

**From:** [Pamela dean](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** re Planning reforms  
**Date:** Monday, 17 February 2020 11:46:20 AM

---

To Whom it May Concern

## **SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 (City of Burnside)**

In response to the draft Planning and Design Code – Phase 3, which is currently out for public consultation, I wish to register my strong objections to a number of issues as summarised below.

### 1. All Existing Residential Areas

a) Non-Residential land use: Currently in the City of Burnside's residential areas, shops, offices and educational establishments are non-complying. In the new Code existing residential areas will allow these non-residential uses which will adversely impact traffic, parking, noise, neighbour's amenity and the character of our suburbs. This is unacceptable. All uses which are currently non-complying in our residential areas (eg. office and shop) should be "restricted development". Alternatively, a new zone should be created purely for residential land use.

b) Siting and Setbacks: Under the Code, building setbacks from side and rear boundaries will noticeably decrease, particularly at upper levels. This is unacceptable and will severely impact green space and tree canopy and privacy. Existing siting, setback and floor area criteria should be maintained throughout all our residential areas.

c) Density and Allotment Sizes: The draft Code contains a number of errors and omissions which I am sure the submission from the Burnside Council will elaborate on. It is important that current minimum allotment sizes, heights and frontage widths match existing, as any reduction will reduce green space tree canopy and street parking as a consequence. While I appreciate the need to stop urban sprawl, the proposed density and allotment sizes are a retrograde step, particularly at a time when we need to increase green space and tree canopy to adapt to climate change.

### 2. Commercial Centres

The Code places large scale centres in the same zone as small local shops, allowing large scale development and more intensive land uses throughout all these areas. This is inappropriate. A hierarchy of centres should be maintained. Additional zone(s) are needed to cater for the lower intensity local centres, particularly in older established areas. Large commercial centres put small operators out of business and also promote increased use of motor vehicles. Smaller, more local centres and businesses add to the desirability/convenience of an area and can be walked to, thereby decreasing green house gasses.

### 3. Public Notification

The Code should include notification for all development that increases development intensity, including additional dwellings on the site, two storey development, earthworks where new dwelling is located 600mm above ground level, and change of use from residential to non-residential. Not only is it very discourteous not to notify your neighbours of the development, it will also potentially negatively impact on solar panels as they will be shaded. Having invested or planning to invest in solar panels, which help reduce carbon emissions, it is a waste of money and infuriating to have the roof then shaded so that they are or will be useless. This goes directly against the State Governments stated goal of being carbon neutral in the foreseeable future. It does not allow the adjoining properties to plan in a fare and practical manner.

### 4. Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

The State Government's own 30-Year Plan calls for an increase in tree canopy cover, however, the draft Code works directly against this by facilitating larger and denser developments and the subsequent easier removal of trees on both private and public land. This will result in a significant reduction in canopy cover, habitat loss and climate resilience, due the increased infill development opportunities, reduction in minimum site areas, site coverage, setbacks and increased number of street crossovers.

Unless the above issues are addressed and the draft Code is amended to reflect these concerns,

there will be an unacceptable loss of local character and amenity in my neighbourhood.

I trust that the concerns detailed above will be given your full consideration.

Yours sincerely

Pam Dean, TUSMORE

[REDACTED]