



# ST PETERS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INC.

E-mail [spra@senet.com.au](mailto:spra@senet.com.au)

Representing the Residents of St Peters, College Park, Hackney, Stepney, Maylands, and Evandale.

## **SUBMISSION - PLANNING & DESIGN CODE (PHASE 3).**

### **Introduction.**

The St Peters Residents Association (SPRA) was formed in 1972 in response to the former St Peters Council proposing zoning provisions that would have encouraged the replacement of the predominant Victorian-era dwellings on large allotments with blocks of two-storey cream brick walk-up flats.

Since that time, the Association has been actively involved in Development Plan and heritage reviews in 1992 and, following council amalgamation, in 2005-6.

We therefore welcome this opportunity to comment on the revisions made following the initial consultation on the draft Planning & Design Code (P&DC). While the Association welcomes the work undertaken since the first round of consultation and acknowledges the improvements made, we still have concerns on several matters.

The Association recognises the vast amount of work that has been required for the State Government's proposed reform of planning legislation and policies. The merging of 72 separate development plans into a single document is a complex process and one that has been rushed in the final stages.

The Association is concerned that the new Planning and Design Code (P&DC) will introduce significant changes to planning policy in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters (NPSP), policy which has evolved over almost 50 years, and which mostly suits the needs of the City.

The P&DC is not a 'like for like' transition of provisions that we were led to believe it would be at the start of the process, but rather a 'lowest common denominator – one size fits all' approach. Important local policy contained in the NPSP Development Plan (DP) has not been transitioned across to the D&PC contrary to assurances that these local characteristics would be accommodated in the Code.

While the revised draft P&DC that has been released for consultation is a vast improvement, it still remains incomplete, contains many errors and omissions and is not easily accessible on the electronic planning system.

The Association is unable to support many of the proposed changes as we believe they will result in poorer planning outcomes for our area. The implementation of the Code still needs more time to enable the deficiencies to be better understood and corrected

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has prepared a comprehensive submission on the Code, one which fully analyses these deficiencies and makes appropriate and reasonable recommendations. SPRA fully endorses this submission by our Council and wishes that it be considered as part of our submission.

## **The Proposed Planning & Design Code.**

We continue to have many concerns with the Draft Code.

In brief, our concerns include, but are not limited to the following: -

- The process has been marred by poor consultation resulting in limited awareness and frustration by all those involved.
- The Draft is still incomplete with revisions and additions being made on the run during this period of consultation.
- The Draft Code is incomprehensible even for professionals.
- The interactive ePlanning system is obviously still in a development phase, making the consultation maps and policy almost impossible to navigate.
- The Code will not make planning easier, quicker, simpler, and more equitable.
- It will be a 'goldmine' for lawyers, planning professionals, and consultants, with resultant cost penalties for residents and developers alike.
- While the listing of Contributory Items, albeit under a different name is welcomed, there is no evidence that they have any different status to any other building in an Historic Area.
- The Historic Area Statements are minimal in content and completely inadequate as they fail to ensure new development responds to the unique history and context of the current RHCZ and the various Policy Areas.
- Sub-zones were committed to as means to provide local area variation and policy but were not used effectively in the draft D&PC and none have been implemented in City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, highlighting the loss of local policy
- Shops, offices and consulting rooms have changed in residential zones from non-complying land uses to envisaged land uses with no notification for shops/ offices/ consulting rooms of 100m<sup>2</sup> or 200m<sup>2</sup> depending on location.
- No protection is provided for developments fronting un-serviced St Peters laneways as contained in the current NPSP DP.
- No discouragement of undercroft carparking in residential areas (currently not enabled)
- Reduced protection for significant trees.
- Reduced minimum site area in Maylands – down from 400m<sup>2</sup> to 300 m<sup>2</sup>.
- Allowing hammerhead and battle-axe subdivisions in areas where it is currently not permitted.

It is beyond the resources of the Association to comment in detail on all aspects of the draft P&DC, and so we have selected a few indicative examples to illustrate our concerns.

## Consultation.

It is the opinion of SPRA that the consultation process has been one of presentation of material, not respectful community engagement. Whilst there were many public forums, they were frustrating presentation and Q&A style events with no opportunity for Commission members to genuinely listen to concerns and alternatives proposed by attendees. In fact, some people were actually insulted by Commission members.

