

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2022

Attention: Expert Panel,  
GPO Box 1815,  
Adelaide SA 5001

Dear Expert Panel Members,

Re : SUBMISSION re The current Expert Review Committee of the PDI Act of 2016 (as amended) Regulations, the Planning & Design Code and attendant documents.

I am pleased an independent panel of planning experts has been appointed by Minister Champion to conduct a review of reforms to the state-wide planning system, including the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, the Planning and Design Code and associated Practise Guideline documents. The intent, as promised by Premier Malinauskas, is for the independent Expert Panel to consider relevant information, listen to submissions and to assist him in improving many public concerns around the current system. We shall look forward to a positive and ethical outcome.

As a former member of the Adelaide City Council and a resident of North Adelaide for 46 years with a strong commitment to Adelaide and its heritage and to the democratic involvement of the community in planning decisions here are matters listed below, I wish to see considered and improved on positively for the benefit of our society.

The Design Code lacks direction and provides no certainty for participants in terms of policy content. Very few clear standards are based on clear and distinctive polices. Planning is crucial at a community and local level. Clarity needs to be brought back at least to the standards prior to changes made during the Rau period, if not better.

It is essential the current marginalisation of local government strategic planning be elevated and included into state policy.

It is critical that the massive transfer of non-complying developments to performance assessed processes, for evaluation 'on merit', with an absence of clear standards in the Code be reviewed.

A minor number of non-complying development proposals transitioned to 'restricted' developments further restrict third party appeal processes by limited notification to adjoining owners. Wider notification for restricted developments should be more widely notified and assessed under clearer limitations of height within the Code.

I believe that it is vital to reinstate notification for developments of significant impact beyond the 60 m notification area, when proposed heights, activity, parking etc of third party appeal rights adversely impact locality character and patterns of movement and relevant considerations of impacts on the natural environment, its biodiversity, natural and cultural heritage.

I am very aware of the public concerns over several current developments approved and legislation that now substantially reduces third party appeal rights. Third party appeal rights have been substantially reduced, exacerbating the lack of the democratic right to challenge decisions of adverse consequences to persons, property, and environmental and cultural amenity. This right should be reviewed and reinstated

The Review should provide clear standards of height. Tall is not necessarily the best answer for good living.

I want to see the removal of scattered Catalyst Sites within the City of Adelaide. There is no evidence of their contribution to the social well-being of people or to the economic benefits to the public realm. Catalyst Sites should not be within the residential areas of the City – SE and SW of the City and North Adelaide; they are totally inappropriate to the cultural and historical aspects of this area.

I wish to see the Review of the Code take into consideration the Heeding the Heart Foundation's research into the impact upon public physical and mental health of how our cities, settlements, and rural areas as they are being developed and lived in. This is so important, in relation to the population's need for healthy living by prioritising access to open space, physical activity and public transport as a part of state rezoning. No buildings on parklands.

Another great concern is the issues of parkland and tree canopy. Of real concern is the fact that state government departments are not leading by example about the retention of tree canopy. I totally support the moves by SPC to improve policy in this area and as advocated by Conservation SA in its submission on the topic. It is suggested all trees, including historic plantings of introduced species, should be examined for their capacity to produce shade and shelter, and be protected from unnecessary destruction. The Review should address this urgently.

I would also wish to see the Review promote a progressive response to ensure sustainable development, planning needs to establish consistent standards of design and future proofing of infrastructure systems to manage the increasing number of extreme weather and bushfire events associated to **Climate Change**.

More widely and most importantly I wish to inform you that I fully support the following submissions that are based on research, experience and/or based on wider consultation of those who are unable to be heard and/or do not have the time to dwell deeply into this important topic:

- The Local Government Association's detailed submission on the basis that it represents all local councils in the state and makes a number of recommendations based on consultation with members, workshops, research and experience of using the current system.
- The well-researched and well-informed submission by the WACRA, a 50 year old coastal resident association, and those by coastal members of the Community Alliance SA Inc.
- The Community Alliance SA Inc. who represent 36 resident action groups and individual residents and who have endeavoured to consult with members in a pro-active manner.
- The Conservation Council of SA Inc, and Conservation SA.

It is my hope that the outcome of this review will be ethical and of benefit to society now and into the future.

Yours Sincerely,

Léonie M Ebert BSc., M.Ed.Admin



