

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 20 September 2012 Council endorsed the Statement of Intent for the Residential and Main Street Development Plan Amendment (DPA).

In order to inform Council's preparation of this DPA, early input was sought from the public. The period for early feedback closed on 26 October 2012, with 138 submissions being received.

This report, together with all feedback received, will be provided to Council to inform policy development. In order to assist in this process, the feedback received has been grouped and analysis by precincts as follows:

- South-East: Residential Zones RA1-RA4 and the Main Street (Hutt) Zone
- South-Central: Residential Zones RA6 & RA7
- South-West: Residential Zone RA7
- North Adelaide: Main Street Zones (O'Connell and Melbourne Street East and West)

This Executive Summary is a consolidated summary of all feedback received. Unless specified, the feedback relates generally to all precincts. More detailed, area specific, analysis is included in the body of this report.

Community – Strong and connected communities exist in the residential areas (Residential Zones) of the City of Adelaide. The majority of people enjoy the easy access to services, facilities and the Park Lands and the ability to walk to most places contributes to residents knowing people in their area as they literally meet on the street.

Character – Respondents cited the low or “human” scale detached and semi-detached dwellings in the residential areas as being central to their character, with one and two-storey development being the predominant dwelling height. In both the South-East and South-West precincts the importance of the heritage and historic character dwellings was noted by the majority of respondents, with some calling for greater protection via a Historic Conservation Zone, or similar policy.

Social Cohesion – Respondents generally made the link between the built form character and the connectedness of their communities. The connection between front yards (private open space) and public spaces is seen as central to knowing the people in the area.

Building Height & Density – Respondents generally made no distinction between their comments on building height and density, and analysis of submissions suggest they are seen as one in the same. In the eyes of the community:

- Low density development is 1 – 2 storeys. Development at this scale is widely supported as it is viewed as being in keeping with the historic character and “human” scale of the residential areas.
- Medium density development is 3 – 4 storey and generally associated with townhouse development. In the Residential Zones, there is general support for development up to 2 storeys, with a lower level of support for 3 storey development.

- High density development is above four storeys and generally described as apartment buildings. There is minimal support for development above four storeys, including along East Terrace and South Terrace.

Design

Respondents generally accept that new development will occur in the existing Residential Zones, however have significant concerns about the quality of new development that is occurring. The main concern is that the majority of new developments, particularly townhouses, make no meaningful connection with the public realm. High blank front walls, locked gates and walls of garage doors were cited as design elements which detract from the public realm. It is generally felt that the historic dwellings contribute to the social fabric, whereas new development offers little, and works against community building.

Density & Amenity

Opposition to higher density development was, in the main, provided in the context of largely varying scale being “out of character”, interface issues, overshadowing (particularly of solar panels), overlooking, increased traffic volumes, car parking pressures, and pressure on local services/amenities.

Catalyst site provisions introduced via the Minister’s Capital City Development Plan Amendment are strongly opposed to, for the reasons cited above. Further, due to the development capacity of the Capital City Zone, it is viewed by respondents that there is sufficient capacity for higher density development to be accommodated in that zone.

Land Use Mix in Residential Zones

Respondents are generally happy with the current land use mix in the Residential Zones.

In the South-East [RA1 – RA3] precinct there is strong support for non-residential (retail and commercial) uses to be located and consolidated in Hutt Street. The predominantly medical related land uses (hospital and consulting rooms) in RA4 were noted, and the operation and ongoing development of St Andrews hospital was cited as having a negative impact on residential amenity in neighbouring streets/zones.

In the South-Central [RA5 & RA6] and South-West [RA7] the greater mix of residential and non-residential land uses in the Residential Zones was generally viewed a positive which contributes to the unique character of these areas. There was however, a general preference that the non-residential land uses not be expanded in number or size, and that any new development or change in land use be residential in nature.

Main Streets

Hutt Street is generally viewed as meeting the needs of residents in the South-East precinct, and as central to the “village atmosphere” of this area of the City. However there is a clear preference for more local services including a butcher, baker and fishmonger. Cafe and restaurant uses (evening economy) are generally supported, however opposition to late night venues does exist.