The Community Engagement Charter has five principles that must be observed. These require that engagement be genuine, inclusive and respectful, fit for purpose, informed and transparent and includes processes which are reviewed and improved. SPRA expected that the Charter's five principles would be followed, however we consider that none have been successfully achieved in the consultation process. These failures are fully detailed in the previous City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters submission.

The Commission has not invested in the systematic road testing of the new Code and has tried to assure the concerned community that rectification of any errors can be made after the P&DC has been implemented. This is an absurd proposal and will allow a Code to be implemented which is clearly not fit for purpose. The Code should not be implemented until this has been done.

## Contributory Items / Representative Buildings.

The Association is pleased that earlier representations regarding the failure to recognise the listings of Contributory Items in many Council Development Plans have been acknowledged and, partially, acted upon. We are however not convinced that the name needed to be changed to Representative Buildings.

Of greater concern is the fact that these Representative Buildings are not referred to anywhere within the Code policies. They are only spatially identified in the South Australian Property and Planning Atlas (SAPPA). It is our view that they should be identified in the Code in a similar manner to the tables of Local Heritage and State Heritage Items.

It has also been noted that when an address that contains a Representative Building is searched there is no indication that it is actually a Representative Building. The Historic Area Statement that the search brings up appears to indicate such a status, but this is merely a generic statement to indicate that the area has some Representative Buildings. All properties, whether representative or not, have the same statement. The wording "refer to SA planning database" is also non-instructive and should say to refer to the SA Property and Planning Atlas.

<u>Representative Buildings</u>	Identified – refer to SA planning database.
---------------------------------	---

The Code definition of a Representative Buildings contains the following statement: -

*The identification of representative buildings in a particular area is not intended to imply that other buildings in an historic area are not of importance.*

SPRA welcomes this statement as it serves to indicate that there may be other buildings that should also be similarly recognised.

We do however recommend that the definition be altered to include additional words as highlighted below: -

*Representative buildings (Contributory Items) referenced in Historic Area Statements and mapped in the South Australian Planning and Property Atlas are buildings which display historic characteristics which are important and contribute to the significance of the Historic Area. These buildings should be retained – however if demolition is approved, the design of new development should contribute to the character of the area. The identification of representative buildings (Contributory Items) in a particular historic area is not intended to imply that other buildings in an historic area are not of importance.*

The somewhat improved demolition policy in the Historic Area Overlay has no clear link to Representative Buildings – this is implied only and needs to be clarified. Suggested wording changes are highlighted.

<p><b>PO 7.1</b> Representative buildings, and any other buildings and structures which contribute to the historic character of the area or features thereof that demonstrate the historic characteristics as expressed in the Historic Area Statement are not demolished, unless: (a) the front elevation of the building has been substantially altered and cannot be reasonably restored in a manner consistent with the building's original style or (b) the structural integrity or safe condition of the original building is beyond reasonable repair.</p>
<p><b>PO 7.2</b> Partial demolition of a building where that portion to be demolished does not contribute to the historic character of the streetscape.</p>
<p><b>PO 7.3</b> Buildings or elements of buildings that do not conform with the characteristics described in the Historic Area Statement may be demolished.</p> <p>The poor appearance of a representative Building should not serve as justification for its demolition or significant modification.</p> <p><i>(Note - Very few characteristics are described in the Historic Area Statements. See later comments and the Appendix. The words used are characteristics and attributes. This is very sloppy wording and needs to be amended).</i></p> <p><i>(Note - The policy addition relating to the poor condition of a representative building is taken from the current NPSP Development Plan and is considered an essential addition.)</i></p>

It is the Association's view that without proper referencing and inclusion into the Code, as well as stronger controls over demolition, they are merely a "Claytons" listing and a sop to placate the public that demanded they be recognised.

## **Technical Numerical Variations (TNV).**

The current NPSP Development Plan contains many numerical standards in relation to different forms of development. These standards must be transitioned to the P&DC. The revised draft appears to have resolved most of the issues in the original consultation draft, however there could be some improvement.

## **Historic Area Statements.**

The NPSP Development Plan has several Policy Areas within the RHCZ. Each of these has a Desired Character Statement (DCS) attached which has been developed over the past 30 years to reflect the individual history, area characteristics, building forms, building materials, landscaping, and fencing of the Policy Area.

