes that already requested on 13 June 2019, 21 June 2019 and 1 July 2019 as well as that requested as of today.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date requested</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>13 June 2019</td>
<td>An amended planning report which provides further detail on the proposed mix of uses within the Pinnacle Building and appropriate use classifications having regard to the allowable uses within The Pinnacle Specific Area Plan under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2015. A preliminary review of the application suggests that while part of the building may be appropriately classified as Transport Depot and Distribution and Tourist Operation, the café, restaurant and function centre, amphitheatres and sanctum space should be considered as stand alone uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date requested</td>
<td>Further information required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The café, restaurant (including bar) is consistent within the definition of Food Services which is a discretionary use, however sufficient detail to demonstrate that the function centre is an ‘ancillary and subservient’ use to the Food Services use is required in order to consider this as allowable (i.e. not prohibited use). Additionally, information on the purpose and nature of use for the sanctum space and amphitheater is required to also demonstrate that they are part of an allowable use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>13 June 2019</td>
<td>A copy of the Aboriginal heritage desktop assessment undertaken by Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania demonstrating that there will be no Aboriginal heritage sites affected by the proposed development. The desktop assessment should include the spatial search parameters provided to Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>13 June 2019</td>
<td>This request has been withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated on 1 July 2019. Council as the planning authority has formed an opinion that the access road should not be separately categorised and be considered directly associated with and subservient to the use and development and that there is discretion to consider the access road under the provisions of the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>21 June 2019</td>
<td>An outline of the estimated average and total number of visitors for each use within the Pinnacle Building per year, each day and at any one time. This should include seating capacity for the restaurant, café and bar, carrying capacity of each cable car carriage/cabin and likely number of cable car trip with information on journey time between the base station and Pinnacle building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>21 June 2019</td>
<td>Clarification on whether the application includes the demolition of the existing observation shelter at the Pinnacle. The photomontages submitted with the application show its removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>21 June 2019</td>
<td>Clarification that the new mountain bike (and walking) trails shown on the Masterplan (purple, red and orange lines) do not form part of the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated on 1 July 2019. If they are not intended to form part of the application, please provide a revised master plan image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they are intended to form part of the application, please provide appropriately detailed drawings identifying width, type of construction and extent of vegetation clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>1 July 2019</td>
<td>Clarification on how existing trail users within the area of the base station will be provided with safe and appropriate connections through the development site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRAFFIC IMPACT & ROAD ENGINEERING

T1 13 June 2019

An amended Traffic Impact Assessment that provides justification as to why uses within the Pinnacle Building, which will generally be open to the public, will not increase traffic movement to the Pinnacle and parking demand in the area. The current TIA assumes a reduction in traffic and parking on the basis that the uses in the Pinnacle Building will be accessed via the cable car only. Given that the Pinnacle Building will be accessible via an existing public road it would be reasonable to assume that some patrons will arrive by means other than the cable car.

T2 13 June 2019

Updated on 1 July 2019

The Traffic Impact Assessment recommends improvements to the McRobies Road/ Cascade Road intersection and two-way traffic flow onto McRobies Road; however, under section 1.2.2 of the planning report it is identified that these works do not form part of the development application. Accordingly, clarification is required as to whether these form part of the application.

If they are to be included, then please provide an updated planning report.

If they are not to be included, please provide an amended Traffic Impact Assessment which demonstrates that these works are not necessary for the proposal to demonstrate consistency with the Road and Railway Assets Code under the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015. An amended suite of civil engineering drawings and master plan image which excludes these works should also be provided.

T3 1 July 2019

An amended Traffic Impact Assessment that provides further details on:

(a) how survey results were used to derive estimated number of passengers per vehicle as outlined in section 4.1.1;

(b) the basis for adopting a traffic distribution of 40% buses/coaches/tours and 60% private vehicles/taxis;

(c) how the hourly multipliers in Table 2 were derived noting that the TIA indicated information from Scenic World and Table Mountain Aerial Cableway were used to derived figures;

(d) whether there is adequate car parking at the base station based on that information and the visitor information requested in P4.

T4 1 July 2019

Commentary within the Traffic Impact Assessment on how the give-way priority of the upgraded intersection of Cascade Road and McRobies Road as shown in the Gandy and Roberts Drawing 13.0041 – CO50 Rev 1 and CO51 Rev 1, is intended to function.

