

From: [Harold Gallasch](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)
Subject: re planning reform
Date: Thursday, 27 February 2020 2:04:03 PM

[REDACTED]
Hahndorf, 5245
South Australia

[REDACTED]
25th February 2020

State Planning Commission

To Whom It May Concern,

The 'Planning and Design Code' is essentially a development document.

Heritage needs be considered under 'Heritage legislation'. Heritage can be of local, state, national or international importance and is very often closely linked to tourism at all these levels. Its economic value to the community can be very great, often far greater than that of any short term gains from new development.

The various overlays to the 'CODE' relating to heritage and character do not satisfy the basic requirements of the community –

- viz a) transparency
- b) community input
- c) an independent elected board
- d) an appeal process

If an item is identified under one of the Heritage / character overlays it needs be considered under 'Heritage Legislation'.

The 'Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1988' sets out a format which would be quite adequate for all heritage.

- viz a) Transparency at all levels
- b) registration of items
- c) the owner to care for the item
- d) any proposed change to be considered – by elected board, inclusive of community, etc.

This is already enacted for Aboriginal heritage. There should be no discrimination or racial bias.

Under the proposed CODE, while there may be opportunity for some heritage appraisal by 'heritage architects', this is not transparent to the community nor does it take into account the aspirations and identity of the community in which the 'item' is situated.

The record of heritage architects of the Heritage Department, in providing appropriate advice and protection for our elderly building, is not good. By their own admission, buildings are considered on a piece-meal basis, out of their context, with no overall plan for heritage areas. They have made many mistakes. In brief, they are unable to provide what the community demands – consideration of all factors, community negotiation and real protection.

In most of Europe and North America, heritage guidelines require the public notification of any proposed charge to a heritage building.

This has ensured the continued integrity of the heritage with consequent huge tourism benefits.

While there may be appearance of consistency in the planning CODE this would come at a great cost of the loss of a community's identity.

Most townships, even suburban enclaves, greatly value their identity, their past, what they are now, and their individual aspirations for the future. One plan, one CODE, does not fit all, cannot fit all !!

Health professionals advise of the importance of community, of a sense of belonging, for peoples of all ages.

The proposed CODE, with its lack of transparency, will disenfranchise communities from determining their future, both in forward planning and in keeping what they value from the past.

Harold E. Gallasch