Respondents from the South-Central [RA5] and South-West [RA6 & RA7] precincts generally stated that the Central Market precinct (including Gouger and Grote Street) meet their “main street” needs, and that they have little association with Hutt Street. In addition, given that there is a greater mix of land uses throughout the South-Central and South-West precincts, local shopping and service needs are often met closer to home.

Some respondents suggested that Pulteney Street has yet to reach its potential.

Other Comments

Respondents from all precincts raised some concerns about traffic and car parking including traffic speed, through traffic, on-street parking for residential and commercial uses and parking associated with new development – or lack thereof. All matters raised will be referred to Accessible City for consideration, with some items addressed as part of *Smart Move: City of Adelaide Transport & Movement Strategy*.

Council’s Connector Bus Service was generally raised in a positive light, however some respondents suggested that improvements are required to the frequency and timeliness of the service, together with improvements to the bus stops.

There were some comments on streetscape design and infrastructure quality, particularly relating to Hutt and O’Connell Streets. These will be referred to Council’s City Design and Public Realm Programs for consideration.

1.0 BACKGROUND

On 20 September 2012 Council endorsed the Statement of Intent for the Residential and Main Street Development Plan Amendment (Res & Main St DPA) and an associated Engagement Plan¹.

Implementation of Stage 1 of the Engagement Plan commenced immediately in order to raise awareness of the DPA and to generate early input. The following communication and engagement activities have been undertaken to date:

Communications

- Media release sent out on 21 September 2012
- Your Say Website launched on 21 September 2012 www.yoursay.adelaidecitycouncil.com. The website provides the community with details about the project, links to relevant documents, key project dates, provides a range of options to give early feedback and explains how to receive regular updates by signing onto Council's online newsletter.
- City Messenger and City North Messenger advertisements on 4 and 5 October and 11 and 12 October 2012.
- Letter and project information sheet/feedback form mailed to all property owners in the area covered by the DPA. The letter included details of how they can find out more about the project on the Your Say web page and can 'opt in' to receive regular updates on the DPA progress. Property owners (approximately 2300) will start receiving their letters and project information today.
- Precinct and Community groups were emailed advising them of the mail out and letting them know how they could become involved. The email also directed them to the Your Say web page to find out more.

Presentations

In response to an invitation, Council staff presented to:

- South West Residents Group and South West Network on Wednesday 10th of October 2012. Approximately 40 people attended this meeting.
- Hutt Street Precinct Association on Thursday 11th of October 2012. Approximately 40 people attended this meeting.

Information Sessions

Information Sessions have been held for the community to come and ask questions, find out more about the project and provide early feedback.

Methodist Meeting Hall on Monday 15th of October 2012 between 11:00am and 7:30pm. The session was well attended with 65 people visiting throughout the day.

¹ At the time of writing this report no formal response to the Statement of Intent had been received from the Minister for Planning.

North Adelaide Golf Course on Wednesday 17th of October 2012 between 4:30pm and 7:30pm. This session was also well attended with 26 people visiting.

All materials presented at the Information Sessions is available on Council's website.

Formal Feedback

The communications, presentations and information session outlined above were designed to raise awareness of the DPA and generate early input.

Formal feedback was sought from the community via hard copy or on-line feedback forms, or via letter or email. The period for early feedback closed on 26 October 2012.

This report, together with all feedback received, will be provided to Council to inform policy development and the general public so that the views of the local community are known and are being considered as part of the DPA.

Stage 1 of the Communications and Engagement plan is now complete.

Stage 2 will involve maintaining communication with the community whilst Council develops its draft policy.

2.0 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

A total of 138 submissions were received, via the following methods:

Method	Number of Submissions
On-line feedback form	69
Hard copy feedback form	50
email/letter	19
TOTAL	138

For the purposes of analysis the submissions have been grouped based on the address of the respondent(s). The groupings are as follows, and were influenced by the existing Residential Zones.

Precinct	Number of Submissions
South-East [RA1 – RA4 and Main Street (Hutt) Zone]	65
South-Central [RA5 & RA6]	29
South-West [RA7]	22
North Adelaide	14
Other	8
TOTAL	138

All submissions received are grouped by precinct and included in **Attachment A to E**.

As can be seen in the table above, the majority of respondents (86%) completed the feedback form.

