



17th December, 2020.

To Whom it May Concern

Submission on Revised Draft Planning and Design Code - Phase 3

I am most concerned that this draft plan relaxes the protection for historic areas, heritage buildings, contributory items and property use in residential areas. It also allows for the reduction of tree cover, smaller open space on private property, new buildings to overshadow existing houses and gardens and less off-street parking. This last leads to more cars parked on the streets meaning less room for visitor parking, problems with rubbish collecting services and street sweeping and often making it difficult to see approaching traffic at corners.

Only a few years ago many Councils drew up new development plans which were relevant to the local area. Now this plan tries to remove these plans to make a code which fits all cases. The result is a far more complicated code which, in the main, ignores those very characteristics which make an area desirable to its inhabitants and removes the ability of the general public to have any say on future buildings. The idea that the public has been given this chance to get the code 'right' and therefore should not need to contest any future development is ridiculous, given that the new code is so long-winded that it is not really accessible to the average person. Also, most people do not realise what is going on until they are directly affected and then it is too late for them to do anything. We do not need or want the State to be telling us what we want. We want to allow local people back into planning development in the area in which they have chosen to live and they need to be informed of developments which affect them before plans are signed off.

The new regulations allow individual assessors chosen by the new owner or the developer to make assessments on whether or not a building fits the regulations or can be demolished. These decisions should be made by someone totally unconnected with the particular development and who knows to take the character and history of the area into consideration, otherwise any sort of control will be totally lost.

People choose to live in residential areas to be free of excessive traffic, noise and change to the amenity of the area and shops, offices, consulting rooms, etc should not be allowed in such areas, especially without any chance to comment effectively. Buildings on the boundaries of properties should be very limited to avoid overcrowding, overlooking and neighbourhood annoyance, not allowed to be increased as detailed in the draft plan. In any case, there should be some ground around buildings for rain to get into the soil - for the good of the building as well as for environmental reasons.

The amount of green space and trees needs to be increased and while the draft plan specifies that at least one tree should be planted on the property, it does not always allow proper space for this and there is the suggestion that a fee may be paid to avoid such planting. We have seen in the past that fees in place of actual green space often do not result in extra green space and even if it does, it is not always in the local area. Trees on private property as well as street trees and trees in parks are a vital part of creating a cooler ambience which is necessary for general health and to fight the effects of climate change. Reasonable sized rainwater tanks which are tapped into the house system are also needed for every new property.

Especially in historic areas heights of buildings need to be stated (one or 2 storey) not left to an untrained assessor to decide what would be suitable. Also things such as house size and garage size should be large enough for people's needs so that the garages are not used as storage places and cars

are actually parked in garages and off-street. Garages need to be wide enough for vehicle doors to be opened without fear of scraping the walls and not made just for the smallest cars.

Adelaide is different from other cities and needs to remain so if it is to retain its desirability as a place to live and visit. We need the tourism, we do not need to lose the character and charm that attracts many from interstate and, when the situation permits, overseas. Once old buildings have gone they cannot be brought back. We need some new buildings, but they should have a long life, be attractive and environmentally acceptable, not concrete boxes which often look drab and neglected after 10 or 20 years and take extra power to heat and cool. They are often built too close to the pathways so that they make visibility a problem when exiting driveways or roads.

I am glad that the government delayed this the plan and made some good changes, but I sincerely hope that these arguments are taken into serious consideration and that this draft plan is further amended before being put into use as I wish to preserve the character and amenity of my suburb.

Yours faithfully,  
Elaine Dyson.

cc

The Premier, Hon. Steven Marshall  
Deputy Premier, Hon. Vickie Chapman  
Hon. Mark Parnell MLC  
Leader of the Opposition, Mr Peter Malinauskas  
Kensington Residents' Association