

**From:** [Leigh Mortimer](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#); [Hon Steven Marshall](#); [Hon Stephan Knoll](#); [Hon David Pisoni](#); [Jayne Stinson](#)  
**Cc:** [Don Palmer](#); [Jennie Boisvert](#)  
**Subject:** SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S NEW PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE  
**Date:** Tuesday, 28 January 2020 12:46:23 PM

---

Following several meetings with Cr Don Palmer and after attending the recent public forum at the Clarence Park Community Centre we are fully supportive and endorse the following

### **Opening Observations**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code. We live in Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East avenue). Our current zone, under the City of Unley Development Plan RB350 is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. Contradicting the assurances of the Minister and the Commission Chair that our zone would be transitioned into the new zone with little or no change the changes to our zone are significant. So significant, that we suggest the two zones simply are not compatible. The changes are so impactful that they depict the zone in which we live as a zone presenting for complete renewal. Changes that we trust are not intended but which could see our population double in a short period of time.

### **Differences and the Impact of these differences on Black Forest/Clarence Park.**

Not only has the area per dwelling changed from 350m<sup>2</sup> to 300m<sup>2</sup>, (or down to 200m<sup>2</sup> for row housing), setbacks have been drastically changed. The front setbacks have been effectively halved, from the current existing established setback of around 10m (suburban wide) to a mandatory 5m.

New developments will, under this change be predominant in the streetscape. They will impact seriously on the visual amenity of the adjacent neighbours for years to come creating streetscapes of conflict rather than the harmony that exists now.

Side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This is surely in error. Such if included in the final draft will see the current spaciousness of our suburb disappear. Potentially streets could become a series of row housing.

The current zoning does allow a 2 for 1 redevelopment of the average site in Black Forest/Clarence Park. The changes that the draft indicates would allow for most sites a 3 for 1 redevelopment opportunity. In many cases, particularly corner sites, this grows to 4 for 1, or more. We trust the Government/the Commission is not intent on seeing a whole suburb with 3 houses on each property.

Such redevelopment potential will artificially increase the value of most properties in Black Forest/Clarence Park. Affordability, for other than developers, will result as properties that are currently within the reach of the average person, will no longer be affordable.

This results in Black Forest/Clarence Park realistically being not a like for like, but a zone that is seen as a regeneration zone. A zone with a potential to double the population. Doubling the population in an area with a road network and infrastructure that cannot sustain such.

The amount of roofed area is increasing from 50% to 60% of the site area, with private open space reducing from 20% to as little as 8%. This may work in a future Greenfields development where public open space is plentiful.

It does not and cannot however work in an infill environment where public open space is minimal. Particularly in the City of Unley which (at around 2.5%) has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area. This would place pressure on the City of Unley to find more open space, which would be a significantly costly exercise.

Overlooking restrictions have been reduced from 1.7m cill height on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows to 1.5m cill heights. An average height person can see over a cill height of 1.5m with ease, effectively eliminating the effort to minimise overlooking.

Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% will see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

### **Summary**

The General Neighbourhood Zone has no numerical variation overlay.

The Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, on the other hand, does. This zone provides the opportunity for the Commission to reflect the public promises being made to transition zones like for like from the Council Development Plan to the Planning & Design Code.

Our request then is to support the submission prepared by the City of Unley, particularly the observations on their part that the current RB350 zone be transitioned into the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. That, in so doing the current RB350 numerical values be used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay.

### **Council as a preferred driver of Development Policy into the future**

We understand it is the Parliament's intention to remove/restrict what input Councils will have in the future with changes to the Code. Councils (Local Government) are surely best placed to actually be the driver of investigations into future changes. They have the empathy with the amenity of the community that State Government Departments can't have.

This is currently being demonstrated with the City of Unley's in depth analysis of what appears to be a draft Code full of errors and omissions. An analysis without which the new Code potentially would have been so disastrous as to destroy the amenity of the suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular our suburb. Likewise in their leading the Development Plan Amendment in the Life Care, Norman Terrace Precinct.

Their ability to engage with the community in both exercises demonstrates they are far more equipped to conduct community consultation than is the department.

We request in all sincerity therefore that you should respect the role that Councils can and do provide. Please, not only re-include them in the process, but consider allowing them to be the driver of future considerations for change.

### **Finally**

We trust the intention of the Government is not for the RB350 zone to be a regeneration zone, that it was meant to be transitioned like for like. If this is the case then the numerical discrepancies noted in our submission are in error, and not deliberate.

If in error, this may reflect that the Commission is under severe pressure to put this mammoth exercise together in the time frame the parliament has decreed.

We ask the Parliament to provide the Commission with an extension of time to ensure that errors and omissions do not see their way through to actual development. Any resultant and unexpected abhorrent development that might occur as a result of not taking our time to get it right will surely impact on the Government's re-election chances

Leigh and Sandra Mortimer

[REDACTED]

Clarence Park SA 5034

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]