
strengthening our community

5 November 2012

Executive Officer
Environment, Resources and Development Committee
House of Assembly, Parliament House
PO Box 572
Adelaide SA 5001

Dear Mr Philip Frensham,

Capital City DPA

The South East City Residents Association (SECRA) wishes to express its concerns about two aspects of the Ministerial Capital City Development Plan:

- Catalyst sites in residential areas and on Hutt Street
- The weakened protection for local heritage

Attached for consideration by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee are the following two documents:

- The South East City Residents Association (SECRA) submission to the Development Policy Advisory Committee
- The South East City Residents Association (SECRA) submission on the Adelaide City Council's Residential and Main Street DPA

It is considered that these two documents adequately address SECRA's concerns about the Capital City DPA which is being considered by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee.

SECRA therefore does not wish to make presentation to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee at its meeting on 14th November 2012.

Yours sincerely,

HN

for

John Underwood
Chairperson
South East City Residents Association (SECRA)
PO Box 7017 Hutt Street
Adelaide 5000

SECRA Postal address: PO Box 7017, Hutt Street, Adelaide SA 5000.

The Presiding Member
Development Policy Advisory Committee
GPO Box 1815
ADELAIDE SA 5001

Dear Sir or Madam,

The South East City Residents Association (SECRA) supports planning that leads to better urban design, especially in the public realm. We support taller buildings within the central core of the city. We support planning that recognizes Adelaide's stock of historic and heritage buildings as an asset that makes our city liveable; that gives our city its unique character and charm. We support planning reforms that allow older buildings to be repurposed for residential use.

We do not support the development plan amendments that would increase building heights in residential areas and in zones which adjoin residential areas. We are happy with the status quo. We believe building heights of 4-5 storeys have created "vibrant" neighbourhoods; nineteenth century cottages coexist happily with contemporary townhouses and low-scale apartment blocks. Residents know their neighbours; they take pride in the public realm, many caring for nature strips and adjacent Park Lands.

We do not understand why the State Government would want to threaten such successful examples of, what we consider is, medium-density living. Residents feel betrayed. We are not living on a quarter-acre block. We are not responsible for urban sprawl but we are now faced with possible overshadowing by, what was considered, non-complying development which will lead to the decrease in the value of our homes. This is transferring value from the owners of domestic property to non-resident property developers.

Residents have had only six weeks to educate themselves about major changes to our neighbourhood. Why is there a need for "urgent action to unlock development potential" (p2). Who, or what, is driving this urgency? Residents need more time to understand the implications of these changes. We need more time to digest our Council's response to the amendments. The public consultation period should be extended until the end of July. Perhaps the Minister for Planning, the Hon. John Rau could meet concerned residents during that time.

We are confused by a document that states: "further engagement will be undertaken with communities on policy recommendations that have a more direct impact on residential areas. This engagement will be progressed through Adelaide City Council's structure planning process and implemented through a future DPA"

We believe that the amendments in the current document do have a "direct impact on residential areas"; in particular **we vigorously reject the idea of catalyst sites in residential areas**, in particular Residential (East Terrace) Zone RA1 and Residential (Waverley) Zone RA3 and Main Street (Hutt).

"The DPA proposes to create opportunities for catalyst sites (ie sites over 1500 square metres) ... to allow for medium or high density mixed use development that can provide community hubs and/or activate areas"(p.iv).

We don't see the need for "catalyst" sites in our area:

- We already have medium density in our area.
- Nearby Hutt Street is a community hub
- Our streets are sufficiently "activated" by pedestrians and cyclists.

- We do not want mixed-use developments in RA1 and RA3. In particular we do not want new licenced premises or the extension of existing licenced premises' opening hours in residential areas. We do not want high rise car parks as these only encourage more traffic into narrow streets
- A recent mixed use development in our area (Angas and Hutt) failed to "activate" the street because the developers would only allow office space at street level. They decided that purchasers of apartments did not want to live above cafes or restaurants (noise, food odours, early-morning deliveries). As a result we have a wall of frosted windows facing the street. Hardly "activation".

We are particularly concerned by the lack of limits put on building heights on these catalyst sites and the following statement: "where there is an apparent conflict between the catalyst site principles and zone or Council Wide objectives and principles the catalyst site principles will take precedence." (Attachment G). We take this to mean that neighbours will be denied the opportunity to object to inappropriate development. We strongly object to this. And what are these "catalyst site principles"? How can we be expected to comment on principles that haven't been explained?

We note that the Adelaide City Council has proposed that catalyst sites should be no smaller than 2100m².

We are also very concerned about the interface between the Capital City Zone (which allows 15 storey buildings and higher) and adjoining residential areas, in particular those near Angas Street (Zones RA2 and RA4). **We want the CC Zone boundary moved north of Wakefield Street and west of Frome Street.** This will protect residential areas to the south and east from overbearing development and overshadowing. In addition there should be a "stepping up" of heights; it is ridiculous to go from cottage or two storey townhouse to 15 storeys.

Many residents have installed solar panels (with the encouragement of both State and local government). Are they now to be overshadowed by high rise development? Will adequate compensation be paid?

Our area is characterised by narrow streets and lanes. Any increase in heights on Hutt Street will seriously affect residents living in nearby streets, in particular, Corryton Street, Allen Place, Vincent Place, Cairns Street. Where will residents living in these proposed mixed-use apartments on Hutt Street enter and exit their undercover carparks (if, indeed, these are provided)? Any increase in traffic (noise, pollution) in these streets will have a particular impact on cottages situated next to the street. They do not have front gardens to act as a buffer.

We agree with our Council that city character should be strengthened and reinforced by setting "tailored retention depths for Local Heritage buildings" and that new buildings should recognise Adelaide's charm and historic feel.

