

DIT:Planning Reform Submissions

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 27 November 2020 5:34 PM
To: DIT:Planning Reform Submissions
Subject: Submission Regarding Phase Three Planning and Design Code
Attachments: Submission for Draft Planning and Design Code.pdf

Following are our comments regarding the Amendments.
We have also attached our original submission from February for reference.

Submission Regarding Phase Three Planning and Design Code Amendment

Julie and Kym Tilbrook
[REDACTED]

P.9 Public Notification ... states "most residential forms of development will not be subject to notification unless they exceed the maximum building height specified in the zone". If they exceed the maximum building height specified, THEY SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BE REJECTED AS NOT COMPLYING, otherwise what is the point in specifying a maximum building height! We have already seen our suburb suffer from the fact that the "rules" have not been followed and believe if there is a code, it should be followed to the letter with variations not permitted.

We also believe that all property occupiers/owners within a 100m radius of a proposed development have the right to be notified, but particularly immediate neighbours who may have their privacy or amenity compromised. We ask again (as in our previous submission) what right of appeal will the public have? We should not be denied the right to comment on developments that affect our community.

P.18 Urban Infill Policy ... and brochure **Raising the Bar on Residential Infill Development**

The proposal for mandatory tree planting ("Maintain ... policy in urban infill areas of one tree per new dwelling") and minimum soft landscaping requirements is pleasing but we are concerned about an option of an offset fund for payments instead of planting trees onsite. Who would collect this money? Local Councils? It seems it may be open to abuse. Easy for a big developer to hand over cash rather than adhere to a need for greenery on a development to cool neighbourhoods increasingly being concreted. As we already see, they often are prepared to cut down a significant tree onsite and simply pay the fine! How do we know this money paid WILL be used to plant trees nearby and not go into a general revenue fund? As for the removal of significant and regulated trees, a fine is not an adequate deterrent where big money from developers is concerned. Plan approvals should take this into account. The removal of a 50 year old tree TAKES 50 YEARS TO REPLACE!!! **P.24** ... "Regulated and Significant Tree Overlay protects mature trees in metropolitan Adelaide" ...does it!??

We note that "Industry" queried or made objection to Tree Planting and Soft Landscaping ... developers are about making money and don't have to live with the consequences as nearby neighbours do.

We feel that the planning system has always prioritised the interests of developers over the lifestyles and opinions of the community, which we have particularly seen in the City of Campbelltown where we live.

P.27 Car Parking Rates... WE ARE EXTREMELY CONCERNED AT THE PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE A NEW RATE FOR STUDENT ACCOMMODATION of 1 space per 2.5 beds. We have personal experience of this as being totally inadequate! Yes, some international students do not have cars, but many do...this is Australia, after all and they also want to explore. A student block across the road from the Paradise Interchange and opposite our home has 3 units, with 4 bedrooms in each and AT LEAST 5 student tenants in each at the moment. The developer is also applying to partition each of those bedrooms again so that there could potentially be 33 students living at the site! There is only garage space for 5 cars in total and currently there are 5 cars at one unit with 3 being parked in the communal driveway. See photo.



This is causing many problems with the tenants often parking their cars illegally all day in 2 hour parking zones on the adjacent streets. So, even though this accommodation is next to a major transport hub, the students still have many more cars than there are parks provided.

We note On-Site Parking requirements will be 2x spaces per 3+ bedroom dwellings. This must be adhered to with no variation. Many of the developments in our area just do not have adequate car parking and so narrow residential streets become clogged with cars. And we are still concerned about the lack of provision for storage, resulting in garages being used for such and cars ending up out on the street.

Finally, we repeat, “We feel that the planning system has always prioritised the interests of developers over the lifestyles and opinions of the community, which we have particularly seen in the City of Campbelltown where we live developers are about making money and don’t have to live with the consequences as nearby neighbours do.” Please acknowledge the rights and needs of the community in what happens in their neighbourhoods, particularly with regard to greenery and urban heat. Developers should not get priority.

