

19<sup>th</sup> November 2013

**Institutional (St Andrew's) DPA**

The Presiding Member  
DPAC  
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure  
GPO Box 1815  
Adelaide 5001

Dear Sir or Madam,

The South East City Residents Association (SECRA) welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the Institutional (St Andrew's) Development Plan Amendment.

Background to this DPA

Our members do not support Minister Rau taking this area out of the Adelaide City Council's Residential and Main Street DPA to benefit a development which did not conform to planning regulations.

The Minister's catalyst site provisions for high-rise development in residential areas in his Capital City DPA were comprehensively rejected by residents but he went ahead and introduced them over our protests.

Last year we made detailed submissions to inform the Adelaide City Council's Residential and Main Street DPA. We are told that Minister Rau's office sat on this DPA for over six months. It has only just been released for public consultation.

And now we have Minister Rau's Institutional (St Andrew's) DPA. A DPA released on an interim basis before any consultation with the public and which appears to have been written for St Andrew's Hospital and its commercial interests, medical and other.

However, Minister Rau has been reported as saying that he will take account of residents' concerns and make changes to the Institutional (St Andrew's) DPA to address them.

## Residents' concerns

The changes introduced by the DPA will negatively affect local residents' amenity to a very significant degree, in particular, residents living in Vincent Street, Vincent Place, St John's Lane and that section of Gilles Street directly behind St Andrew's Hospital. The proposed changes will reduce the value of their properties.

A DPA which has been created to "establish a new institutional zone" in place of an existing residential zone should not allow the demolition of medical consulting rooms to build residential apartments, cafes, restaurants and shops.

Parking ratios for a medical precinct should be different from those in other precincts.

The DPA should not allow St Andrew's Hospital to construct a multi-deck car park which they can then run as a commercial business.

The DPA states that "catalyst sites should be developed to manage the interface with residential development" but later states that in cases of "apparent conflict" then catalyst site principles will take precedence. The DPA is unclear about how it will be established that a conflict is "apparent", or perhaps even, "real"? Given that there appear to be few restrictions on what can happen on catalyst sites how will there, indeed, be any "conflict"? Those living nearby will have no opportunity to object.

We are particularly concerned about the effect of the DPA on:

- a. Residents living in cottages on the eastern side of Vincent Street. They are vulnerable to overshadowing from any new development on the western border of St Andrew's Hospital (which is a catalyst site).
- b. Dwellings on the western side of Vincent Street will also be affected negatively by St Andrew's Hospital increasing their building footprint to the west.
- c. Residents on Gilles Street, directly opposite St Andrew's Hospital, will be overshadowed by any development at the northern end of the hospital site.
- d. Residents living in townhouses on the southern side of Vincent Place that face south will suffer a significant loss of privacy, amenity and sunlight if four-storey buildings are permitted on South Terrace between Hutt Street and Vincent Street.

Residents in St John's Lane and Vincent Street will be affected by any development of the St Andrew's existing car parks. We note that the current car parks are two-thirds empty after 6pm.

We note the mention of a "multi-decked car park" within the St Andrew's Hospital site. Residents objected to just such a development some years ago. We wonder how a multi-decked car park can be constructed to "restrict noise levels" and "minimise overlooking".

We object to any demolition of character villas on South Terrace.

Residential amenity of minor streets and side and rear lanes will be detrimentally affected by vehicles using these streets and lanes to access new developments on South Terrace. There is already too much traffic using these minor streets and lanes.

Adjacent Hutt Street has a plethora of restaurants, cafes and shops which are likely to be affected detrimentally by retail developments on South Terrace.

This DPA should take into account the proposed requirements of the adjacent Residential and Main Street DPA, with regard to triggers for category 2 notification.

Suggested changes to respond to residents' concerns:

1. Four storeys must not be built next to, or in close proximity to, single-storey or two-storey residential properties.
2. Category 2 notification should be triggered by a building height of nine metres and higher (approximately 2 storeys)
3. Commercial or retail activity not directly related to a medical function (residential apartments, cafes, restaurants, shops, commercial car parks) should be non-complying
4. Development on catalyst sites should not exceed 22 metres in building height
5. Parking requirements should be developed that suit a medical precinct adjacent to a residential zone. There should be an adequate provision for disabled parking.
6. Any proposal which would significantly increase traffic in St John's Lane, Vincent Street or Vincent Place should be non-complying.
7. Development should maintain the existing pattern of building set backs from South Terrace, with space between buildings and a strong landscape setting
8. A minimum of 20 percent landscaped open space should be provided on the site of any development.
9. Landscaped open space should be arranged and planted in a manner which will provide for the retention of existing significant vegetation, will reasonably maintain and enhance the established predominant pleasant amenity and landscaped character of the locality and which will respect the amenity of adjacent residential neighbours.

We wish to speak to our submission.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Heather Nimmo  
Secretary