Yours sincerely,

Heather Nimmo
Secretary
South East City Residents Association (SECRA)
PO Box 7017 Hutt Street
Adelaide 5000

30/5/12

Residential and Main Street DPA
GPO Box 2252,
Adelaide 5001

The South East City Residents Association (SECRA) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Adelaide City Council's initial public consultation on an "updating" of the Development Plan for our area.

This "updating" is the result of the State Government's 30-year plan and not resident dissatisfaction or desire for change. We note the desire of the Adelaide City Council to "conserve the heritage and character of the City's residential areas, whilst allowing sympathetic developments that will allow for a diverse and vibrant Adelaide, particularly along the Main Streets."

What we like most about our community

The South- East Corner (from East Terrace to King William Street and South Terrace to Wakefield Street and Bartels Road) is already a "**diverse and vibrant**" medium-density residential area of nineteenth century cottages and villas, townhouses and low-rise apartments that work well together. It has a successful Main Street in Hutt Street, with essential high street businesses such as a post office, banks, pharmacy, two small supermarkets, shoe repairer (one of the best in Adelaide), newsagent, drycleaners.

Many residents have installed, or intend to install, solar panels and are very concerned about overshadowing by any proposed new developments.

It is a compassionate community that includes a number of Housing SA complexes, supported residential facilities, social welfare organisations. We enjoy our library, our community centre at the Box Factory, schools and daycare centres, theatres and good public transport to the CBD (including the Council's well-patronised Connector bus). It is a walking and cycling community; as a result, people know and value their neighbours.

Our area happily includes light industry/home businesses.

Residents enjoy easy access to peaceful Park Lands (most of us have a small garden or no garden); in particular, Victoria Park gives us precious vistas to the Hills and open space for informal recreation and connecting with nature.

We would like to make the following comments:

1. There is enough development potential in the CBD to meet 30-year Plan population targets. Residential areas which are working well should be left alone.
2. We live in medium-density residential zones and therefore should not have developments that increase density with the resulting overlooking of small properties on narrow lanes.
3. We reject the concept of "catalyst sites" in residential zones and on Hutt Street.

4. RA1, RA2, RA4, RA5 should become “residential character zones” and retain the height limits and plot ratios in the current Development Plan.
 - a. RA1: 3 levels
 - b. RA2: 2 levels
 - c. RA4: 2-3 levels (I am not sure if it is 2 or 3 levels).
 - d. RA5: 4 levels
5. These “residential character zones” should achieve the same protection as residential areas currently enjoy in North Adelaide. This will include street trees, nature strips, gardens, open space.
6. Any existing non-complying developments in these zones should return to residential use in the event of change of use and should be limited to the existing height limits.
7. In these residential zones there should be no new hotels or extensions to existing hotel accommodation
8. There are enough shops on Hutt Street. We don't need them in the residential zones.
9. There are enough premises with liquor licences in our area (mainly on Hutt Street). We do not want them in residential zones.
10. That there be residential developments that allow the frail aged to remain in the area
11. The Plan should encourage family sized units with good sized rooms (and to resist intensive use by too many one and two-bedroom apartments) that will allow couples with children to remain in the area.
12. That the issue of residential parking permits is addressed in any new developments.
13. Pulteney Street and King William Street are more obvious Main Streets for residents close to, or west of, Hurtle Square. Existing office buildings could be converted to residential use with shops such as small supermarkets/chemists/newsagent/post office/cafes on the ground floor.
14. Multilevel car parks shouldn't be erected on Hutt Street or residential zones.
15. Hutt Zone
 - a. Hutt Street is a very successful main street but could do with a baker, butcher, greengrocer, laundrette. We have enough cafes, restaurants and liquor outlets.
 - b. Current height limits of 3 storey and current plot ratios should remain.
 - c. Its heritage character needs to be protected and enhanced. Owners could be encouraged to make use of the Council's Heritage Incentive Scheme.
 - d. Residential properties in the current Hutt Zone may need to be added to adjacent residential zones
 - e. Residential properties on narrow streets adjacent to or near Hutt Street are vulnerable to developments on Hutt Street re traffic/bins/noise. This is a another reason for restricting development through retaining the current height limit on Hutt Street.
 - f. Developments on Hutt Street should not allow noise to be directed into neighbouring residential streets through balconies and outdoor dining facing those streets.
 - g. SECRA has concerns that Hutt Street being defined as a "Mainstreet Zone" has the potential to change its current "village in the city high street image", where many businesses currently provide services to local residents. A change to more commercial developments could result in the loss of current services to local residents and change the character of the street.

- h. Also the definition of Hutt Street as a "Mainstreet Zone" could imply that it is seen as a main route for traffic in and out of the city. SECRA is of the view that the current heavy traffic flow in Hutt Street during the weekday morning and afternoon rush hours would be more appropriately diverted along streets such as Pulteney and King William Streets and that strategies to achieve this should be implemented (as suggested in SECRA's recent submission on the Integrated Movement Strategy) .
- i. Land use should
 - i. Resist loss of retail use to cafes, restaurants, nightclubs, betting shops, massage businesses
 - ii. Encourage the use of vacant properties as residential accommodation

16. RA3:

- a. The residential area to the east of St Andrew's Hospital on South Terrace should be included in RA1.
- b. That any proposed developments on the St Andrew's site must take into account the proximity of residential properties in Vincent Street and their loss of amenity.
- c. Similarly with any developments on South Terrace that would affect other residential properties in RA2 and RA5. Residents in Blackburn Street are concerned about a proposed high-rise hotel development behind the TPI Building.

Yours sincerely,



Heather Nimmo
Hon. Secretary
South East City Residents Association (SECRA)

29/10/12