DIT:Planning Reform Submissions

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 27 November 2020 5:34 PM
To: DIT:Planning Reform Submissions
Subject: Submission Regarding Phase Three Planning and Design Code
Attachments: Submission for Draft Planning and Design Code.pdf

Following are our comments regarding the Amendments.
We have also attached our original submission from February for reference.

Submission Regarding Phase Three Planning and Design Code Amendment

Julie and Kym Tilbrook
[REDACTED]

P.9 Public Notification ... states “most residential forms of development will not be subject to notification unless they exceed the maximum building height specified in the zone”. If they exceed the maximum building height specified, THEY SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BE REJECTED AS NOT COMPLYING, otherwise what is the point in specifying a maximum building height! We have already seen our suburb suffer from the fact that the “rules” have not been followed and believe if there is a code, it should be followed to the letter with variations not permitted.

We also believe that all property occupiers/owners within a 100m radius of a proposed development have the right to be notified, but particularly immediate neighbours who may have their privacy or amenity compromised. We ask again (as in our previous submission) what right of appeal will the public have? We should not be denied the right to comment on developments that affect our community.

P.18 Urban Infill Policy ... and brochure **Raising the Bar on Residential Infill Development**

The proposal for mandatory tree planting (“Maintain ... policy in urban infill areas of one tree per new dwelling”) and minimum soft landscaping requirements is pleasing but we are concerned about an option of an offset fund for payments instead of planting trees onsite. Who would collect this money? Local Councils? It seems it may be open to abuse. Easy for a big developer to hand over cash rather than adhere to a need for greenery on a development to cool neighbourhoods increasingly being concreted. As we already see, they often are prepared to cut down a significant tree onsite and simply pay the fine! How do we know this money paid WILL be used to plant trees nearby and not go into a general revenue fund? As for the removal of significant and regulated trees, a fine is not an adequate deterrent where big money from developers is concerned. Plan approvals should take this into account. The removal of a 50 year old tree TAKES 50 YEARS TO REPLACE!!! **P.24** ... “Regulated and Significant Tree Overlay protects mature trees in metropolitan Adelaide” ...does it!??

We note that “Industry” queried or made objection to Tree Planting and Soft Landscaping ... developers are about making money and don’t have to live with the consequences as nearby neighbours do.

We feel that the planning system has always prioritised the interests of developers over the lifestyles and opinions of the community, which we have particularly seen in the City of Campbelltown where we live.

P.27 Car Parking Rates... WE ARE EXTREMELY CONCERNED AT THE PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE A NEW RATE FOR STUDENT ACCOMMODATION of 1 space per 2.5 beds. We have personal experience of this as being totally inadequate! Yes, some international students do not have cars, but many do...this is Australia, after all and they also want to explore. A student block across the road from the Paradise Interchange and opposite our home has 3 units, with 4 bedrooms in each and AT LEAST 5 student tenants in each at the moment. The developer is also applying to partition each of those bedrooms again so that there could potentially be 33 students living at the site! There is only garage space for 5 cars in total and currently there are 5 cars at one unit with 3 being parked in the communal driveway. See photo.



This is causing many problems with the tenants often parking their cars illegally all day in 2 hour parking zones on the adjacent streets. So, even though this accommodation is next to a major transport hub, the students still have many more cars than there are parks provided.

We note On-Site Parking requirements will be 2x spaces per 3+ bedroom dwellings. This must be adhered to with no variation. Many of the developments in our area just do not have adequate car parking and so narrow residential streets become clogged with cars. And we are still concerned about the lack of provision for storage, resulting in garages being used for such and cars ending up out on the street.

Finally, we repeat, “We feel that the planning system has always prioritised the interests of developers over the lifestyles and opinions of the community, which we have particularly seen in the City of Campbelltown where we live developers are about making money and don’t have to live with the consequences as nearby neighbours do.” Please acknowledge the rights and needs of the community in what happens in their neighbourhoods, particularly with regard to greenery and urban heat. Developers should not get priority.