



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

24 August 2010

City of Unley
181 Unley Rd
Unley SA 5061

Attention: Ms Fiona Koutsikas

**Development Application 090/152/2010/C3
79-85 Mary St and 58, 60-62 Arthur St, Unley**

Dear Ms Koutsikas

The following comments are offered in connection with the above application. The Unley Development Plan and Principles of Development Control clearly define the principal features appropriate for development in this RS (BF) zone.

The proposed development does not adequately meet the requirements of Unley's development plan yet in return offers no offsetting benefits of value to the community. Unley's residents appreciate the various characters of the city precincts and it's "Village Charm." A contribution to the village charm from this development is questionable.

Specifically the proposed development appears to not meet the objectives and principles of Unley's Development Plan in various ways including the following respects:

- The redevelopment in the zone is intended to provide for primarily street-fronting dwellings, together with the use of existing non-residential buildings and sites for small-scale local businesses and community facilities. There is nothing small scale about this development which is much more intense than any of the nearby multiple residential facilities. Nor does the proposal include any community facility. On this point alone it should not receive consent.
- Development should present a single storey built scale to the streetscape. On the narrowest street frontage of Mary Street a two story construction is proposed while on the wider Arthur Street the building section fronting the street is of single story. The two story buildings on Mary Street are not of single story scale [as for Arthur St] and are not acceptable.
- Any two story building is required to be set well behind the primary street façade of any dwelling fronting the street so as to be inconspicuous in the streetscape, without being of a bulk or mass that intrudes on neighbouring properties and neighbouring spacious conditions. The Arthur Street two story buildings do not meet this requirement particularly as they are within 2 metres of the property boundaries and in some instances not complying with the 4 metres collective side setback provisions.

- It seems very clear that the Development Plan does not envisage three story buildings in this zone. New buildings should produce a streetscape setting and built forms complementing the desired character of the zone. The three story buildings are out of character and of a mass and form that intrudes on neighbouring properties and neighbouring spacious conditions. FOCUS objects to the inclusion of three story buildings.
- The development relies on the demolition of two Arthur Street houses. Demolition of number 62 removes an “eyesore”. Number 58 seems to be a fine character residence and in FOCUS’s opinion should be retained at all costs. Apart from diminishing the streetscape and its loss would result in waste of materials and the energy embedded in the building.
- The proposed loss of 5 significant trees is lamented. It just seems too convenient that the trees acceptable for removal just happen to be not on the perimeter of the site.
- The extent to which the site is being over developed is shown by the incorporating a narrow one way entry from Arthur Street squeezed within a meter of a building.
- *The traffic report is based on 200 trips per day. Doesn’t this imply 400 vehicle movements – ie 200 departures and 200 returns? Both Arthur and Mary are narrow carriageways and carry a large volume of traffic compared to any other East- West roads between Unley and King Wm. This development will exacerbate the current access problems at the intersections of Arthur and Mary with both Unley and King William Roads. Increase traffic will be generated at the un signaled Mary Street intersections with limited use being made of Arthur Street which provides entry only to the site. The traffic report does not address this unsatisfactory aspect.*
- The overdevelopment is also shown by the necessity to use inconvenient and sub standard parking tandem spaces to achieve the bare minimum off street parking to satisfy the minimum requirements of the Development Plan. Tandem parking is not provided for in the Australian Standard. Parking spaces and aisle widths are the bare minimum and will not be particularly user friendly.
- The onsite rubbish collection point seem difficult to access. [Does the collecting truck reverse up the one way entry?] More than one bin will be needed for recycling needs resulting in multiple truck visits. Rubbish removal is a noisy activity and must be controlled with respect to time and frequency to minimise annoyance to residents in and adjacent the site.
- There are no areas allocated for recreational activities such as gardening. Access to the indoor recreation from Building 1 is across roadways – Pedestrian access within the site and from the inside of the site to Arthur and Mary is poor.
- Solar Access – Bed 2 in Rooms Type B & J in building 2 have windows at the end of a narrow 5m deep recess – They will have poor light and ventilation and no view as a result. All buildings have East West windows with inadequate solar control – as a result Cooling Energy use will be high. In other instances windows are opposite close adjacent window which must lead to privacy issues.
- Provisions for heating, cooling and ventilation plant not adequately indicated nor measures for noise control on such plant.

Has the proponent demonstrated there is a demand amongst retired persons for a development of the type and standard proposed?

We object to the development as presented and would be disappointed if Council’s Development Assessment Panel does not come to the same decision. A low density development with individual cottages would be more appropriate and in keeping with the desired character of the zone. A FOCUS representative would be happy to speak to the Development Assessment Panel in support of the comments in this letter.

[Development Plans are to guide the development of Unley. Should this development receive consent as presented, one wonders why bother with a Development plan at all!]

Yours faithfully

Cc Mr Paul Weymouth