

**From:** [Kirsten Potoczky \(Walking SA\)](#)  
**To:** [DIT:ODASA Consultation](#)  
**Cc:** [Tuesday Udell](#); [Heath Edwards](#); [McCormack, Brad \(DIT\)](#)  
**Subject:** Local Design Review Scheme Consultation  
**Date:** Friday, 4 September 2020 4:17:54 PM  
**Attachments:** [pastedImagebase640.png](#)  
[HF\\_Logo Master\\_RGB \(1\).jpg](#)

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Overall the Active Living Coalition and the Heart Foundation welcome the potential design review of individual buildings. As the policy is written it appears that participation is entirely voluntary and it is not 100% clear what benefits may be to a developers - will it hasten faster approvals if they have taken Design Panel advice? Also it is not clear to us why advice would only have to be provided to the assessing Council if there has been 2 or more sessions with a review panel?

### **Individual buildings**

Our hope is that more significant individual buildings - even under \$10 million value - may voluntarily undergo design review assessment.

Individual buildings can support or hinder users from active choices both internally and external to the building. We are pleased to see that design review will be guided by the Principles of Good Design (p5) which currently include a commitment to inclusivity, and health and wellbeing. Support for health and wellbeing through active choices is important; because our current population activity levels are not enough to support good health; costing individuals and taxpayers both financially and in quality of life.

Evidence shows that clever building design can promote incidental physical activity – one of the key ways of increasing overall activity levels. Individual buildings also contribute to the general walking and cycling environment for the broader population using that area - influencing decisions to use active travel for journeys. Convenient access to public transport and safe streetscapes are all ways of encouraging more physical activity.

To support physical activity, building users need:

- Provision of secure cycle parking, and end of trip facilities
- option of stair use being pleasant safe and comfortable
- appropriate doorway widths and places to sit and rest

Broader contribution at street level:

- Transparency at ground level of facades and appropriate lighting both promote Crime Prevention through environmental design
- Shelter from wind/sun/rain for footpath users and people waiting for public

transport.

The Coalition and the Heart Foundation note that a number of the above measures were proposed in the draft Planning and Design Code; although we are yet to see the final version of the Code to see if they have been retained.

We would like to see a stronger focus in the principles to support active living; as being included in sustainability, although relevant, can be problematic. Sustainability in buildings can be focused on energy use/emissions/water and health and wellbeing in building design can also include thermal comfort, air quality, lighting, spatial layout, access to nature, views and daylight, colour, and noise control.

We note that in the current Green Star credits system for building design; promoting active travel and mobility within buildings sits under both liveability and as part of sustainability (as active transport).

For these reasons we would suggest the principle be amended to specifically include active living or transport:

*Good design is sustainable because it is environmentally responsible and supports long-term economic productivity, active transport, health and wellbeing.* Otherwise can active transport or active living be included elsewhere?

The ideal outcome is that future buildings will make an active choice the easy, convenient, pleasant choice for all ages and abilities.

For more information please see <https://www.healthyactivebydesign.com.au/design-features/buildings>

### **Infill**

It appears from the consultation document that the design review process could possibly be applied to infill development IF a developer chooses to undergo a design review process.

The Coalition and the Heart Foundation have concerns around current standards for ad-hoc infill. Notable issues with many current infill projects include: lack of footpaths, lack of soft surface and greening, increase in concrete driveway coverage driving an increase urban heat and runoff, lack of biodiversity, increase in on-street parking and lack of contribution to streetscape all which detracts from active transport and quality of life.

Our hope is that design review process can support densification which delivers benefits of density with less impact on surrounding urban areas. A design review process may be able to ensure co-operation between local government and developers to ensure streetscapes are re-installed or improved as part of urban infill projects.