



VICTORIA PARK  
URBAN TREE  
NETWORK  
2017

# 35 WESTON STREET

Public Submission

## **SUMMARY**

Thank you for accepting our submission relating to the development of Lot 899, 35 Weston Street Carlisle. We would firstly recommend you make yourself familiar with this application by viewing the plans if you haven't already done so. After reading the council report pertaining to the application, we feel it is not comprehensive in discussing the issues relating to this proposal.

We are interested to see this prominent location developed and better utilized to provide a higher amenity to the local community given the valuable green canopy and heritage house that currently exists here. However, we believe the current proposal will not achieve this for a variety of reasons that will be outlined in this submission.

If you have not viewed the plans then we highly recommend you do so.

Firstly, we would like to express our disappointment with the artist impressions of the proposal that show trees surrounding the development. These trees do not exist and given their location on the adjacent property to the development, cannot possibly be conceived as part of this application. It is a disingenuous attempt to beautify the proposed development. It also falsely represents what is being proposed. The applicant should have been made to resubmit their plans with these items removed.

We would also like to mention that in the recent IGA proposal, the potential impact to the streetscape by removing Marri Trees, which was listed as a reason for refusal, is notably absent in this proposal. The trees that surround the 35 Weston Street site add incredible amenity and streetscape value to this exclusive part of Carlisle, just like the trees at the IGA. The property and trees are the bookend to the quaint village main street that Archer Street is and their impact should not be dismissed. It is disturbing that two developments so near in both location and timing of application can be assessed so wildly different.

Our submission regarding 35 Weston Street is discussed in the context of how it relates to the Town Planning Scheme No.1 Carlisle Precinct and individual aspects of the development plan and how they relate to relevant policy. Please read on.

## TOWN PLANNING SCHEME

We have reservations about the manner in which this particular area of Carlisle is being developed.

The proposed development (shown in red below), is located nearby to a portion of Archer Street that is comprised of uses listed as permitted "P" in a local centre zone. These uses are discretionary "AA" and prohibited "X" in a residential zone, yet appear here in significant form.



The addition of yet another local centre zone "P" use in the residential zone, at this particular location, further promotes this section of residential zoning into a 'quasi local centre zone'.

The growth of "P" uses outside of the local centre zone is contrary to the precinct plan that states "local centre development will not be permitted to occur outside the boundaries of these areas".

While the residential zone allows for a 'limited number of non-residential uses' such as child care, 'limited' is not defined in any way and according to the statement of intent, is envisioned 'throughout' the precinct, not specifically in one area.

It is reasonable to assume an agglomeration of "P" uses from the local centre zone is contributing to a visual extension of the Archer Street local centre that

is not envisioned in the town planning scheme precinct map or within the contents of its wording. Further development of this nature should cease without suitable amendments to the Town Planning Scheme No.1 and a community discussion.

Developments of a discretionary nature also require far greater scrutiny to ensure their impact to amenity is not undue or excessive. In this case, a variety of impacts are noted and could be suitably dealt with by simply assessing the development honestly against the Town Planning Scheme, with the intent of guiding the applicant to submit an acceptable proposal based on sound planning principles.

To ensure minimum impact on residential zones and surrounding amenity the following points taken from the precinct plan and statement of intent should be considered to guide the proposed development, notwithstanding there is legal compliance to do so;

1. *"The retention of existing homes with the development of infill at the rear is the most favoured form of redevelopment" and "The retention and restoration of original housing that contributes to the character of the precinct will be encouraged".*

The proposed loss of an original weatherboard residence (which is in direct contravention of Town Planning Scheme No.1), should not be supported. There is no report or heritage assessment that discusses the character of the original residence. It is obvious from a site viewing that this residence contributes to the character of the Carlisle precinct.

The lack of a municipal inventory listing should not preclude this investigation from occurring. Any development application that deals with an original residence, whether that be an identified original residence or a suspected one, should trigger a response from planners and most certainly a mention in a council report to inform elected members and the wider community.

Given the discretionary nature of the proposal and its location in the residential area, consideration should be given to retaining and restoring the residence as part of this development and with respect to the statement of intent in the Town Planning Scheme. This would provide further incentive to retain some of the significant mature trees that surround the property and retain the character of the area.

2. *"Onsite parking requirements may be waived by the council where the uses are to serve the local population and are unlikely to require prolonged stopovers by customers." and "New car parks and vehicle*

*access points shall be combined with existing parking facilities where possible."*

The point of child care is to drop/pickup your children and leave. Therefore, the provision of dedicated bays on site that will only be used briefly during drop off/pickup is wasteful. This is amplified by the fact that there is demarcated (and chronically underutilised) street parking along both sides of Archer Street.

Many of the submissions and concerns about the child care center focus on the perceived danger of Archer Street (which we do not support and of which no evidence has been submitted). Functional street parking on both sides of Archer Street is proven to slow down vehicles and improve safety. By waiving the parking requirement onsite or reducing it significantly, there is far greater potential to retain existing vegetation on the site and limit the impact to amenity that will occur from their removal.

Promoting street parking along Archer Street will increase pedestrian activity, visual surveillance, create a buffer between the footpath and the road for pedestrian safety and assist in encouraging walking behaviour. There is potential for approximately 50 bays just on Archer Street alone and all under a 2 minute walk from the site. This substantial parking facility needs to be activated before enacting Local Planning Policy 6 onto the applicant and especially when there is an option to waive this as part of the local centre zoning, of which this area is most certainly operating as.

## **DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

### **Tree Removal**

Plans do not show the existing trees to be removed or retained as part of the development. There needs to be a clear indication of what is changing on this site and that should be shown on the plans and before any decision is made on this proposal. A comprehensive report as to why these changes must take place should also be required given there will be significant visual changes occurring to the streetscape and ultimately the amenity of the surrounding area.

