06 February 2020

Attention: Anita Allen

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure
By email: dpti.planningreformsubmissions@sa.gov.au

To whom it may concern

Submission - Planning & Design Code Phase 3 – McLaren Vale Joint Venture

Introduction

URPS has been engaged by McLaren Vale Joint Venture to review and provide a submission on the Draft Planning and Design Code Phase 3 (‘the Code’) as it relates to the proposed ‘Suburban Main Street Zone’ and the following properties in McLaren Vale:

- 130 (lot 77) Main Road, McLaren Vale (CT 5782/769).
- 130 (lot 79) Main Road, McLaren Vale (CT 5454/526).
- 130 (lot 76) Main Road, McLaren Vale (CT 5818/267).

The following maps are attached to assist:

- Current Development Plan Zones, Policy Areas and Precincts.
- Draft Planning and Design Code Zones.

Our client wishes for some of the proposed ‘Performance Outcomes’ and ‘Designated Performance Outcome Criteria’ to be reconsidered to better facilitate development that is specifically envisaged within the ‘Suburban Main Street Zone’.

Background

McLaren Vale Joint Venture owns numerous properties throughout McLaren Vale and is deeply involved with the revitalisation of the township.

As such, McLaren Vale Joint Venture wishes to deliver orderly and economic development outcomes that support local businesses, tourism and vibrancy within the township and in turn the McLaren Vale area more generally.

Of particular note, McLaren Vale Joint Venture wish to establish a 4-star tourist accommodation facility on the subject allotments listed above.

Based upon the research undertaken by our client there is a considerable need for tourist accommodation within the McLaren Vale Town Centre. A new motel will better enable tourists to stay in the Town Centre.
for an extended period of time, rather than visiting via tour bus and returning that same day to Adelaide or wineries that are distanced from McLaren Vale in the surrounding primary production and Character Preservation Area.

A new tourist accommodation facility will ensure local businesses can flourish and properly capitalise on tourism attracted to the region which in turn will assist the local economy and provide vibrancy to the McLaren Vale Town Centre.

**Discussion**

**Zone Change**

The ‘Neighbourhood Centre Zone’ and ‘McLaren Vale Policy Area 22’ (as per the current Development Plan) within McLaren Vale is proposed to change to the ‘Suburban Main Street Zone’ (as per the Planning and Design Code).

**Land Use**

We support ‘Designated Performance Outcome’ 1.1 within the Draft Planning Design Code as it clearly encourages the development of tourist accommodation within the proposed ‘Suburban Main Street Zone’.

Further, we also support ‘Performance Outcomes’ 1.2 and 1.5 which specifically state:

PO 1.2 *Land uses that promote movement and activity during daylight and evening hours, including restaurants, educational, community and cultural facilities, and accommodation for visitors and residents.*

PO 1.5 *Tourist accommodation and visitor attractions that support the visiting public and holiday makers.*

(Underlining added)

The proposed ‘Suburban Main Street Zone’ clearly establishes that tourist accommodation is envisaged along with other uses that promote activity. This in-turn supports local business.

**Centre Expansion**

Objective 3 of the current Policy Area states:

3 Centre expansion limited to under-utilised land between the abandoned railway line and the rear of buildings on the northern side of Main Road.

The subject allotments are not situated between the abandoned railway line and the rear of buildings on the northern side of Main Road. On this basis, Objective 3 suggests that centre expansion should not occur on the subject allotments despite being situated in the ‘Neighbourhood Centre Zone’, and arguably being under-utilised.

We support that Objective 3 does not appear to be carried over into the Draft Planning and Design Code.

In our opinion, the land could be used in a more productive manner by providing tourist accommodation in a discreet location that does not impact upon the existing low-scale character of the main street.
**Building Height**

The current Policy Area imposes building height limitations of one-storey and suggests it is “high priority” for development to be of a scale, form and appearance that maintains and reinforces the country township character through predominantly small scale, single storey-built form.

Proposed ‘Designated Performance Outcome’ 2.1 states:

**DTS/DPF 2.1 Buildings that:**

(a) include a clearly defined podium or street wall with a maximum building height of 1 building level or 4m in height; and

(b) have levels above the defined podium or street wall setback a minimum of 2m from that wall.

Proposed ‘Performance Outcome’ and ‘Designated Performance Outcome’ 3.1 states:

**PO 3.1 Building heights that are low to medium rise, where the height is commensurate with the development sites frontage and depth as well as the main street width, so that the impacts of building mass on adjoining properties and the streetscape can be minimised.**

**DTS/DPF 3.1 Building height is not greater than any maximum, or less than any minimum, specified in the Maximum Building Height Levels Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay, the Maximum Building Height Metres Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay, or the Minimum Building Height Levels Technical and Numeric Variation Overlay.**

It is currently unclear what the maximum building height will be under the ‘Planning and Design Code’ however the intent of retaining a low to medium rise township character is acknowledged.

In our opinion, some level of flexibility with regard to building height should be provided within the ‘Planning and Design Code’ to enable heights above one-storey on underutilised land that does not front the main street (Main Road, McLaren Vale), and which development will not impact upon the main street and country township character (such is the case for the subject land).

This will ensure the reasonable development of the town centre is not diminished by inflexible building height policies that do not acknowledge the circumstances of land distanced from the main street.

**Conclusion**

Thank you for considering our submission. For the above reasons, we think the department should give strong consideration to increasing policy flexibility for land situated within the proposed ‘Suburban Main Street Zone’ yet does not front the main street and is underutilised.

Please contact the undersigned with any questions on...

Yours sincerely

Matthew King
Managing Director