



---

**GRANT AVENUE PRECINCT PLAN  
RESPONSE TO PRESENTATION (BY MATT JACKSON)  
ON 12 OCTOBER 2016**

---

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Precinct Plan proposals are generally a refreshing approach to regenerating or uplifting the study area.
- 1.2 It is noted that much of the analysis was done via desk top studies or observation and not a comprehensive land use survey on the ground.
- 1.3 One of the major thrusts is “a mixed use commercial strip” supporting the community and the proposal identifies current trends whilst also looking for “opportunities for future development and growth potential”.
- 1.4 It is clear that the provision of parking and traffic movements are a problem and require an innovative approach.
- 1.5 The Precinct Plan seeks to create a well-balanced mix of uses.

**2. THE APPLICATION**

- 2.1 The Plan has failed to acknowledge the fact that there are already approved non-residential uses on Grant Avenue between Osborn and Iris Roads. These include Portion 6 of Erf 32 Victoria (HIV/AIDS Counselling), Portion 1 of Erf 351 Norwood (Dental surgery), Portion 1 of Erf 38 Norwood (office in existing structure), whilst Remaining Extent, Portion 2 of Erf 32 have existing offices upon them. Consequently, Tables 43 and 44 on Page 61 need to include “offices in existing structures in Land Use Activities. This should also be carried through into Section 4.5.4 : Land Use – Medium Density Residential plus offices/home enterprises in existing structures. [It should be noted that the Norwood Orchards Residents’ Association has evolved policy guidelines for similar scenario on The Avenue where mixed use exists.]
- 2.2 With regard to Ivy Road, the Residents Association had hitherto not supported new non-residential developments but based on the mixed land use scenario and existing approved non-residential such as physiotherapists, vets and home enterprises would accept offices in existing structures (or a maximum floor area ratio of 0,3) as they believe floor area ratios of 0,5 and 0,6 for such uses are not acceptable. Clearly, on-site parking must be provided.
- 2.3 The public parking area opposite Norwood Spar north of William Road presents an important opportunity to resolve parking problems in that part of Norwood, as soon as the ownership issues are resolved with the DPW.
- 2.4 It is noticed that the properties north of Henrietta Road and the Norwood Park are also designated as mixed use residential and office/home enterprise. This is intended to be catalytic to upgrading and the securing the park. The initiative is supported but may require some flexibility in implementation.



- 2.5 The Precinct Plan does not identify incentives to developers such as engineering contributions to be used in the area; rates rebates, or rates holidays plus town planning incentives (such as increased height if building is set back). A considerable body of work exists on this subject.
- 2.6 The Precinct Plan also incorrectly designates land that is part of Paterson Park (northern edge) for development and this needs to be corrected.

### **3 OTHER ISSUES OF CONCERN**

- 3.1 The proposed typologies for densification of erven along Ivy Road and east of Grant Avenue are generally welcomed, but the Residents Association is concerned about the impact of densification on neighbouring, low density erven. We suggest that the Plan provides mitigations, including:
  - 3.1.1 Stepping down heights towards low density erven. For example, stipulating that heights decrease towards Henrietta Road on erven on the northern side of Ivy Road.
  - 3.1.2 Retention of mature landscaping bordering lower density erven.
  - 3.1.3 Planting of screening landscaping on the boundary of lower density erven.
- 3.2 The Residents Association remains concerned about unauthorised uses and illegal building and the need to ensure the Council's Law Enforcement Department is more responsive and efficient.
- 3.3 The urban environment is not conducive to pedestrianisation because of inconsistent treatment (and often pedestrian unfriendly) of sidewalks. Attention must be paid to this including by-laws. To an extent this goes hand in hand with community policies and safe pedestrian environments.
- 3.4 The Grant Avenue high street needs signage standards and suitably designated street furniture and lighting. At present there is little control and this does not add to the visual attraction of the Precinct.
- 3.5 Not considered as part of the Plan is development north of Grant Avenue, along The Avenue. This area is designated for mixed use development subject to specific controls to retain the residential scale and appearance. The Residents Association has for a number of years attempted to enforce controls that were accepted at a public meeting in 2011, but very little enforcement is currently taking place and illegal uses are rampant. We urge Development Planning to give The Avenue urgent attention.

### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 The Precinct Plan is generally a positive and refreshing approach to uplifting a potentially vibrant and strategically located area.
- 4.2 Appropriate corrections and changes are recommended under Section 2.0 above and should be inserted into the final version of the Precinct Plan, whilst Section 3.0 identifies other issues that need attention.



**Steve Jaspan and Associates**

---

**DATE:**

**OCTOBER 2016**

**REFERENCE:**

**Grant Avenue Precinct Plan/SCJ/dve**