

Document use in making my representation 01.07.2025

Bone Fides

My name is Jerry de Gryse

I am a Landscape Architect and a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects with 45 years of experience in site planning, hard and soft landscaping, townscape planning and landscape and visual assessment.

I have previously been recognised as an expert in these matters by the Planning Tribunal.

I appear today as a private unpaid resident and a homeowner and rate payer of Hobart who frequently transits through and around the site for recreational purposes. I therefore bring site-specific knowledge, professional and lived experience to the analysis of the impacts of the Stadium in relation to the fabric of the City and its landscape.

My site-specific knowledge has been gained through multiple professional engagements related to Macquarie Point and its surrounds. Amongst other projects, I was part of the master planning team for the Mac Point, “New Territory from Old Ground” master plan and was the principal author of the Queens Domain Master Plan. Through this work I have developed a deep understanding of the opportunities and constraints for development on the site.

In preparing for today I have:

- reviewed the TPC’s Draft Integrated Assessment Report, Section 3 Urban Form and Planning;
- reviewed the Executive Summary and portions of the Orbit Solutions Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment;
- viewed the model on display at the site;
- perused the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997; and
- reviewed the POSS Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium summary report

My Representation

I assume that you have reviewed my original representation opposing the development in which I concurred with the findings of the TPC's Draft Integrated Assessment Report which found that the "size of the stadium is disproportionate to Hobart's small scale and would be contrary to Hobart's visual values (pg 45, Section 3) and that the built form would present an overbearing appearance in the context of the existing built form of the area with its height, coarse grain and size intruding on the identity of the place and the city".

Other relevant objections, where I concur with the findings of the Integrated Assessment are its commentary on the lack of adequate street level amenity around the building, the impacts of wind and shade on the user experience and the constraints on pedestrian access to and around the site.

Justification for my conclusion

I like to take this opportunity to frame my concerns regarding these matters using documentation related to the project as reference.

Publicly accessible urban precinct

I question the LVIA claims that the site will be transformed into a "publicly accessible urban precinct" (pg 4, para 3) when access, in my opinion, appears in the plans to be constrained, unsafe and climatically uncomfortable.

Constrained

In regards to constraint, I note the narrow spaces between the perimeter of the Stadium and adjacent buildings and landscape spaces and challenge the assertion that the Stadium "maximises public access" (Pg 9, Orbit Executive Summary). Consider for instance the location of Gate 3 which is obscured by the adjacent facilities which challenges the legibility of the arrival experience for the un-initiated.

The LVIA also claims at Pg 5, para 2 that the Stadium seamlessly links "with public areas like Constitution dock". This is to be questioned. Here I reference Figure 7.1 in the draft Integrated Assessment which shows numerous pinch points around and leading to the Stadium. I also note the proximity of the western edge of the Stadium to the high-volume, high-speed and noise of the Tasman Highway and the dangerous conditions created at the crossing points from west to east.

Pg 10 states that the ground plane is "highly permeable" when by definition the Stadium is closed off and ticketed, the bulk and large scale of the footprint effectively making pedestrian and cycle movement through the site indirect and challenging and effectively blocking any potential for light rail into the City from the existing rail corridor.

Further in the proponents documentation, pedestrian and cycling access are predicated in part on the construction of the "Collins Street active transport bridge" (pg111, Macquarie

Point Multipurpose Stadium report September 2024). No detail or time frame is provided for this. As pointed out in the Integrated Assessment the bridge, in itself could have considerable impact on the urban environment due to its likely scale and footprint (page 50) and its visual impacts.

Unsafe

In regards to unsafe, I note that the area leading to Gate 3 is a dead end wherein a person could become trapped which does not accord with best practice CPTED principles. Reliance on security cameras does not obviate the danger of entrapment.

Climatic Comfort

It is a local maxim of site planning and building design that users want to be “in the sun and out of the wind”.

I note that the narrow spaces around the Stadium where buildings or landform bound it all have the potential to become wind tunnels.

I also note that the shade diagrams provided by the Architects (Consolidated Plans 2, PDF Pages 29 and 30) show the entirety of Evans Street and the southern forecourt to the Stadium (where 60% of users are expected to enter) to be in shade for the bulk of the day at Winter Solstice (and therefore likely many days either side of that date). It is worth noting that Winter Solstice this year coincided with the start of Round 16 of the AFL season.

Human Scale

I further question the claim that the “proposed project contributes to a human scale environment at ground level” (Pg 7, Orbit LVIA). At 22 metres in height the perimeter edge of the building is ~14.5 times the height of the average adult and the street edge the façade at ~15m is roughly 10 times the height of the average person, thereby presenting an overwhelming presence, particularly when experienced in the narrow spaces around the Stadium.

It is my professional experience that a person needs to be set back roughly 4 times the height of an object to take it in as a whole and thereby interpret it meaningfully as an element.

I further disagree with Orbit’s assertion that the “detailed articulation employed” in the design breaks down “perceived bulk”. In my opinion, none of the background or middleground vistas from the east (the river), west (the Brooker Highway) or north (Tasman Highway entry to the City) that have been montaged could be interpreted in this manner. In all cases, the building presents as a large, virtually solid object, the scale and bulk of which is little mitigated by any detail in the design.