Please note that if these works are to not comprise part of the application (see request T2) then this information may not be required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date requested</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>1 July 2019</td>
<td>Commentary within the Traffic Impact Assessment on the compliance of the proposed roundabout at the junction of the new access road with McRobies Road as shown in the Gandy and Roberts Drawing 13.0041 – CO35 Rev 1, with Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4B: Roundabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>1 July 2019</td>
<td>Turning path diagrams demonstrating that a bus can negotiate the proposed roundabout at the function of the new access road with McRobies Road as shown in the Gandy and Roberts Drawing 13.0041 – CO35 Rev 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>3 July 2019</td>
<td>Details of the type and size of commercial vehicles that will be using the access road and confirmation that the grade of the access road will comply with Clause E6.7.2 under the Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUSHFIRE MANAGEMENT**

BM1 21 June 2019  
This request has been withdrawn.  
Updated on 1 July 2019.

BM2 1 July 2019  
An amended Fire Protection Report that:

(a) References the January 2019 version of the architectural plans with any appropriate modifications to the assessment based on the latest version; and

(b) Removes any assessment under Planning Directive No. 5 (Council as the planning authority has formed an opinion that PD5.1 rather than PD5 applies due to section 23(5) of the Wellington Park Management Act 1993).

BM3 1 July 2019  
Amended architectural plans which show the location of the remote offtake points for both the Pinnacle building and base station to demonstrate that compliance with requirements for static water supply for fire fighting will not require any further development (including works).

Please note there are concerns regarding the ability for a fire truck to access the remote offtake points, particularly at the Pinnacle.

BM4 1 July 2019  
Evidence that the Chief Fire Officer is likely to accept the proposed performance based approach for bushfire management outlined in the Fire Protection Report prepared by Castellan Consulting and dated 16 January 2019 to demonstrate that no additional ground disturbance and vegetation clearance is likely to be required.
BM5 3 July 2019  Further information required

Confirmation as to whether there will be any storage of hazardous chemicals (such as diesel fuel for back up generators) stored on site that would exceed the manifest quantity as specified in the Work Health and Safety Regulations 2012.

If there is to be storage of hazardous chemicals in a manifest quantity please provide an amended Fire Management report which addresses the relevant requirements under Planning Directive 5.1.

BIODIVERSITY

B1 21 June 2019  Updated 1 July 2019.

Clarification of whether the Natural Values Impacts Assessment prepared by North Barker and dated 5 June 2019 addresses all direct and indirect vegetation clearance proposed, particularly in terms of access tracks to the lower tower locations, walking tracks for ongoing use and any construction phase impacts (eg laydown areas). The Planning Report prepared by Ireneinc Planning & Urban Design and dated 12 June 2019 states at Page 10 that excavators will be 'mostly' helicoptered into site and the architectural drawings (Site Plan 1780_DA00 dated January 2019) show an indicative construction track to tower 2.

If the Natural Values Impact Assessment does not address all direct and indirect vegetation clearance then it is to be updated those matters.

This is be provided in a mapped format showing the maximum extent of all impact relating to the development overlain with the ecological survey results.

B2 21 June 2019

Confirmation of the extent (including specific footprint and timing) of each ecological survey (noting the time of year of each survey) with direct reference to the development footprint (which must include all areas of direct and indirect vegetation clearance). This is to be provided in a mapped format.

B3 21 June 2019

An arboriculture assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified arborists which outlines the condition and likely impact of all high conservation value trees within the development footprint. The assessment should identify trees that must be removed as well as trees which may require trimming or incur encroachment within their tree protection zone.

B4 21 June 2019

Further information to demonstrate that compliance with P2.1 under Table 5 of the Wellington Park Management Plan 2013, particularly in regard to how adverse effects have been remedied to ensure no long-term impact on vegetation values. This information should include consideration of any appropriate ongoing management or mitigation measures including offset mechanisms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date requested</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B5a | 21 June 2019   | Further information to demonstrate compliance with subclause (c) under P1 of Clause E10.7.1 of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015*, particularly in regard to the development component outside of the Wellington Park area and therefore subject to the Biodiversity Code. Specifically provide:  
(a) a copy of the economic analysis prepared by Mr Saul Eslake, referenced in the planning report that supports the argument that special circumstances exist;  
(b) justification that no feasible alternative locations for the access road existing, including an options analysis; and  
(c) an outline of what is considered to be the most appropriate mitigation strategy (including a potential offset) and ongoing management measures for remaining high priority biodiversity values. |
| B5b | 21 June 2019   | A roadkill risk report prepared by a suitably qualified person, analyzing the roadkill risk, particularly to threatened fauna, presented by the proposal including risks along the new access road to the base station as well as Pinnacle Road with respect to potential change in evening/night traffic associated with the uses within the Pinnacle Building (including restaurant and bar) and construction impacts.  
This analysis should include a draft Roadkill Mitigation Plan confirming how roadkill risks will be mitigated and managed. |
| B6  | 21 June 2019   | A bird collision report prepared by a suitably qualified person, analyzing the risk of bird collision with cables and other structures (including windows in buildings) as well as during construction, having regard to the intended use of helicopters.  
This bird collision report should specifically consider the likelihood of risk to threatened avifauna that are likely or are known to be present within the area. |
| PCL1| 21 June 2019   | Updated 3 July 2019  
An environmental site assessment prepared by a suitably qualified person in accordance with Clause E2.3 of the *Hobart Interim Planning Scheme 2015* that demonstrates compliance with P1 of Clause E2.6.2.  
30 McRobies Road is a potentially contaminated site. |
| TW1 | 1 July 2019    | Information to satisfy the enclosed additional information request from TasWater TWDA 2019/00841-HCC dated 25 June 2019. To discuss these points please call TasWater on 13 6992. Please note that all additional information intended to satisfy these points should be |
submitted to the City of Hobart, not TasWater. Please submit the information through the City of Hobart online services development portal. Additional information submitted in any other way will not be accepted.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