As an example, the DCS for the Avenues Policy Area is about 1000 words in length and provides necessary local context. The DCS provides guidance on the existing historic features which should be preserved and the desired design features for new development. Both are equally important in managing development within historic areas.

These DCS are no longer a part of the P&DC and have been largely replaced with Historic Area Statements (HAS). The Historic Area Statements are brief and are not adequate or appropriate replacements for the extensive local policy content currently contained in the Development Plan DCS. They only reflect existing conditions and do not provide guidance for new development which limits their effectiveness.

These statements do not include any “forward facing” policies as they are descriptions of what exists only (and these descriptions are very lacking in detail). Therefore, the ability to control the appropriateness of new development in these Historic Areas is very limited, and much weaker than existing Development Plans. Issues such as appropriate wall heights, locations of double garages etc, are very difficult to control, and the promised guidelines for these areas have not yet been made available for public review. The level of Historic Area character protection is therefore inadequate, and to turn on the Code in its current form will expose these areas to increased risk of inappropriate development.

The proposed Zones, Heritage Overlays and Historic Area Statements provide limited detail on the local context. The existing DCS were carefully crafted and have evolved since the 1990s, standing the test of time and facilitating good outcomes that are suited to each locality within the City.

The comprehensive policy detail in the NPSP DP that has been removed includes: -

- Policy governing not rendering or covering original brickwork and stonework
- Policy specifying dwelling types – (eg detached, semi-detached)

- Site coverage consistent with buildings which contribute to character
- Wall height and window placement
- Vertical and horizontal proportions of windows and openings
- Minimisation of unbroken walling, treatment of openings, depths of reveals
- Roof form, pitch and colour
- Verandah, balconies and eaves detail
- Upper levels in the roof space
- Policy regarding excessive mass, overlooking or overshadowing
- Total width of upper level windows not exceeding 30% of total roof width
- Corner site redevelopment to address both frontages
- Use of stone, brick, natural coloured bagged render and/ or brick as main external wall finish
- Avoidance of brightly coloured or highly reflective materials/ surfaces
- Development not fronting rear un-serviced laneways
- Historic Guidelines Table NPSP/4 (illustrated design principles)
- Carports/ garages not extending verandah elements or historic detailing across the same alignment as main face of building
- Not incorporating undercroft carparking as it is not consistent with historic character
- Garaging to rear of allotment where laneway exists
- Row dwelling garaging to the rear
- Retention of front gardens and substantial landscaping
- Fencing to not restrict visibility of dwelling
- Fencing material and height detailed for each Policy Area

The loss of this policy detail and clarity equates to weaker policy protection and not stronger policy protection as has been stated. All these policy provisions should be retained in the new P&DC.

An example comparing the existing NPSP Development Plan provisions for the Avenues Policy Area with the proposed Code provisions has been attached as an appendix to this submission.

SPRA understands that there will to be two guideline documents prepared to supplement the Historic Area Overlays and Statements. Common Style Attribute Guidelines are meant to supplement the Statements regarding common architectural attributes for identified styles and periods of development such as typical roof pitch, materials and detailing of Victorian villas. Design Advisory Guidelines will also provide details on how to achieve the roof form with the prevailing characteristics of the historic area.

Such guidelines are clearly going to be important to the development assessment process. Details of this type are presently found in many existing Development Plans and often in the tables to the back of the Plans.

However, these guidelines are not available for them to be considered during this period of consultation. A complete and comprehensive period of public consultation should

include the draft guidelines, and without which it is very difficult to consider and comment on the efficacy of the Historic Area Overlays and Statements.

We are also concerned about the extent to which planning authorities and the ERD Court can have regard to such guidelines (which are not part of the Code) when making their development assessment decisions. Planning authorities have to assess a development against the relevant provisions of the Planning Rules (102(1)(a) PDI Act). “Planning Rules” are defined to be the Planning and Design Code, Design Standards prepared by the Commission relating to the public realm or infrastructure or any other instrument prescribed by regulations. The ‘public realm’ means parks and other public places and streetscapes’. The documents being drafted are described as ‘guidelines’ not as ‘design standards’. Are they “Practice guidelines’ under s43? If so, they do not have to go through a public notification process nor be open to public input. They also do not seem to be something the Planning authority is required to consider as part of its development assessment function. The key details should be available for public comment. The community Consultation process is deficient if they are not.

