

Ken Smith,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Attention:

Planning Review Panel, South Australian Government.

My personal experience in making a submission to the Council and CAPS Panel was a disappointing and eye-opening experience.

The bias towards the developer was extremely evident.

We the residents made many submissions and included a petition which were both virtually overlooked by some members of the panel and Council. The development was passed 3 votes to 2.

Draft refusal statement put by one CAPs member was not even debated, I have attached the statement for your information:

The image shows a screenshot of a document page. At the top left, there is a small icon of a document with a checkmark. Below it, the word "Alternate:" is followed by a paragraph symbol ¶. The main content is a numbered list. Item 1 is a long sentence starting with "Pursuant to Section 107(2)(c) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016..." and ending with "however". Item 2 starts with "Development Application Number [REDACTED] by Leyton Property Pty. Ltd. is not considered to sufficiently satisfy the relevant provisions of the Planning and Design Code and is REFUSED Planning Consent for the following reasons:". This is followed by a list of eight bullet points, each starting with "→". The first bullet point discusses the residential character and amenity of the neighbourhood. The second discusses the building footprint and space around buildings. The third discusses the overall size, bulk, and scale of the building. The fourth discusses setbacks from the primary street boundary. The fifth discusses the rear setback of the building. The sixth discusses waste collection. The seventh discusses traffic flow. The eighth is a general statement about the site design. At the bottom of the page, there is a "Page Break" indicator with a paragraph symbol ¶ on either side. At the very bottom, there is a footer with a date: "Date Printed: -17 February 2022".

¶

**Alternate:** ¶

- Pursuant to Section 107(2)(c) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, and having undertaken an assessment of the application against the Planning and Design Code, the application is NOT seriously at variance with the provisions of the Planning and Design Code; however ¶
- Development Application Number [REDACTED] by Leyton Property Pty. Ltd. is not considered to sufficiently satisfy the relevant provisions of the Planning and Design Code and is REFUSED Planning Consent for the following reasons: ¶
  - The development is not considered to be sited and designed to complement the residential character and amenity of the neighbourhood (General Neighbourhood Zone PO 1.3), with the overall size, bulk and scale, and design of the building not designed to be complimentary to the existing character of buildings in the locality. ¶
  - The building footprint does not allow sufficient space around buildings to limit visual impact, provide an attractive outlook and access to light and ventilation (zone PO 3.1), with the site coverage of 65% exceeding the 60% sought in zone DTS/DPF 3.1. ¶
  - The overall size, bulk and scale, and design of the building does not contribute to a low-rise suburban character (zone PO 4.1), with the maximum wall height of 8.4m exceeding the 7m sought by zone DTS/DPF 4.1. ¶
  - The building is not setback from the primary street boundary to contribute to the existing/emerging pattern of street setbacks in the streetscape (zone PO 5.1), with the front setback not satisfying zone DTS/DPF 5.1(a). ¶
  - The rear setback of the building does not satisfy the intent of zone PO 9.1 and DTS/DPF 9.1(b). ¶
  - Waste collection is not provided for within the boundary of the site, not satisfying Transport, Access and Parking PO 6.6 and DTS/DPF 6.6. ¶
  - *Development is sited and designed so that loading, unloading and turning of all traffic avoids interrupting the operation of and queuing on public roads and pedestrian paths.* ¶

Page Break ¶

Date Printed: -17 February 2022 ¶

The developer was permitted to add further information at the CAPs meeting but we the residents opposing the development were not allowed to add or comment on the additional information.

It is wrong that those who make submissions are not allowed to ask questions or make comments during the debate.

The outcome shows how poor the planning and CAPs system is with no considerations regarding the opinions and outcomes for neighbouring properties.

#### New Developments and Block Infills

With the constant demolition and infills the planning regulations at present are creating almost ghetto type areas with most of these infill developments creating extremely small housing blocks, homes built on these small blocks have no areas for any greenery, trees shrubs lawn etc, or extra family vehicles most only have provision for a single car garage.

This means any other vehicle are parked on the carriage way and converts once 2-way roads into single lane, this is made extremely more evident if it is family home with older children all with vehicles causing more congestion with up to 3 more vehicles parked on the carriageway.

I have added 2 photos for you to see the infill next to my home, one along the boundary and the other a Google view from above, 3 houses with the buildings within 20cm of the boundary, there is no area to locate any type of storage shed for garden equipment etc, the single garage becomes the storage area, and vehicles are parked, a vehicle in the driveway the other constantly parked on the street.



Fence line



Above view via Google Maps

With infill homes on a corner site the vehicles park on the roadway right to the corner obstructing the person turning view of the oncoming traffic.

At times this can be a very dangerous situation.

3 infill homes are nearly always constructed on corner allotments.

We see more and more vehicles damaged, torched, and stolen from streets, surely this obvious just how easy it is now for these things to happen with more and more vehicles on the street creating easy targets for these low life people.

With these infill homes there are no garden areas or very little usually about 10 to 15 square metres, where once a big percentage of rain went into the garden areas and soaking into the ground most now is storm water from paved areas and the house roofing, this means most of the water from rain goes onto the street via storm water piping and eventually into the sea, and we wonder why the sea grasses are disappearing along our coastline.

As a child I can remember storm water running into our garden or on to the driveway, but it soaked in because the driveway was gravel, yes it had water on it after a heavy shower of rain, but it quickly dispersed through the gravel into the soil below.

There were no storm water piping going to the street.

The climate is changing, cities are getting hotter, but with infill housing water from rain is not entering the ground to help cool, and homes mostly have dark roofing this attracts heat while light colour roofing reflects the heat not absorbing it anywhere near as much.

With new housing developments as proposed south in the Seaford and Aldinga Beach areas, and many more north of Adelaide, developers make the blocks as small in size as possible and roadway as narrow as permitted to gain added housing allotments developers are only interested in profit not a viable housing development, blocks need to be larger and mandatory 2 car garaging to get vehicles

off street parking, the road need to be made wider for easier travelling when vehicles are parked on roadways, larger blocks means more rain water will penetrate the ground instead of running to the sea as storm water.

All new development need provision for public transport, this must include wider roadways where buses will be travelling, in many instances provision for a light rail corridor and bus routes linking to those rail stations.

At Aldinga where you are talking 600 homes, think how many millions of litres of water soaking into the ground when it rains now, compared to when the development is completed, how many millions of litres of water will flow into the sea as storm water, killing of sea grasses and polluting the Aldinga Bay area and especially the eco system on the Aldinga Reef, I am no expert only a 77 year old been around for a while, but it is significant if you stop and think about it.

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the current inadequacies I there are in the planning regulations, allowing Developers an open go with little consequences, and even less support residents.

Best Regards,

Ken Smith.

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████