Urban Fabric

I strongly disagree with the statement by Orbit that the stadium integrates with the Sullivans Cove urban fabric “without creating an unacceptable visual impact”. I further disagree that the “transformative effect on the landscape and townscape” is one of integration with the existing urban fabric”

(Pg 5, para 1).

The grain of the City is much finer than the expansive footprint of the Stadium and much more articulated in scale, height and setback from street and pedestrian corridors. The comparative footprint analysis with various factories fails to be relevant to the situation (Orbit PDF pgs 44-45). It would have been more relevant to interpose the Stadium footprint on the City Centre or onto the headland where a general reader could make relevant comparisons with known features.

Of the illustrations, the most relevant to the Stadium of the contrast between the form of a stadium and its surrounds are the Ninja Stadium example and the Eastlands footprint where the contrast of their ‘grain’ with that of the surrounds is most evidently different and impactful.

Review of the montages provided by Orbit (for instance their views at KOP 1, 4, 7 and 12 and those of the Architect (PDF page 2, Consolidated Plan Set 2) visually illustrate the contrast between the bulk and form of the Stadium and the surrounding townscape and the degree to which it impacts the setting by being out of scale with it.

For instance KOP 4 illustrates the degree to which the Stadium’s scale and bulk overwhelm that of the adjacent headland where on sits the Cenotaph.

KOPs 2 meanwhile, illustrates the impact of the Stadium in comparison to the fine grain of the City. KOP 3 illustrates the roof of the structure forming a significant backdrop which obscures distant views to the fine grain of the City and KOP 3 the bounding landform of Mt Nelson (a backdrop of such importance that the City purchased land there to protect the skyline).

Historic Integration

I also disagree with Orbit’s finding that the Stadium integrates with the historic character of the area (pg 5, para 4). Construction of the Stadium:

- requires moving the Goods Shed, reducing it in scale and removing the floor level changes therein that speak to its former use;
- requires the removal or relocation of most all extant evidence of the use of the prior use of the site – minor fittings, rails and the Red Shed;
- creates an overwhelming presence adjacent to the Royal Engineers building and historic buildings aligning Evans Street;
- requires construction of the northern access road which will sever the connection of the historic regatta pavilion from the water’s edge; and

- significantly intrudes into the experience of the Cenotaph and the landscape beyond as a place of contemplation (here I riffed on the expansive views – see below).

Landscaping

I further question the veracity of the positive comments on about the “human scale” of the Stadium which in part relies on “extensive public plazas and landscaped buffers” (Pg 9) and “appropriately scaled landscaping elements.

As noted yesterday, there are no landscape plans (Pg7). All landscaping shown in the montages including plantings and hard features is speculative and should not be relied on in an evaluation of impact of the current plans.

In my experience, the landscaping is one of the first elements of a project to be cut during value management and/or the design/construct processes. Therefore, any reliance on the landscaped surrounds to reduce the massing, bulk or scale of the Stadium is to be questioned. In any case, in the montages provided by Orbit Solutions there is no appreciable difference between the stadium with and without landscaping (apart from in close views such as KOP6 where the scaling effects are limited).

In conclusion, it is my expert opinion that the magnitude of impact of the Stadium is substantial and unacceptable. The change to the visual landscape of the City strongly contrasts with its character and viewing experience where the development will be viewed as a permanently dominant change.

On this basis, I believe the development should not be approved in its current form and/or in its proposed location at Macquarie Point.

Extemporaneous comments made during my presentation

Expansive views

During testimony, I commented that the views from the Cenotaph had value beyond the sunrise view on Anzac Day. Of importance I noted the value of the “expansive views” from the Cenotaph area and their place in history. I noted that Traditional Owners may well have enjoyed the headland as a place to gather, that the military in creating a defence for the Derwent from a Russian threat in the late 19th C built a battery (a gun emplacement – the Queens Battery) there in conjunction with other locations at Princes Park, Bellerive Bluff and the Alexandra Battery at Lower Sandy Bay.

I noted that anything that reduced that expansive view would be a significant visual impact.

Mr Goss had noted that the dome of the stadium impeded the view but its impact could be mitigated through planting which I suggested would further diminish the expansiveness of the view.

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)

In response to Ms Penn, I elaborated on the principles of CPTED and the failure of the area at Gate 3 in regard to those principles.

Comments Made in Response to Questioning

Perceived Conflict of Interest (Mr Townsend) – pre-prepared notes read verbatim

As I noted at the Directions Hearing, there may be a perceived conflict of interest as my firm, Inspiring Place has been engaged by a private developer to consider an alternative location and design for a stadium. I believe that my objection to the current proposal is in no way influenced by this work and have focused my concerns solely on the Mac Point development independent of any comparison with another proposal.

The value of landscaping in evaluating impact (Mr Turner)

I noted that in the absence of any plans, the landscaping in the renders was purely speculative and should not influence evaluation of the user experience. In practice, a Development Application would require a layout plan showing areas of landscape and the general distribution of plants. A species list is also required along with information about the mature size of the proposed species. This information would inform a renderer who would use an available digital plant palette to insert lifelike plants into their render.