3.0 QUESTIONS POSED AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Given that Council Members are in the very early stages of policy formulation, with no agreed policy positions for the public to respond to, the questions posed were deliberately designed to be open-ended.

The public were asked to respond to five questions:

Question 1: What is it you like most about your community?

Question 2: Are there housing types (eg detached houses or apartments) in your area that you would like to see more or less of?

Question 3: Are there types of commercial buildings, businesses and/or services in your area that you would like to see more or less of?

Question 4: What is your nearest Main Street? (Hutt, O'Connell or Melbourne Street) Does it meet your needs or what would you like to see more or less of?

Question 5: Any other comments?

The following are observations about how people generally interpreted and responded to the questions:

- Although not specifically asked, respondents generally used Question 2 to provide their views on dwelling height and/or density
- Respondents generally made no distinction between their comments on building height and density, and analysis of submissions suggest they are seen as one in the same. In the eyes of the community:
 - Low density development is 1 – 2 storey detached or semi-detached dwellings
 - Medium density development is 3 – 4 storey is generally associated with townhouse development
 - High density development is above four storeys and generally described as apartment buildings. In general there is strong opposition for high rise/density (above 4 storey) development on either South or East Terrace and on large (Catalyst) sites
- Although not specifically asked, a relatively high number of respondents used Question 2 to provide their views on the design and quality of new development
- As was the design intent, the overwhelming majority of respondents answered Question 3 in relation to the Residential Zone in which they reside. Therefore as part of the detail analysis in the next section, the feedback is summarised under the heading of Land Use Mix in Residential Zones

3.0 METHOD OF ANALYSIS

As explained above, given that Council Members are in the very early stages of policy formulation, with no agreed policy positions for the public to respond to, the questions posed to the public were deliberately designed to be open-ended.

This approach has proven both successful and beneficial due to the variety of views and information that has been generated.

However, due to this approach, it was not deemed accurate or appropriate to attempt to consolidate the feedback into a quantifiable measure. For example, concluding that 10 (30%) of respondents from the South-West precinct raised the design of new development is not appropriate as there was not a direct question on this matter, or position to respond to.

The approach that has been adopted is to identify and summarise common themes that have emerged through the submissions and use words with some relative strength to describe the strength of community opinion. For example “overwhelming support”, “general support”, “some support”, “no support”. The same terms are used in the negative. For example “general opposition” or “some opposition”.

4.0 ANALYSIS OF FEEDBACK BY PRECINCT

This section analyses the feedback received for each precinct, those being:

- South-East: Residential Zones RA1-RA4 and the Main Street (Hutt) Zone
- South-Central: Residential Zones RA5 & RA6
- South-West: Residential Zone RA7
- North Adelaide: Main Street Zones (O'Connell and Melbourne Street East and West)

It is noted that there is a reasonable level of repetition between the feedback for the South-East, South-Central and/or South West precincts. This reflects the consistency of views across the geographical areas and is valuable information to inform policy development. Quotes which reflect the general views of respondents are used where possible to provide context specific to a given precinct.

3.1 SOUTH-EAST PRECINCT

For the purposes of this analysis the South-East precinct includes Residential Zones RA1- RA4.

There were 65 submissions received which focused on the South-East precinct. A list of the names and addresses of respondents and all submissions received is included at **Attachment A**.

An overview of the submissions received is provided below. It is not exhaustive, but captures the common themes raised.

The submission from the South-East City Residents Association is comprehensive and largely reflects the views of the majority of respondents from the South-East precinct.

What people like about their community

Respondents generally described the South East as having a “village atmosphere”. This generally related to traditional mainstreet (retail/commercial focus) surrounded by residential areas.

Existing Character

“A “diverse and vibrant” medium density residential area of nineteenth century cottages and villas, townhouses and low-rise apartments that work well together.”

[South-East City Residents Association Inc]

The majority of respondents mentioned the one and two storey heritage/character dwellings and townhouses as being central to the character of the area which create its “human scale”. There is a clear preference to retain this character, whilst allowing “sympathetic” development that respects this character.

The South-East City Residents Association Inc believe RA1-RA5 should become *“residential character zones”* which *“achieve the same protection as the residential areas currently enjoy in North Adelaide.”*

Dwelling Type, Mix & Height

Respondents are generally happy with the current mix of dwelling types, noting that it is an “appropriate” or “balanced” mix that should be retained.

