

South Australia Planning, Development and Infrastructure ACT 2016

Representation on Application

First name:

Charlotte

Last name:

Hutchesson

Email: *

Consultation Document Submissions

Part 3 - Overlays > Character Area Overlay

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

Your Feedback

I believe the draft code simplifies and generalises planning policy for individual council areas in a completely negative way. I live in the NPSP council, and it is clear that much detail in the current development plan for historic and character areas will be left out in the new design code. The development rules in the draft design code seem to rely on vague statements which are open to interpretation, as opposed to the current development plan of the council which detailed, accurate and clear. It appears to me that the overlay policies lack detail, and often do not correspond with the character statement.

One specific problem I have is that I own a property in a character area in Stepney. This property was highly desirable to us as under the current NPSP development plan, subdivisions are not allowed. The draft design code makes no mention of this detail in the character statement (it omits any mention of Stepney in its statement on subdivisions in this character area).

I am concerned about building heights in character areas. The 'Local Variation (TNV)' in many character areas of NPSP does not match the character statement. For example, the character statement for NPSPC1 details 'Single storey, with some two storey to the rear of buildings (with single storey appearance to primary street frontage)' but the 'Local Variation' says there is a 2 storey building height limit. Likewise, the character statement for NPSPC5 details single storey buildings, but the Local Variation says there is a 2 storey building height limit. All I want is for development to be sympathetic to the existing streetscape across Adelaide, but especially in character and historic areas.

The character area overlay should reference all performance outcomes to the 'character statement', rather than the 'character area'. I think this will achieve more consistency with the building styles in a character overlay.

At a recent NPSP council meeting, I found this comment on the design code:

“Substantial volumes of detailed and valuable local policy will be lost in the transition to the Code. Mechanisms such as TNVs do not adequately translate local policy, and the loss of desired character statements and concept plans will result in a significant void in local policy context”

These are exactly my concerns, and I strongly hope that local council (my democratic voice) is being listened to.

Part 1 - Rules of Interpretation > Introduction

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

Your Feedback

I oppose the Planning and Design Code and would prefer to retain the current system where individual councils develop their own Development Plan

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

Your Feedback

I believe there needs to be far greater open space and 'greenscaping' surrounding high density living zones (with the exception of properties in the city). I do not believe that developers should be able to contribute to a fund instead of creating open space.

Urban infill and the effect of 'urban heat islands' have been predicted to cause greater temperature rises in cities than climate change. Whether one believes in climate change or not, there can be no doubting the effect of concrete and hard surfaces on the levels of heat in a city.

I believe Adelaide can do better in terms of building design and quality. Good design still contributes to the economy, and in a fortunate society like ours, I think we should expect a lot of developers. Attention should be paid to:

1. Space for gardens and trees
2. Adequate off street parking
3. Area for storage of garbage bins
4. Adequate on street parking for visitors
5. Traffic issues
6. Privacy
7. Buildings that are pleasing to the eye

I accept that Adelaide lacks affordable housing, which is resulting in smaller block sizes. I am concerned though about shrinking backyards. Children need space to run around, and while not everyone wants a big backyard, I worry that there will soon be so much competition for a backyard, that many families will simply not be able to afford to have one. Care needs to be taken that affordable housing doesn't always mean tiny blocks, especially in areas a long way from the CBD.

