

COPY

**SOUTH-EAST CITY
RESIDENTS
ASSOCIATION INC.**

strengthening our community

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