“I like the village atmosphere of the south east corner with the mix of heritage and modern dwellings of single and double storey height.” [Jackie Hahn]

One and two-storey attached and semi-detached character dwellings (row cottages and villas etc) are viewed as defining the existing and desired “low scale” character of the area.

There is general support for new development that is well designed and sympathetic to existing character, including support for complementary additions.

The overwhelming preference is for new development at 1 – 2 storeys, with minimal support for development above 3 storeys, except for on East Terrace, where development up to 4 storeys would be entertained by some – but not all.

“Residential development along East Terrace should NOT be permitted to exceed that of the current 3-4 storey development, perhaps 5 storey AT THE MOST.” [David Hassell]

“4+ storey developments are more appropriately located in the Capital City Zone.” [Robert Laws and Glenyss Steedman]

The former Queen Victoria Hospital (now converted to residential apartments) on Fullarton Road was referenced (in terms of height) as to what people don’t want to see (9 storeys including ground floor).

There is overwhelming opposition to high rise/density development (above 4 storeys) on either South or East Terrace and on large (Catalyst) sites.

*“I am strenuously opposed to high rise development on either East or South Terrace in this Precinct.”
[Jeffery Anderson]*

The reasons cited in opposition to these developments were that are generally out of character with the low scale historic character of the area and the impacts of overshadowing, overlooking, transition from high to low scale development and access and car parking considerations.

There is some opposition to the proposed development on the TPI site at 318 South Terrace (alterations and restoration work to the heritage building and construction of an 8 level tourist accommodation building on the northern boundary) as it is felt that it is inappropriate in scale/height in the context of existing dwellings.

New Development – Design & Quality

"New buildings should be sympathetic in design to adjacent and nearby residents existing property designs. New should not be at the expense of old, in that new should not block light, access and general living quality of existing development." [Tanya and Marcus Battye]

"More adaptive re-use of heritage houses – maintaining heritage character but creating contemporary useful dwellings. Less tilt up townhouses that all look the same and create banks of garages facing the street." [Taryn and Marcus Battye]

There were not as many comments on design & quality of new development compared to respondents in the South-West (see Section 3.3), however the concerns raised in the South-West will be considered when reviewing policy for all Residential Zones.

Land Use Mix in Residential Zones

There is overwhelming support for the retention of the Residential Zones for residential uses, with non-residential land uses (retail and commercial) to be restricted to Hutt Street.

There were some concerns raised about the impacts of development and business operation on the boundary of the Main Street (Hutt) Zone and Residential Zones, particularly with respect to changes in scale, noise management and rubbish collection.

There were some concerns raised about ongoing development of the St Andrews Hospital site and the impact of this on neighbouring residential streets. Operational matters were also raised including deliveries and car parking, and their impact on residential amenity.

"Let's face it, any further development of St Andrews will be simply too big, too much and too commercial for the existing infrastructure available within the SE corner. Any further development will seriously impact on this area in some many ways. Especially in Gilles, St John and Vincent St areas." [Lee Ryan]

Hutt Street (Main Street)

"Hutt St is a very successful main street but could do with a baker, butcher, greengrocer, laundrette. We have enough cafes, restaurants and liquor outlets."

[South-East City Residents Association Inc]

Respondents generally described Hutt Street as having a "Village feel".

Respondents generally spoke favourably of Hutt Street and felt that it largely meets their current needs

Despite some comments about what people want more of, respondents generally feel the retail mix is right and meets their daily needs. There is a preference for more local services including a butcher, baker, fishmonger and small hardware store. The Hutt Street Library is strongly supported.

There were differing views on café/restaurants. There is general acceptance of these, however some don't want any more, and some are happy with more if this is not at the expense of local services.

Although there is general acceptance of Hutt Street's evening economy, with some interest in seeing small wine bars, there is no support for more late night premises, and issues with the existing premises were cited by some respondents. Massage parlours were mentioned by some respondents and not supported.

3.2 SOUTH-CENTRAL PRECINCT

For the purposes of this analysis the South-Central precinct includes Residential Zones RA5 & RA6.