EI1 1 July 2019 Details on how the proposed sewer pump station will comply with the EPA Sewage Pumping Station Environmental Guidelines, specifically in relation impacts on receiving water values, proposed protections measures to be adopted and how any emergency overflow to the environment will be managed.

EI2 1 July 2019 An assessment prepared by a suitably qualified odour expect on the likelihood of odour generation for sewage holding tanks for the Pinnacle building with the appropriate odour control measures identified given that detention times for sewage will be up to 12 hours.

EI3 1 July 2019 Details on how risk of spillage will be managed during transfer of sewage to and from the cable car holding tanks.

STORMWATER

SW1 1 July 2019 Updated on 3 July 2019. A stormwater drainage design prepared by a suitably qualified person which demonstrates that:

(a) The system(s) is capable of accommodating a storm with an ARI of 20 years when the land serviced by the system(s) if fully developed; and

(b) stormwater runoff from the base station and access road will be no greater than pre-existing runoff or any increase can be accommodated within existing or upgraded public stormwater infrastructure.

Please note the stormwater design for the development must include management of stormwater runoff from the access road noting that the downstream catchment is McRobies Gully which is an EPA regulated premise. An initial review indicates that on site detention may be required for the base station and access road.

SW2 1 July 2019 Clarification of whether any oil interceptor treatment will be provided for stormwater runoff from the car park at the base station.

NOISE IMPACTS

N1 1 July 2019 A revised Acoustic Report which:

(a) provides reasoning for assessing the proposal as \( L_{eq} \) as opposed to \( L_{max} \) noise emissions against the requirements of the Wellington
Further information required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date requested</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Management Plan 2013 (amended October 2015);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) expected $L_{eq}$ and $L_{max}$ noise emissions from the proposal specifically at 50m. Please note that the Wellington Park Management Plan 2013 (amended October 2015) does not explicitly reference vertical or horizontal dimensions and the assumption made in the Acoustic Report prepared by Pearl Terts dated 27 May 2019 has provided the basis for increasing the assessment distance to greater than 50m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT & GEOCONSERVATION

GEO1  1 July 2019  An amended Geotechnical Study that:

Updated on 3 July 2019.

(a) in Section 6:

(i) provides a landslide characterisation for each identified hazard at each of the sites (Pinnacle building, base station and tower sites) in more detail as to type, material, history of movement, likely mechanism, size, volume, velocity, travel distance and other matters in Section 5.3 of AGS 2007a;

(ii) comments in more detail on the likelihoods adopted from each hazard (the degree of belief approach needs to be justified. Commentary on accuracy of assessment and risk and a range of stated inputs (and hence risks) might better reflect the uncertainty;

(iii) comments in more detail on the consequences adopted from each hazard;

(iv) includes at least one risk to life assessment, which discusses risk to a group of people and potentially the worst-case geotechnical scenario (eg landslide at the base station or toppling boulder hitting a cable car). Consider including an event tree;

(v) comments on the estimated risks in relation to acceptance criteria; and

(vi) concludes whether the development is likely or not likely to cause instability on land outside of the development site;

(b) in section 7.1 and 7.2 provides general comments on the scope, rationale and methodology of the detailed intrusive investigations at the Pinnacle building, Tower 3 and the presumably less detailed intrusive investigations at the base station and Towers 1 and 2;

(c) in Section 7.3 considers whether an AS2870 Class P might be more appropriate for the base station (Class M can remain as an appropriate guide for footing design in relation to expected ground conditions).
(d) in Section 7.4 considers the rarity of the features relating to the geoconservation significance of the Organ Pipe Columnar Jointing and Wellington Range Periglacial Terrain in a regional and Tasmanian context as well as the reversibility of impacts/alterations proposed to these features. The assessment provided indicates that the features of geoconservation significance are broad/regional features, however an initial review indicates that this is an incorrect interpretation of the listing and that the features are ‘localised’ with sub-regional and regional significance.