### **Laneway Development and Streetscape Impacts.**

The NPSP Development Plan contains clear policy regarding which laneways can and cannot serve as a primary frontage for dwellings. This policy is to ensure dwellings have appropriate access to essential infrastructure services. Most of the laneways are in the former St Peters Council area and formed part of the original subdivision layout in the mid-1870s. These lanes were for rear property and night-cart access and have narrow (4.2m) lightweight pavements. They also do not have services including power, water, gas, phone/NBN, storm water, street lighting, and are too narrow for modern garbage collection vehicles with robotic arms to operate in.

The NPSP Development Plan also contains requirements for vehicle access by specifying minimum setbacks between carports/garages and the opposite side of the lane to allow for safe access and egress without causing damage to the property opposite. It is very concerning that these provisions have been omitted from the Code.

Other specific policies in the NPSP DP ensure that new garaging and driveways are not created on the primary street frontage, due to the availability of rear laneways for access and garaging. The reduced policy protections under the P&DC mean that there is no policy to guide new garaging to the rear of dwellings. This will impact on the streetscape, and result in the loss of street trees, on-street parking and on-site landscaping.

## **Overlooking.**

In order to reduce the potential for overlooking from upper-level windows, balconies, terraces and decks the NPSP Development Plan specifies a sill height of not less than 1.7 metres or the adoption of other measures to reduce the potential for overlooking, and to ensure privacy.

The proposed reduction to a 1.5 metre sill height is not supported as this is clearly inadequate.

## **New Land Use Options in Established Neighbourhood Zone.**

SPRA is concerned at the opened-up land use opportunities in the Established Neighbourhood Zone. Much of this zone is currently in the RHCZ. Within the RHCZ, land uses including shops, offices, consulting rooms, are non-complying uses. With no appeal rights this opens St Peters and College Park for non-residential development in the middle of residential streets.

## **The ePlanning System.**

The gateway to the P&DC is intended to be via an on-line ePlanning portal.

The SPC information sheets claim that: -

- ePlanning will simplify how community members, developers, decision makers and others interact with the planning system
- One centralised place for all South Australia's planning and development matters.
- An electronic planning system to simplify processes and speed up the movement of information, saving all users time and money
- Improved consistency of all planning decisions, with legislative amendments implemented centrally under standardised interpretation

SPRA and others doubt the SPC claim that the ePlanning system will "simplify processes and speed up the movement of information, saving all users time and money"

As the ePlanning system will be the only way to access the Code we have concerns that it will not be fully implemented in time the revised early 2021 P&DC implementation date.

The Phase 2 ePlanning system experience indicates the possibility of a planning debacle. The ePlanning system has the potential to be the SPC's version of Health's EPAS system.

## **Conclusion.**

SPRA understands the intent to have consistent policy across the State, however this must not be at the cost of replacing almost all nuanced local planning policies with a few, generic and standardised policies as proposed in the draft Planning & Design Code.

Collectively, these proposed changes will result in poorer development outcomes, and destroy the very historic character that our community values and has sought over decades to protect.

This character is what sets St Peters, Adelaide and South Australia apart from the other Australian suburbs, cities and states.

Over the past almost 50 years there has been considerable capital investment in planning by City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters and its predecessor Councils. This has resulted in a Development Plan and policies that, in most respects, reflect unique local policy and suits the needs of the local community.

The value of St Peters properties has increased up to 100-fold over the last 45 – 50 years, and residents who have invested in their homes do not wish to see this value degraded by poor planning policies.

The St Peters Residents Association urges the State Planning Commission to step back from this Planning & Design Code, seriously reassess the objectives, genuinely consider all comments and recommendations, and return with a Code that will benefit all sections of our community.

cc

The Premier, Hon Steven Marshall  
Deputy Premier, Hon Vickie Chapman  
Leader of the Opposition, Mr Peter Malinauskas  
Shadow Minister for Planning, Ms Jayne Stinson  
Hon Mark Parnell, MLC  
City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters  
Community Alliance South Australia  
National Trust of South Australia  
History Trust of South Australia  
South Australian Heritage Council  
Australian Civic Trust

## **APPENDIX.**

The current NPSP Development Plan includes a description of historic development and context and what is desired for the area. By way of example the DP contains the following for the Avenues Policy Area.

