

**From:** [Dave Monceaux](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Reform Submission Complaint Burnside 27 Feb 2020  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 12:17:36 PM

---

State Planning Commission

27 February 2020

By email: [DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au)

To Whom it May Concern

### **SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 – City of Burnside**

In response to the draft Planning and Design Code – Phase 3, which is currently out for public consultation, I wish to register my strong objections to a number of issues as summarised below.

I and my family have lived in Burnside for 40 years. We love the existing quality of life in Burnside and South Australia. We see this Planning Reform as seriously undermining the quality of life for us, our friends and our children and future generations. These reforms must not be implemented as they are currently proposed.

The intention to increase housing density in Burnside is totally unacceptable. Among other problems, the recent construction of many 2 for 1 townhouses has led to traffic problems in the narrow suburban streets because there are more cars parked in the narrow streets and less room to park because there are more driveways and so less parking space. Sometimes you cannot drive through the street and have to reverse out. Also more driveways means that some street trees have to be removed which increases urban heat problems. Also the already increased population has created significant increased stress on some children who cannot get into the local zoned schools because they are full. I know of one child who has to leave home one hour early to catch 2 buses to get to Morialta Middle School because she cannot get into her zoned school Glenunga High. Another family have to send their 2 children to a Private Catholic school because there is no room in their zoned school Linden Park Primary. They cannot afford this. Children are separated from their neighbouring friends. Increased housing density will make the shortage of places in local schools worse. This all causes more distress to families and children unnecessarily. The proposed relaxing of controls on our friendly small local shopping centers to allow high rise development is destructive of our local intimate community centers.

This proposed increase in housing density is totally unacceptable.

I have heard similar complaints from a friend who lives at Noarlunga. Increased housing density there is adversely affecting residents' quality of life, and further increase in density will make it worse. Many, many people feel his way but are either unable to register their complaint or feel that complaining is futile. We all feel that these reforms are unnecessary and will destroy our existing good quality of life.

I believe that there are too many significant problems with the proposed reforms and their implementation should be deferred for at least 1 year to amend the proposal to accommodate the serious community concerns and fears about the dreadful adverse impact on our communities, both in Burnside and statewide in South Australia.

## 1. General Neighbourhood Zone and Housing Diversity Zone:

The draft Code places some areas of the City of Burnside's in the General Neighbourhood Zone and the Housing Diversity Zone. The policy in these new zones is at odds with current zone policy and allows for a greater intensity of development than existing. The current zones focus on preserving character rather than accommodating change and infill and do not envisage a greater range and intensity of development than currently exists. I request that you move all residential areas to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone with TNVs to match existing conditions.

## 2. All Existing Residential Areas

a) Non-Residential land use: Currently in our council's residential areas, shops, offices and educational establishments are non-complying. In the new Code existing residential areas will allow these non-residential uses which will adversely impact traffic, parking, noise, neighbour's amenity and the character of our suburbs. This is unacceptable. All uses which are currently non-complying in our residential areas (eg. office and shop) should be "restricted development". Alternatively, a new zone should be created purely for residential land use.

b) Siting and Setbacks: Under the Code, building setbacks from side and rear boundaries will noticeably decrease, particularly at upper levels. This is unacceptable and will severely impact amenity and privacy. Existing siting, setback and floor area criteria should be maintained throughout all our residential areas.

c) Density and Allotment Sizes: The draft Code contains a number of errors and omissions. It is important that current minimum allotment sizes, heights and frontage widths match existing.

## 3. Historic Area Overlay

The lack of identification of Contributory Items in the Code, by either a map or list of addresses, will create uncertainty and confusion for owners, neighbours and prospective buyers. Existing protections and identification of Contributory Items should be maintained.

## 4. Commercial Centres

The Code places large scale centres in the same zone as small local shops, allowing large scale development and more intensive land uses throughout all these areas. This is inappropriate. A hierarchy of centres should be maintained. Additional zone(s) are needed to cater for the lower intensity local centres, particularly in older established areas.

## 5. Public Notification

The Code should reflect our council's current Development Plan policy with respect to the notification of neighbours and the public. The Code should include notification for all development that increases development intensity, including additional dwellings on the site, two storey development, earthworks where new dwelling is located 600mm above ground level, and change of use from residential to non-residential.

## 6. Impact on Infrastructure and Essential Services

The potential rate and intensity of new development which will be facilitated through the proposed Code policies, could place existing local infrastructure, especially roads and stormwater systems, under stress, particularly in our older established areas.

## 7. Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

*The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide* calls for an increase in tree canopy cover, however, the draft Code works directly against this by enabling larger developments and the increased removal of trees on both private and public land. This will result in a significant reduction in canopy cover, habitat loss and climate resilience, due the increased infill development opportunities, reduction in minimum site areas, site coverage, setbacks and increased number of street crossovers.

Unless the above issues are addressed and the draft Code is amended to reflect these concerns, there will be an unacceptable loss of local character and amenity in my neighbourhood.

I trust that the concerns detailed above will be given your full consideration and that you will also delay the implementation of these reforms for at least 1 year to amend them to accommodate the enormous community concerns and fears.

I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely

David Monceaux  
Civil Engineer

██████████, Mount Osmond, SA 5064