



F.O.C.U.S.

Friends of the City of Unley Society

F.O.C.U.S
Friends Of the City of Unley Society, Inc.
P.O.Box 172
FULLARTON SA 5063
Email: info@focusonunley.org
Web: www.focusonunley.org

**FOCUS Representation
Special DAP meeting 4 March 2011
Development Application 79-85 Mary and 60-62 Arthur Streets**

The following text is basically as presented to the Panel by DC Kemp at the special meeting

Unley's Development Plan [DP] clearly sets out the requirements for development within its borders with the aim of maintaining "village charm" while also creating "city style". The land the subject of this application **was** and **is** in primarily a "dormitory village."

This parcel of land provides the opportunity to revert the land to its original purpose and enhance the amenity of Unley. Indeed the DP is quite clear that any development should, and I quote from the DP "**ensure** that the character and levels of amenity enjoyed by the existing residents are substantially maintained"

So does the proposed development have the potential to meet the objectives of Unley's DP and its guiding principles?

FOCUS supports the initiative in returning the site to residential use **but not** in the proposed form for the following principal reasons.

- Traffic - is the 200 trips per day as per Master Plan's October response in fact 200 outward and 200 return journeys or vehicle movements or only 100 journeys? I suspect it could be more like the 200 or 400 vehicle movements! Given that the Arthur St access is entry only most of the traffic will be in and out via Mary St. The traffic increase in Mary St would then be more like 10-20% rather than the 3% stated!
- Parking – on site provisions with tandem parking is not provided for in the Australian Standard. The end result is an unsatisfactory outcome. Furthermore, if site access is controlled via automatic gates some provision for on site queuing is essential to minimise impact on the street.
- Built form and appearance – Policy Are 8 is explicit that development should be **low scale** which is hardly the case in this proposal. FOCUS does not accept that 3 storeys will be OK because they will have negligible impact on the streetscape. While they might be 60 metres from the streets they are much closer to the residential properties to the east and west of the site. These three story blocks are around 11 metres tall [much taller than the present structure] even with their non complying flat roofs and dominate the neighbouring properties.

- It is suggested too, that the two storey buildings for Mary St accurately reflect the existing character of the street. FOCUS disagrees – the original and present character is overwhelmingly single story. Let us keep the original character!
- 58 Arthur St – The argument for its demolition is acknowledged but its replacement will be a poor substitute as well as a waste material and the energy embedded in this fine character home. Why not add value to the development by its adaption for retirement living!
- Trees – It just seems too convenient that the significant trees are not worth keeping. Trees are the lungs of Unley! The DP requires, and I quote a “high standard of compatible built form as well as tree planting to maintain and improve the locality.” There does not appear to any space for future significant trees for Unley to adopt. How about some space for replacement trees!

In conclusion FOCUS is of view that the proposal is an over development of the site. As evidence of this just look at the:

- Entry and exit arrangements
- The rubbish dumpsters, assuming they can turn into the site, via in effect a private driveway sized lane
- The inadequate onsite parking
- The inclusion of non complying three story elements
- Non complying collective side setbacks on the Arthur St frontage
- The non replacement of significant trees
- And the neighbours’ concerns on privacy and overshadowing.

FOCUS also notes the previously expressed concerns on the development **always remaining** as residences for retired persons

FOCUS is not convinced the development offers sufficient compensating benefits to allow acceptance of all the areas on non compliance with Unley’s DP.

FOCUS would be disappointed to see the development proceed as proposed.