It is noted that respondents west of King William Street generally view themselves as part of the South-West community. The consideration of RA5 & RA6 together is due to these zones abutting the newly created Main Street (Adelaide) Zone and the differences in land use mix when compared to RA7.

There were 29 submissions received which focused on the South-Central precinct. A list of the names and addresses of respondents and all submissions received is included at **Attachment B**.

An overview of the submissions received is provided below. It is not exhaustive, but captures the common themes raised.

What people like about their community

"That it feels like a community – community centre, local shops, diversity, mix of small housing and business, parks, quirky art etc" [Bronte Morris]

The majority of respondents from the South-Central precinct commented on its strong sense of community (knowing neighbours, chatting on the street), where social diversity is accepted and celebrated.

There is a real sense that the urban fabric (nature, scale and mix of development and streetscape) contributes to the social fabric (sense of community).

The streets (streetscapes) are valued places for social interaction.

Other elements of the community that were common themes throughout the responses include:

- Friendly and safe streets
- Environmental/sustainability values of the community are evident, particularly in RA6
- Whitmore Square is highly valued, as is the Central Market
- Proximity to Park Lands
- Proximity/access to services
- Walkability

Existing Character

The majority of respondents mentioned the one and two storey heritage/character dwellings and townhouses as being central to the character of the area which create its “human scale”. There is a clear preference to retain this character, whilst allowing “sympathetic” development that respects this character.

“The residential area should be able to retain its essential character ie cottages, along with 2-3 storey apartments/townhouses. Existing ‘brown sites’ should be allowed to qualify for sympathetic development [Norman Rohde]

Dwelling Type, Mix & Height

“We have a mix of housing, old and new, tall and low. I would consider any apartment blocks over 6 storeys as too high for our neighbourhood.” [Chris Hales]

Respondents are generally happy with current housing mix (ie mix of new and old and styles eg detached and townhouses).

The majority view the value of historic character and heritage buildings as the essence of existing characters.

Respondents generally love living in the precinct due to its human scale, and there are general concerns that this will literally be overlooked by new development at a higher scale.

With respect to new development, there is general support for medium density development to a maximum height of 2 storeys, with some support for 3 storey development. Some respondents are willing to accept development of 5-6 storeys, however this appears to be related more to Sturt and Halifax Streets (Main Street (Adelaide) Zone).

There is general opposition to high rise development for the following reasons: it is generally out of character with the low scale historic character of the area, and the impacts of overshadowing, overlooking, transition from high to low scale development and access and car parking considerations.

There is general opposition to the Mayfields development, which was cited as inappropriate in scale/height due to being out of character and interface pressures

There is general opposition to catalyst sites, with main concern being the impact of higher density development on existing character and residential amenity

In summary, the general preference is for more low density dwellings, higher quality (design and materials) townhouses, some apartments (max.3 levels) and no high rise.

New Development – Design & Quality

There were not as many comments on design & quality of new development compared to respondents in the South-West (see Section 3.3), however the concerns raised in the South-West will be considered when reviewing policy for all Residential Zones.

However the Christie Walk development was noted as being a good example of how “higher” density can be delivered sensitively.

“Christie Walk is a good example where density is medium to high but there are areas of garden including a roof garden.” [Joan Carlin]

Land Use Mix in Residential Zones

The majority of respondents stated that they are happy with the current mix of residential and non-residential (commercial) land uses throughout the area and noted that this adds to its character and streetscapes.

“Despite the mixed residential/commercial/professional use, there’s still a very residential feel to it.”
[Simon Fisher]

However, although the current land use mix is accepted, there is some preference that there be no increase in the amount (area, size or number) of non-residential land uses, and that commercial sites revert to residential use when redevelopment , or a change of land use, occurs.

“We do not need any more commercial buildings in the area. The area should be zoned residential.”
[Edward Farley]

Main Streets

The majority of respondents from the South-West precinct stated that the Central Market precinct (including Gouger and Grote Street) meets their “main street” needs, and that they have little association with Hutt Street. In addition, given that there is a greater mix of land uses throughout the South-Central precinct, local shopping and service needs are often met closer to home.