### **Boundary Walls**

Plans show solid boundary walls along a portion of the Archer St frontage and along the laneway adjacent to the carpark. We do not support the solid boundary walls along either frontage based on the CPTED principles relating to passive surveillance. The rear laneway would be far safer if it could be

viewed from all angles. Archer Street is already significantly walled up surrounding private residential properties. This circumstance has resulted in the streetscape becoming bland, impermeable and lacking in passive surveillance.

Solid boundary walls also prevent the veranda feature (specifically added to ensure the development suited the residential area), to be viewed and appreciated from the streetscape.

White walls are a blank canvas for graffiti. The design of the wall is boring and is of so little interest that it will detract from the streetscape and discourage pedestrians from enjoying and appreciating this section of the street.

### **Play Areas**

Retaining the existing vegetation as part of the play areas would provide the amenity, shade and acoustic mitigation needed for these spaces to function appropriately, safely and beneficially for children, whilst limiting the impact on surrounding residents (all noted as issues within the report). The council report states rather dismissively that 'the majority of trees are located either within the position of the proposed building, car park, or outdoor play areas, in which case retention of most trees is not possible.' Deemed clause 67(p) requires considering to be given regarding tree preservation. In this case absolutely no consideration to this clause has been given in the report or why the outdoor play areas cannot include the existing trees. It is not up to the Council officer to dismiss this clause on the applicant's behalf.

### **Carpark**

The proposed carpark results in the removal of all significant trees species at the southern portion of the site. Artist impressions of the development falsely show significant trees surrounding this carpark that add to the impression the carpark will have minimal visual impact. The removal of these trees will impact negatively on the view corridors of Apollo Way, O'dea Street and Archer Street, while drastically impacting on the streetscape qualities of Archer Street.

The inclusion of a carpark here will increase the visual presence of the existing carpark that services the aged care facility. Up to 70 metres of carpark frontage along Archer Street will result from this additional carpark which reduces the pedestrian amenity along Archer Street, detracts from the streetscape and increases the temperature of the surrounding area.

We do not support black asphalt as a parking surface, based on the heat retention that will occur. There is sufficient and chronically underutilised parking along both sides of Archer Street that should be activated first and seen as an opportunity to retain this key vegetation.

## **Shade Sails**

The applicant proposes the use of shade sails to mitigate acoustic issues. These are not included in the plans nor on the artist impressions. According to the streetscape policy, shade sails are not to obscure views of the dwelling from the street. Given the development is required to take on a residential character, it should also be required to meet the requirements of this policy given the absence of a guiding document. It is unclear how these shade sails can be installed in play locations that surround the building without them blocking the view of the building from the street. It is our view that the existing trees that surround much of this play area should be retained to cater to this requirement and need.

## **Artist Impressions**

Artist impressions falsely show the development including trees that don't and couldn't possibly exist in the context of this application. The north elevation is missing which would show how the proposal integrates with Weston Street and a critical impression of how the proposal might look for pedestrians and vehicles travelling south down Archer Street is also missing. Another missing aspect is before and after photos to show the true impact of removing all the vegetation which will drastically alter the streetscape appeal as one reaches the top of the Weston/Archer Street hill and enters the Carlisle café strip.

## **Design**

The proposed design of the building is unsuitable as a replacement of the original house that has developed and maintained the character of the suburb for almost 100 years. This location is a landmark site in Carlisle and has been represented by not one but a collection of some of the area's oldest homes (which are slowly disappearing). Any new development here should be representative of or inclusive of the original house. Materials should be of similar colour and design to the original house. Fencing should have a vegetative component to soften the already overly walled nature of Archer Street. Artistic elements included on the proposal make no sense or have unknown relevance. Random colours for a piece of fencing and window frames are another inclusion that detracts from the appeal and feels ad hoc and added only to break up the monotonous façade of grey's and blacks evident in the design. The vertical elements across the southern and eastern façade are in direct opposition to the horizontal weatherboard elements associated with the existing residence.

## **Conclusion**

Ultimately, we are overwhelmingly disappointed in this proposal for its clear lack of innovation in bringing some of the best features of the existing site into the new design. No attempt has been made to articulate why the heritage

house and significant number of existing trees can't form part of this development in some manner - either representative or wholly. The applicant's plans have little regard for the site constraints, or its context and the plans appear to be drawn in complete isolation from the streetscape and certainly not with viewscapes and the relationship to its residential context in mind. The false inclusion of trees in the artist impression that don't and couldn't possibly exist, has negatively impacted on our impression of this development.

While we respect that working with old houses is not desirable or managing and dealing with existing trees can be difficult, there are incredible benefits of doing so. Certainly when a town planning scheme and policies call for these aspects to be taken into consideration, applicants can and do come up with amazing designs that add value to the community.

Our view is if this plan had factored in the heritage house and kept the majority of the trees that exist in the play zones the outcome would be far more beneficial to every party and the wider community. If the town waived or modified the arbitrary parking policy and recognised there is ample space to account for parking on the street in this instance then the developer may be able to justify the extra expense involved in retaining trees and working with original character homes.

The Victoria Park Urban Tree Network recommends that elected members do not support the clearing of blocks in development applications where it is obvious that this approach is not necessary and has not been backed up by any written documentation. We are concerned that some objectives of the Town Planning Scheme No.1 Carlisle Precinct have not been taken into consideration when assessing this application, especially the 'retention and restoration of original houses which contributes to the character of the area'. We believe the application in its current form is untenable and should be refused until changes are made that bring it into line with the TPS and for which will benefit the community and improve and sustain the amenity of the location.

Peter Melrosa

Victoria Park Urban Tree Network