

DIT:Planning Reform Submissions

From: C. Lastname [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 18 December 2020 4:54 PM
To: Joseph Masika; DIT:Planning Reform Submissions; council@marion.sa.gov.au
Subject: From Chris Smith, constituent: Submission Protect our Streets and local communities

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Attention Dr Masika OAM (local member, Woodlands Ward), City of Marion, DIT Planning Reformers

I do not support the Draft Planning and Design Code that favours developers' intensive infill, impacting negatively on local residents and the local community - refer to Helga Lemon, Councillor, City of Burnside, article "The Impact of Urban Infill", *The Adelaide East Herald newspaper 10/12/2020* - page 6.

Marion Council's key points, as per its Protect our Street flyer appear preferable but should allow even larger minimum block sizes, frontages and setback from the road and have at least 2 metres space between boundaries with neighbours. The ceiling height of single storey homes should be higher and have wider eaves. Cars should fit easily into garage(s) and also have storage space.

This submission is further to the one I submitted in November 2017.

My concerns include:

1. ROADS are for access by the residents, the public, emergency services, utilities, buses and Local Council services eg bin/hard rubbish collection, street sweeping, watering trees.

Current and proposed dense infill, with small or no garages, and inadequate 'driveways' means that those residents have **privatised roads** by using them as private carparks.

This has resulted in:

- * lack of visibility to exit/access one's property ie safety is compromised
- * permanently occupied road space in front of one's residence
- * inaccessibility of vehicles for eg bin collection and street sweeping
- * only the centre of the road being available to drive to to cars parked on both sides - another safety matter
- * increase traffic
- * increased risk of damage to vehicles and property

2. STORMWATER: the increased roof space, concrete and no gardens means that water has nowhere to absorb, leading to road flooding

3. CHARACTER: of the area with its mix of predominantly family homes and paired housing trust homes surrounded by gardens is being changed with mostly adjoining units, with an increasing number of multiple storey units, lacking in diversity and surrounding space.

A minimum of 20% garden space should surround each dwelling which should have wide eaves, no more than 2 joined units, to allow airflow, vegetation, allow water to absorb into gardens, and to reduce the heat sink/radiant heat from concrete and walls. These are essential for a health and well-being. A small dog park/reserve is not an adequate substitute for space around homes.

4. QUALITY OF LIFE and a sense of community is diminished with dense infill and its lack of diversity. Low ceiling height, low roofs, very narrow or no eaves, concrete surrounds, high fences,

lack of gardens and vegetation means that there is a reliance on air-conditioners. There is also an increase in noise from people living in such proximity plus reduced PRIVACY and reduced peace. Multiple storey dwellings affect amenity and intrude on a neighbour's privacy through overlooking as well as rendering solar panels less efficient due to overshadowing.

OVERSHADOWING of properties leaves others in darkness and cold, blocking sunshine and airflow from existing gardens and solar systems.

There is continuous noise, dust, heavy vehicle traffic from the many demolitions and constructions, often commencing before 7 am.

5. NOTIFICATION of all development that increases intensity of dwellings, including earthworks, change of use: the public and those people impacted by development must have the opportunity to voice their concerns given the vast changes to existing local development plans.

6. HERITAGE dwelling and CONTRIBUTORY items, and trees should be protected rather than rewarding neglectful owners by enabling them to demolish and replace them with one or more dwellings to maximise their investment.

Suburban Adelaide should distinguish itself by being liveable and enabling a healthy community, with predominantly single storey single family homes on a decent sized block with gardens. The current rate and density of infill, made even more severe by the proposed plans, is further destroying the look and amenity of our streets. The proposed Planning Code does not contribute positively to safety or pleasant neighbour/community interaction.

Such close living compromises privacy and well-being.

Developers are the ones who gain from the infill and the Proposed Planning Code. There are societal and economic repercussions by making these types of small dense dwellings dominate the street scape: it is social engineering with negative consequences on people's everyday life and on the community.

Dear councillors, developers, architects: do you or would you live in one of the adjoining small units such as those that are being built/proposed in the Planning Code?

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.

Chris Smith