Although out of the scope of this DPA, there is some opposition to portions of Sturt and Halifax Street being included in the Main Street (Adelaide) Zone.

“Although Hutt Street is my nearest Main Street precinct, I do not use it, as Gouger Street and the Central Market provides a rich choice of eating and drinking and take-way food which is conveniently close to me. I see no need for Sturt/Halifax Street to become another Main Street precinct, given the adequate main street style services already provided only 2 blocks away in Gouger Street.” [Simon Fisher]

3.3 SOUTH-WEST PRECINCT

For the purposes of this analysis the South-West precinct is made up of the Residential Zone RA7.

There were 22 submission received which focused on the South West precinct. A list of the names and addresses of respondents and all submissions received is included at **Attachment C**.

An overview of the submissions received is provided below. It is not exhaustive, but captures the common themes raised.

What people like about their community

"(i) Its strong sense of community (ii) the essential character of the area (its history and heritage, low scale/low density of dwellings) (iii) its proximity to the Central Market and Gouger St cafes and CBD generally) ... all within easy reach by walking, cycling, tram/bus." [Norman Rohde]

The majority of respondents from the South-West precinct commented on its strong sense of community (knowing neighbours, chatting on the street), where social diversity is accepted and celebrated.

There is a real sense that the urban fabric (nature, scale and mix of development and streetscape) contributes to the social fabric (sense of community).

The streets (streetscapes) are valued places for social interaction.

Other elements of the community that were common themes throughout the responses include:

- Friendly and safe streets
- Environmental/sustainability values of the community are evident, particularly in RA6
- Whitmore Square is highly valued, as is the Central Market
- Proximity to Park Lands
- Proximity/access to services
- Walkability

Existing Character

The majority of respondents mentioned the one and two storey heritage/character dwellings and townhouses as being central to the character of the area which create its “human scale”. There is a clear preference to retain this character, whilst allowing “sympathetic” development that respects this character.

“It is imperative that the history, ambience and community of the SW city is preserved and enhanced only with appropriate, sympathetic and human scale development.” [Julie Jordan]

Dwelling Type, Mix & Height

Respondents are generally happy with current housing mix (ie mix of new and old and styles eg detached and townhouses).

The majority view the value of historic character and heritage buildings as the essence of existing characters.

Respondents generally love living in the precinct due to its human scale, and there are general concerns that this will literally be overlooked by new development at a higher scale.

With respect to new development, there is general support for medium density development to a maximum height of 2 storeys, with some support for 3 storey development. Only one submission supported development greater than 5 storeys, but on large sites only.

There is general opposition to high rise development for the following reasons: it is generally out of character with the low scale historic character of the area, and the impacts of overshadowing, overlooking, transition from high to low scale development and access and car parking considerations.

The Mayfields development was cited as inappropriate in scale/height due to being out of character and interface pressures.

There is general opposition to catalyst sites, with main concern being the impact of higher density development on existing character and residential amenity

In summary, the general preference is for more low density dwellings, higher quality (design and materials) townhouses, some apartments (max.3 levels) and no high rise.

New Development – Design & Quality

There is a general acceptance that new development will occur, however there are concerns with the design and quality of new development. The major concern is that new development does not contribute positively to, or connect with, the streetscape, and detracts from the existing character and social cohesion.

“I don’t want to see more of the 3 storey townhouses that have popped up all over the West. They are fortress like. You never see, or socialise with and of the occupants as there are no front gardens or common areas for people to relax and interact. So I find them soulless.” [Peter Stubbs]

New development at 3 levels would appear to be acceptable to some respondents if:

- it is designed in a way that maintained the human scale; and
- delivered private open space that supports the existing social cohesion of this area.

Development setbacks were mentioned (or inferred) by some respondents.

Some respondents provided examples of what they see as good & bad development, providing evidence that higher density, and higher (height), development is accepted if well designed, for example:

Good: Christies Walk, Whitmore Square Affordable Housing (ACC) and Sturt Street Affordable Housing (ACC)

Bad: "*Townhouses with high front fences and locked gates*" (Anna and Jim Wishart)

Development of 5 storeys or above is not supported.