(e) provides an assessment of the access road. Where within the Wellington Park boundary this should be against the relevant requirements of the Wellington Park Management Plan. Where outside the Wellington Park boundary it should be identified where the access road traverses the Landslide Hazard Overlay and an assessment made under the relevant provisions of Clause E3.0 Landslide Hazard Code.

GEO2 1 July 2019 Evidence that the assessment of impact upon sites of geoconservation significance contained at Section 7.4 of the Geotechnical Study prepared by Cardno and dated 11 January 2019 has been prepared by a suitably qualified geomorphologist.

VISUAL IMPACT

VIA1 1 July 2019 A visual catchment assessment (VCA) of the wider area including all locations that have a line of sight to the proposed development including all proposed infrastructure. This would be an extended version of Figure 15: Pinnacle Centre Zone of Theoretical Visibility shown on p54 in the Visual Impact Assessment prepared by Urban Ethos and dated 24 January 2019

VIA2 1 July 2019 Based on the VCA identify further positions that would benefit from additional analysis in the form of accurate/verifiable Aligned Photomontage images that represent:

(a) Existing conditions;

(b) Proposed built form;

(c) Proposed built form and proposed landscape; and

(d) Proposed built form and proposed landscape with outline of proposed built form in contrasting stroke.

VIA3 1 July 2019 An amended Visual Impact Assessment that:

(a) Includes revisions based on the additional photomontages requested in VIA2;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date requested</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) Provides further analysis by the author of the VIA (rather than reliance on the architectural statement) of the proposed built form against the following criteria:

(i) Colour;

(ii) Form;

(iii) Line;

(iv) Texture;

(v) Scale; and

(vi) Spatial Characteristics;

c) extends the evaluation to views from the River Derwent and the Eastern Shore, nearby tracks where there is line of sight, the moving components of the cable car (speed, frequency, size, material, glare and reflectivity, lighting, total number of cabin in operation on the cable lines and the relative spacing) and night time impacts;

d) Provide further analysis of the base station and related infrastructure;

e) substantiates the evaluation of building siting that concludes the proposal satisfied the performance criteria as outlined in Section 8 (eg a view from the vicinity of the intersection of the Pinnacle Track and Radfords Track where there is line of sight to the summit); and

(f) includes the January 2019 version of the architectural plans with any appropriate modifications to the assessment based on the latest version.

Please submit your additional information through the City of Hobart [online services development portal](#). Additional information submitted in any other way will not be accepted.

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.

Under the Act, the Council has 42 days to determine your application (excluding the period from the date of this request until the information is received to the Council's satisfaction).

You may appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal against this request within 14 days from the day on which this notice was served on you.

Please also note that the additional information must be received to the Council’s satisfaction, within two years of the request being made, otherwise the application will lapse in accordance...
with section 54(2AA) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

The City of Hobart reserves the right to seek further additional information in accordance with section 54(1) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* if required.

Please telephone the undersigned on [insert number] if you have any queries regarding this letter.

Yours faithfully

(Ben Ikin)
SENIOR STATUTORY PLANNER
CITY PLANNING
**Request for Additional Information**

*For Planning Authority Notice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Planning Permit No.</th>
<th>Application date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLN-19-345</td>
<td>17/06/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TasWater details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TasWater Reference No.</th>
<th>Date of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWDA 2019/00841-HCC</td>
<td>25/06/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response issued to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council name</th>
<th>TasWater Reference No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOBART CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>TWDA 2019/00841-HCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TasWater Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(03) 6237 8243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response issued to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:coh@hobartcity.com.au">coh@hobartcity.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Property ID (PID)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 PINNACLE RD, WELLINGTON PARK</td>
<td>5587226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of development</th>
<th>Stage No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Wellington Cable Car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional information required**

Additional information is required to process your request. To enable assessment to continue please submit the following:

1. TasWater will not accept direct inline boosting from the water network unless it can be demonstrated that the periodic filling and testing of the system will not have a significant negative effect on our network and the minimum service requirements of other customers serviced by the network. To this end break tanks may be required with the rate of flow into the break tank controlled so that peak flows to fill the tank do not also cause negative effect on the network. Please provide an amended concept servicing plan for water services which address this issue.

**Advice**

NIL

**Authorised by**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TASWATER CONTACT DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 6992</td>
<td><a href="mailto:development@taswater.com.au">development@taswater.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Web</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPO Box 1393 Hobart TAS 7001</td>
<td><a href="http://www.taswater.com.au">www.taswater.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>