

**From:** [Bob Schapel](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft Code  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 10:55:38 PM

---

Dear Madams/Sirs,

It is difficult for the average person to compare the effects of the Draft Code to existing zones and this is made more so, due to many current non-complying situations. However, we hope that you will consider the following issues. We have lived in the same home for 42 years and our yard is the hub for extended family and haven for six grandchildren.

One of our main concerns is at the boundary between residential areas and non-residential areas. This is already a problem in many situations, including our rear boundary, where existing restrictions have already been stretched well beyond intended limits. Hopefully, any new Planning Code will be at least as restrictive as existing zone requirements. We would prefer it to be MORE restrictive. We believe that the land immediately abutting residential areas should act as a "buffer" between residential and more commercial zones. Surely amenity for residents should be paramount at such boundaries. Large businesses might be applying pressure for restrictions on development to be reduced. These businesses often push to be allowed to develop where they should not be allowed, but their interest is only in profit for the business. Multi story units should not be allowed on the boundaries of established residential areas. Once again, there should be a buffer between them and traditional residential areas. High-rise residential should not be allowed to spoil areas which have traditionally been single story residential. If development such as has occurred along Churchill Road becomes the trend, then it will be very sad. If six story residential buildings are needed, they should be built in areas where they do not impact on the amenity of existing traditional homes.

Residential streets are another concern. There might be a push for more housing density, but surely that can happen in newer suburbs where the infrastructure can be designed to match. Roads, drainage, water, gas and electricity are already stretched to the limit in inner suburbs. Allowing small businesses and shops in residential streets will be counter productive as they reduce residential availability. Such shops and businesses will also irreversibly change the feel of our much-loved suburbs. Such land uses might be effective in outer suburbs, as it should reduce traffic and infrastructure overload in the inner suburbs. However, it would certainly irreversibly damage the traditional culture in ALL suburbs.

We hope that the points we have made will be taken into account when the Code is finalised. Any change to the status quo will be impossible to reverse, so they must be considered carefully. Australia is a wonderful country. We should be resisting changes which would make it more similar to countries which are not so wonderful!

Margaret and Robert Schapel

 Glenunga, 5064.

**From:** [DPTI.NoReply@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.NoReply@sa.gov.au)  
**To:** [DPTI:SA Planning Portal](#)  
**Subject:** SA Planning Portal - Website issue/feedback  
**Date:** Wednesday, 26 February 2020 12:21:45 PM

---

### Form Information

Site Name: SA Planning Portal  
Site Id: 276778  
Page Standard Name: Contact Us  
Page Standard Id: 412712  
URL: [https://www.saplanningportal.sa.gov.au/contact\\_us](https://www.saplanningportal.sa.gov.au/contact_us)  
Submission ID: 639944  
Submission Time: 26 Feb 2020 12:21pm  
Submission IP Address: [REDACTED]  
User logged in as: N/A (User, Public)

### Submission Details

Name:	Bob Schapel
Email:	[REDACTED]
Phone:	[REDACTED]
Which best describes you:	Local resident
Feedback type:	Website issue/feedback
Please tell us your thoughts:	<p>My wife and I are very concerned that the amenity of our "Suburban Neighbourhood" zone home will be negatively impacted if the proposed changes allow any more freedom of development behind our rear boundary. Our home of 42 years is in an area proposed to be "Suburban Neighbourhood" and the land behind it is proposed to be "Suburban Activity Centre". Currently, as a "Local Centre Zone" in Burnside area, the restriction limits behind our property have already been stretched enough to severely affect our amenity, and there is another big foreign business planning a huge new development which would stretch those restrictions even further. (And despite their misleading claims, would actually reduce employment within Australia at two levels.) We believe that the interests of residents must be foremost in any plans of change. Afterall, despite both being necessary, businesses are there to serve the residents; Residents are not there to serve businesses. Any new zoning should be VERY restrictive adjacent to residential property. With such a restrictive "buffer", further development beyond should be more acceptable because it would have much less negative impact. Residential streets themselves are another concern of ours. It would change the feel of the suburbs we love so much if shops and small businesses are</p>

allowed in residential streets. Combined with smaller setbacks and smaller building block sizes, these changes would irreversibly damage the culture we have always enjoyed in Australia. In closing, Please take into account that any negative effect of changes will be virtually impossible to reverse. Once there is a multi story building with noisy land use next door, it will always be there! Maggie and Bob Schapel [REDACTED] Glenunga 5064

Upload a  
file/image:

No file uploaded