

**From:** [vala Vinogradoff](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Submission objecting the proposed planning classification of areas south of Seacombe Road  
**Date:** Tuesday, 17 December 2019 8:04:19 PM

---

## Submission Summary

This submission strongly objects to the proposed planning classification of the areas south of Seacombe Road being classified as General Neighbourhood Zone with block sizes of 300 m<sup>2</sup> or 200 m<sup>2</sup> in a row dwelling.

These areas were traditionally hills face and should be zoned similarly to the Bellevue Heights, as residential Neighbourhood, with minimum lot sizes of 1200 m<sup>2</sup>. Both Panorama and Pasadena have similarities of hills face. I have resided in Seacombe Heights for over 40 years and have seen the devastation and impact that “infill” pressures are having in my community.

Residents in areas such as Seacombe Heights, Seaview Downs, Seacliff Park and Darlington that have a northern boundary of Seacombe Road should maintain their minimum lot sizing and not be subjected to the disastrous minimal lot allocations as Warradale, Seacombe Gardens, Dover Gardens and nearby suburbs. These have, in some areas become concrete ghettos, unsafe street parking zones, unseemly rentals full of weeds and continue to change the once attractive character of family suburbs. The proposed changes were not transparent proposals ever put to vote through council or state elections and reflect a political tendency to impose by selected groups to the public majority rather than the converse. The voice of the taxpayers is not being heard or if it is, it is ignored.

I have elaborated this position by raising the following issues.

Block sizes

Infrastructure

Health and Safety

Life style

Environmental Impact

Power outages

Strategic and responsible leadership

- Undeniably, block sizes have changed in the Marion area, but the original zoning of hills face in Seacombe Heights, had imposed restrictions related to building materials, landscaping, ratio percentage of building in relation to land and these restrictions were onerously supervised. Residents invested significantly to create the ambience and beauty of the neighbourhood.
  - The current proposals negate the benefits of living in these suburbs as personal choices and reasons for living in this area have been relegated to benefit Council coffers, without benefits to residents.
- No new infrastructure, reduced greenery, unsafe frontage play areas, increased heat map, and street car cluster are just a few of the negatives

Value of infill housing projects has not made housing more affordable for young people but it has definitely contributed to the wealth of investors by increasing rentals

- At a time where concerns on the addiction young people have for IT, and the impact of cyber bullying, the proposals contribute to the factor that there is less play space outside and children will ultimately use the social media inside.
  - Furthermore it would be interesting to compare criminal statistics in infill suburbs as opposed to appealing large allotments and leafy play areas. It is unbelievable that our government is blind to the correlation
  - The apparent higher level of rental properties in these infilled areas correlates with a high level of crime based on Advertiser maps.
- The proposals negatively impact on people who chose to have larger blocks and live in these hills face areas who may suddenly be confronted with infill properties that may be suitable for city living but not in the mentioned suburbs.
  - The value of established properties will drop in Seacombe Heights but not on Victoria Avenue, Unley Park where the blocks are large and could also be subdivided into numerous 300 m<sup>2</sup> allotments
- Cynicism and mistrust of politicians certainly increases when the classification of urban suburbs such as Seacombe heights, once hills face, can develop into a treeless, lawn less, concrete suburb that has the potential to be an eye sore by those looking up to the hills from the city.
- Presently, infill suburbs have minimal trees or lawns. Although council have recently planted trees in Seacombe Heights over 20 died, plus council relies on private house owners to contribute to the eco system and cooling. With the planned small 300 m<sup>2</sup> subdivisions, trees and lawns will disappear as they have on the north side of Seacombe Road.
- Parking and Street Congestion have been mentioned. Major roads cannot be widened and the congestion of Morphett Road from the Oaklands crossing has increased due to increased housing.
  - More cars parked on streets have become a necessity and contribute to restricted passage of cars on a street, thereby increasing the risk of accidents and the potential for more fatalities
- Privacy is lessened and environmental noise is increased due to the close proximity of houses and cheap materials that transmit noise. Power outages will increase due to the increased necessary use of air conditioners.
- Suburbs, where owners chose to live because of the space, enjoy their 800 m<sup>2</sup> blocks that are south of Seacombe Road.
  - With the proposals, we will be damned to the increased clutter occurring in Seacombe Gardens, Warradale, Dover Gardens, and Oaklands Park etc.
  - Opposition voices to infill, subdivisions are not being heard.
  - Decisions made from 40 years ago in purchasing property that had restrictions due to development codes were investments of a particular life style. This policy is now impacting on the asset value of properties and pressuring owner residents to move
- As a resident owner on a sloping block at Seacombe Heights, and as a child growing up in Warradale, my family made decisions to live there because of the

space and later for me because of the beautiful views and serenity of Seacombe Heights p.

- Council is disregarding a lifestyle for which myself, and others invested and met criteria that was regulated.
- It seems that vested interests, masked by undemocratic decisions are leading decisions, governed by greed.
- There is no true leadership from either the government or within a Council that are elected to represent their constituents.
- The infrastructure is under stress due to the increased density of household and related utility needs. Capital expenditure on supplying/repairing roads, gas and water supply, sewerage, power, Internet is borne by us, the rate and tax payers, whereas property developers and council reap rewards.
- I do not see an improvement with amenities provided.
  - Existing facilities seem to be maintained, yet roads are crumbling due to increased traffic.
  - Watering occurs on existing footpath greenery, but most property owners water and maintain the plants they planted on council land at their expense.
  - Marion Council had a splurge on tree planting around September, but at least over 20 trees planted on the Moore Street reserve died and were removed, using ratepayers money.
  - Obviously administrative costs have risen, and contribute to the dipping into of revenue raised from rates.
  - It is noted that Councillors and CEO's have also had substantial pay increases, so it is extremely lucrative to have high density housing to seamlessly provide for salaries to elected councillors who disregard the voice opposed to the rezoning and subdivision of large blocks.
- Strategic leadership and planning is lacking in regard to infrastructure, and in particular opportunities similar to the Tonsley precinct could be expanded to cater for retirees who prefer downsizing that is affordable with attractive amenities, medical access, nearby transport and a safe environment
  - However what is being proposed only increases density without access to facilities, e.g Adelaide, shops, restaurants, transport

Sound developmental plans supported by planned infrastructure should drive progress, not greed that benefits a few. The Southbank, and Dockland development in Melbourne are templates for smart high density living. These are supported by transport and relevant facilities and reflect big picture, futures thinking. Our River Torrens precinct is ideal for high density.

Please don't impose unattractive infill into the identified suburbs that attracted families who invested heavily into houses with space, gardens, views and safe neighbourhoods. These families have often extended into third generation children, now adults who still desire what the suburbs presently offer.

Valentina Vinogradoff



Seacombe Heights

S.A 5047

Sent from my iPad