

State Planning Commission

By email: [DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au)

To Whom It May Concern

## **SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 (City of St Peters, Kensington and Norwood )**

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. General Neighbourhood Zone

The draft Code places some areas (RPA2 & RPA3) of my Kensington Gardens & Magill Ward, in the General Neighbourhood Zone. The proposed policy allows for a far greater intensity of development than existing with long term negative impacts on those who live or travel through this area.. The current zone focuses on preserving character and does not support a greater range and intensity of development. I request that you move all residential areas to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone with TNVs to match existing conditions.

### 2. All Existing Residential Areas

- a) Non-Residential land use: In the new Code existing residential areas will allow 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 proposed Code, building setbacks from side and rear boundaries will noticeably decrease, particularly at upper levels. This is unacceptable and will severely impact amenity 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. It is important that current minimum allotment sizes, heights and frontage widths match our existing code.

With higher density living we have already seen increased traffic throughout the suburbs, inadequate parking allocations in the new developments (given that many homes now have more than one vehicle) and many cars are now parked, out of working hours, in streets which, in many cases, cannot accommodate heavy parking use and still allow for normal traffic use. There is virtually no parking space for business, social or family visitors. Most significantly there have been difficulties for a normal sedan to travel through a side street during the evening – it is terrible to imagine what would happen if an **emergency vehicle** needs to get to a property on one of these streets at such a time. One wonders who would be responsible or liable for any ensuing loss of life or property!

### 3. Historic Area Overlay

The lack of identification of Contributory Items in the Code, by either a map or list of addresses, will create uncertainty and confusion for owners, prospective buyers, neighbours and developers. Existing protections and identification of Contributory Items should be maintained. Particularly with regard to ongoing contribution to the culture, as well as economic value of these items, to the area and its residents.

### 4. 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.

#### 5. Public Notification

The Code should reflect the City of Burnside's current Development Plan policy with respect to the notification of neighbours and the public. 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. Residents should have some say in the use of development of land which impacts upon their enjoyment, as well as economic value, of their property which would have been in mind when the property was purchased. When purchasing a property many factors are considered and among them are the aesthetic, historical and environmental considerations. If a development is to impact upon any of these, an existing resident should have a greater say than a developer who only has his/her own financial gain to consider!

#### 6. Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

The 30-Year Plan calls for an increase in tree canopy cover, however, the draft Code works directly against this by facilitating larger developments and the 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.

There is no doubt about the value of trees – economically, aesthetically and environmentally. The impact of loss of trees will have a detrimental impact upon all those who live in these areas – people but also native animals, bees and birds. There is no shortage of evidence to show that the environment we live in has a strong impact upon our physiological as well as psychological health. Greater density of housing, reduction in trees and gardens, reduction in places where young children can safely play under parental supervision (away from computers and other technology) can only have a harmful effect on those who live in these places.

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

Ida Baranow