"We support the idea of apartments but we do not support high-rise apartment style buildings where there is no contact with the street, and no human interaction. Up to 4 storey apartments seen to be manageable. It is the diversity of small scale housing styles in this area that contributes to its vibrancy." [Susan and Jeffrey Collins]

There were some concerns raised that if "high rise" apartment develop was to occur, small streets would become "*major entrances to any car-parks servicing multi-storey developments.*" [Mij Tanith]

There is a general feeling amongst respondents that design of new should not be at the cost of the old. That is, the design of new development must be sympathetic to the existing.

The responses suggest that the public generally view new development at medium to high density to be of poor quality, with references to "dog boxes", "unfriendly development", "tilt-up concrete", colour schemes, over-use of glass etc.

Some submissions make a clear association between development density (height), development quality and the social cohesion of their communities. Put another way, low density built with front yards and permeable fences are seen as central to social interaction / relationship building – the things that have built the current sense of community.

Some respondents made reference to the importance of permeable open space in new medium density developments (apartment buildings).

Front fences and "walls of garage doors" were raised in a handful of submissions, related to their impact on the public realm and social interaction. For example, blank walls (like Council's promotional photo for the DPA) are not supported as they impact negatively on community connectedness.

Land Use Mix in Residential Zones

The majority of respondents stated that they are happy with the current mix of residential and non-residential (commercial) land uses throughout the area and noted that this adds to its character and streetscapes.

"It seems to be a good mix at the moment – it is good to have small businesses and residential working together" [Anne Marie Shin]

"Having local shops and facilities throughout residential areas increases the sense of community as you get to know your local staff through regular contact" [Marjon & Greg Martin]

However, although the current land use mix is accepted, there is a clear preference that there be no increase in the amount (area, size or number) of non-residential land uses, and that commercial sites revert to residential use when redevelopment , or a change of land use, occurs.

Main Streets

The majority of respondents from the South-West precinct stated that the Central Market precinct (including Gouger and Grote Street) meets their “main street” needs, and that they have little association with Hutt Street. In addition, given that there is a greater mix of land uses throughout the South-West precinct, local shopping and service needs are often met closer to home.

The concept of "Main Street" has various definitions. My "main streets" are Gouger and Grote Streets. There I can bank, shop for groceries, dine out, meet my friends, go the Library, shoe-repairer and Post Office. Sturt St is less "main" to me. I use the Community Centre and Post Office. But I would hate to see the ACC / State Government impose "my" main streets on Sturt St" [Margaret Sullivan]

3.4 NORTH ADELAIDE PRECINCT

For the purposes of this analysis the North Adelaide precinct is made up of the Main Street (O'Connell) Zone, Main Street (Melbourne St East) and Main Street (Melbourne St West) Zones.

There were 14 submissions received which focused on North Adelaide and a list of the names and addresses of respondents and all submissions received is included at **Attachment D**.

As there were a relatively small number of submissions received in relation to North Adelaide, and the residential areas are not the subject of the DPA. There were few common themes that relate to the scope of the DPA.

Points of note include:

- The community appeal appears to be very positive and majority of the respondents commented on the mixed and balanced community.
- A large majority of respondents would like to see a reduced number of late night traders or reduction of trading hours. Friday and Saturday trading should be until 12 pm and Sunday to Thursday until 11 pm.
- No nightclubs should be approved for the area.
- A reduction of the speed limit along O'Connell from 50 to 40, to reduce the amount of noise, the through traffic and make it more pedestrian friendly.
- A larger portion of respondents were not opposed in seeing more apartments along O'Connell, as long as the pleasant streetscape is maintained and the height limit is to be controlled to maintain the current views.
- Fewer take away services were also suggested in many of the responses.
- Suggestions to improve O'Connell Street were made; to improve the shop fronts and also to liven up the streetscape and make it more interesting, such as the lamp posts.

4.0 NEXT STEPS

This report, together with all submissions, has been provided to Council Members to inform their policy deliberations.

At the time of writing this report no formal response to the Statement of Intent had been received from the Minister for Planning.

At this stage Council is still working towards preparing a draft DPA for this Minister's consideration by early December 2012, with the view to undertaking public (statutory) consultation following Ministerial approval to do so.

For more information please contact Nicholas Carr, Team Leader Policy & Promotion on 8203 7238 or email n.carr@adelaidecitycouncil.com