### ***The Avenues Policy Area***

*The following Desired Character Statement, Objective and Principles of Development Control apply in The ` expressed for the Residential Historic (Conservation) Zone and the whole of the Council area in the City Wide section.*

#### **DESIRED CHARACTER STATEMENT**

*The Avenues Policy Area encompasses the bulk of the St Peters suburb between First and Sixth Avenues (to both sides of Stephen Terrace) and extends north to Lambert Road, to include a portion of the suburb of Joslin along First, Second and Third Avenues. It is characterised by the regular pattern of large allotments fronting wide, tree-lined avenues with rear service lanes (in St Peters) and the consistent styles of predominantly single-storey, detached, late Victorian Italianate villas of reasonably substantial proportions set in extensive gardens with imposing front boundary fences.*

*A large portion of the dwellings in this Policy Area were built between the late 1870s and 1900. Double fronted asymmetrical dwellings are the most common dwelling type in The Avenues Policy Area, although there are a range of symmetrical dwellings, East Adelaide Company dwellings and some larger villas and mansions. The double fronted symmetrical and asymmetrical dwellings are an elegant, larger version of the simple colonial cottage with the addition of a projecting wing (in the case of the asymmetrical dwelling), a more elaborate verandah and increased detailing in plaster and render work around openings. The pitch and size of the roof makes this an important design element that will continue to be repeated in new developments. The external walls are generally constructed of bluestone or sandstone dressed and coursed. Verandahs along the front elevation are another important element of both the double fronted symmetrical and asymmetrical dwelling, which will be repeated on new dwellings.*

*This Policy Area also includes some Edwardian style housing (such as Queen Anne and Art Nouveau styles) which were built between the 1900s and the 1920s. This style of dwelling is generally located within the later subdivided areas or on blocks which were re-subdivided from larger allotments. Whilst the Joslin portion of this Policy Area also reflects this character, some of the dwelling stock, particularly towards the Lambert Road boundary, graduates into the 1920s style of housing, introducing with it a component of inter-war housing such as bungalows. All of these dwellings complement the established Victorian villa character of the Policy Area and should be retained. The importance of these dwellings is signified by their listing as a Local Heritage Place or Contributory Item.*

*Development in this Policy Area will conserve and enhance the historic streetscape character created by the regularity of the avenues and the development patterns that have formed around them. Old and new development will be combined in a way that shows an understanding of historic design patterns, avoids poor imitation and improves the overall visual amenity of streetscapes.*

*Due to the high degree of intactness displayed in The Avenues Policy Area, limited opportunity exists for redevelopment. New dwellings will be limited to the replacement of non-contributory items or the re-use of underutilised allotments (eg allotments currently used as tennis courts). New dwellings will reflect the scale of the existing dwellings and will maintain similar roof profiles as well as respect the detailing of the original buildings. Dwellings will maintain a setback from the boundary of roads at a distance equal to or greater than, the alignment of the main face of the adjacent heritage place or contributory item (where a site is between two heritage places or contributory items the greater of the*

two set-backs will be applied). Any new dwellings will include verandahs on the primary frontage of the building.

A large part of the development anticipated in the Policy Area, will be in the form of alterations or additions to existing dwellings. Additions will only occur at the rear or side (where appropriate) of a heritage place or contributory item. No alterations or additions will occur at the front of a heritage place or contributory item unless it is for the purposes of restoration or maintenance, such as the reinstatement of a front verandah. The original openings in external walls (eg doors and windows), particularly along the front elevations will not be altered.

The front boundaries will continue to be defined by fencing that is compatible with the period and style of the dwelling. Solid high front fences such as brush or masonry are generally not sympathetic to the character of the streetscape and will be avoided in favour of lower, more open fencing which allows an appreciation of the detailing of the dwelling, such as brick and stone plinths with cast iron railings and a cast iron gate, for dwellings of the Victorian period, and timber picket and paling or woven crimped wire, for Edwardian and inter-war dwellings. Where dwellings on wide allotments have associated private side gardens, brush panels or solid masonry fencing can be successfully used to screen sections of the garden but will not be continued across the full length of the primary street frontage. Flexibility for fencing types may be considered for properties located along roads carrying high traffic volumes, such as Stephen Terrace, Harrow Road and Lambert Road. Side and rear fences will be erected in traditional materials, such as timber, corrugated iron or well detailed masonry. Side fencing along street corners will continue the detailing of the front fence to the house alignment, solid fencing beyond this point will be erected in traditional materials.

