



# Mt Barker & District Residents' Association

*PO Box 19 Mount Barker, South Australia 5251*

*For the Community*

---

7 February 2024

Derek Henderson, Senior Planner

Mt Barker District Council

Dear Derek

Thank you for the opportunity to meet with members of our Executive on Wed 7 February. We appreciate the information and clarification provided on several matters.

We would like to bring to your attention several points regarding the amendments to the development.

The imagery provided by the applicant is difficult to interpret and brings into question:

- the signage (which appears small in scale to the rest of the building, which we all know is not a Bunnings theme).
- The layout and nature of the planned vegetation, which appears to be planted right down to the South Eastern freeway, but which is not correct
- Difficulty to see, or obfuscation of, the retaining wall now required in the Southern and Western elevations, nor its final scale, height and colour. We have concerns this will become a serious attraction (challenge) for graffiti attacks, which will be prominently visible from the Sth Eastern Freeway. We believe this would be an ideal opportunity to create, for instance, a vertical garden which would assist with screening and provide an additional element to the surrounding environment. We believe the applicant could lead by example here and show they care about the environment and beautify these walls.
- No representation of the agreed (so we believe) pedestrian and cycle path on the Southern boundary, inside the Bunnings site.

We do not, in principle, object to the movement of the building although we question aspects

of the landscaping. Is the applicant using DIT land to complete their landscaping requirements? If so, this effectively results in a net loss of green land. If DIT has approved this, how will this impact on any potential future changes to the freeway interchange? It would be pointless to plant in any area that may in the 'near' future be bulldozed to accommodate the expansion of the freeway interchange.

On page 3 of the application, it states 'the portion of landscape buffer located on the subject land has been reduced to a width of 10 metres, with an intent (with an in-principle agreement in place) to plant the remaining 10m (plus additional) on DIT land.' Which DIT land is the applicant referring to? Is it the steep, 30 degree rock embankment adjacent the exit from the freeway? What can effectively be planted in this location? This must certainly reduce the number of reasonable size plantings. Also, by utilizing DIT land, the applicant is in effect reducing the overall area of 'green' land, as the DIT owned land would have been in addition to the original 20m buffer. Therefore, the applicant should in good faith, identify and allocate the same amount of land elsewhere on the site for plantings to compensate for this.

If DIT land is used for landscaping, and Bunnings is responsible for maintaining this, does DIT, Bunnings or the developer incur the risk if anything were to happen on this land? We agree that the use of tube stock of river red and SA blue gums is appropriate and will attract wildlife. We do not want deciduous trees planted as they provide no benefit to native wildlife.

The applicant further indicates 'the amendment will facilitate a significantly improved outcome in this regard, where **additional** land will be included for landscaping'. 'The revised landscape buffer concept will ... provide a considerably larger area of land for the 'greening' to the south and west of the development. We ask the applicant to indicate exactly where that additional land is?

As in our original submission, we remain concerned about whether there will be adequate screening from the freeway. The artists impression at the end of the application indicates a regimented plantation style of planting. We request that the plantings are random to reflect a more natural style and with the intention of maximising screening of the building from the freeway.

We appreciate this is an industrial site but as per the original fauna report, there is wildlife that still inhabits the area and this will potentially increase as the native plantings grow. As such there needs to be some measures in place to manage wildlife effectively, especially if they were to move through the site or across the freeway. We appreciate the improvements to access with a more gentle slope and the inclusion of a roundabout to protect the significant gum tree in the centre.

We appreciate the pathways surrounding the development and would like to see the pathway extended initially to Totness Recreational Park and then onto Hahndorf.

Overall we have no objection to the amendments to this development, although we still object

to the development as unsightly at the entrance of our townships. We welcome discussions with the applicant and Council so that we can achieve an outcome that would be beneficial to the community.

Kind regards

*Douglas McCarty*

**Douglas McCarty**  
**Chairperson**