Rear access lanes (shown on [Map NPSP/1 \(Overlay 4\)](#)) will be used for the purpose of vehicular access only, no dwellings will have their primary street frontage facing a lane.

Landscaping around a dwelling, particularly in the front garden, is an important design element in this Policy Area as it enhances the dwelling and adds to the appearance and quality of the streetscape. Both new and existing dwellings will incorporate an appropriate garden setting. The streets will continue to be lined with mature street trees in situations where they can be practically grown.

Sites in The Avenues Policy Area which contain buildings that contribute to the desired character of the policy area are shown on [Figures Her/6, 7, 10, 11, 12 and 16](#).

## PROPOSED PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE - NPSP20

**HISTORIC AREA STATEMENT** - Does not include description of historic development and context and what is desired for the area.

The generic statement at the start provides no assistance with development approval process. This is one of the best examples of what is proposed in the Code (as NPSP has been so insistent with improving what was originally proposed) but is still inadequate as it cannot be used to ensure that new development contributes to the historic character of the area.

### The Avenues Historic Area Statement (NPSP20)

The Historic Area Overlay identifies localities that comprise characteristics of an identifiable historic, economic and / or social theme of recognised importance. They can comprise land divisions, development patterns, built form characteristics and natural features that provide a legible connection to the historic development of a locality.

These attributes have been identified in the below table. In some cases State and / or Local Heritage Places within the locality contribute to the attributes of an Historic Area.

The preparation of an Historic Impact Statement can assist in determining potential additional attributes of an Historic Area where these are not stated in the below table.

Eras, themes and context	Late 1870s and 1900, 1900s and the 1920s, and inter-war. Detached dwellings.
Allotments, subdivision and built form patterns	Historic streetscape created by the regularity of the avenues and the development patterns that have formed around them. Primary <u>dwelling</u> frontages to streets, not lanes.
Architectural styles, detailing and built form features	Predominantly single-storey, detached, late Victorian Italianate villas of reasonably substantial proportions. Elsewhere – the consistent styles of detached late Victorian Italianate villas of reasonably substantial proportions. Double fronted asymmetrical dwellings are the most common <u>dwelling</u> type, although there are a range of symmetrical dwellings, East Adelaide Company dwellings and some larger villas and mansions.

	The double fronted symmetrical and asymmetrical dwellings are an elegant, larger version of the simple colonial cottage with the addition of a projecting wing (in the case of the asymmetrical <u>dwelling</u> ), a more elaborate verandah and increased detailing in plaster and render work around openings. The pitch and size of the roof makes this an important design element. Verandahs along the front elevation are another important element of both the double fronted symmetrical and asymmetrical <u>dwelling</u> . Some Edwardian style housing (such as Queen Anne and Art Nouveau styles), generally located within the later subdivided areas or on blocks which were re-subdivided from larger allotments. Joslin portion of this Policy Area – reflects general character, some of the <u>dwelling</u> stock, particularly towards the Lambert Road boundary, graduates into the 1920s style of housing, introducing with it a component of inter-war housing such as bungalows.
<u>Building height</u>	Predominantly single-storey, up to two storeys in some locations.
<u>Materials</u>	Bluestone or sandstone dressed and coursed.
<u>Fencing</u>	Low, open fencing that reflects the period and style of the dwellings. Front fencing (including any <u>secondary street</u> frontage up to the alignment to the fair face of the <u>dwelling</u> ) generally low in height up to 1.2m (masonry), 1.5m (wrought iron, brush, timber and or wire or woven mesh) and 2m (masonry pillars), allowing views to <u>dwelling</u> . Timber picket, timber dowelling, masonry and cast iron palisade, or corrugated iron or mini orb within timber framing for cottages, villas and other dwellings built during the Victorian period.

	<p>Timber piling, wire mesh and timber or tube framing, woven crimped wire, or masonry with galvanised steel ribbon for bungalows, Tudors and inter-war dwellings.</p> <p>Side and rear fences in traditional materials such as timber, corrugated iron or well-detailed masonry.</p>
<p>Setting, landscaping, streetscape and public realm features</p>	<p>Landscaping around a <u>dwelling</u>, particularly in the front garden, is an important design element.</p> <p>In St Peters, wide tree lined streets, with mature street trees and rear lanes used for vehicular access and garages</p>
<p>Representative Buildings</p>	<p>Identified – refer to SA planning database.</p>