

To Whom it May Concern

SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 (City of Burnside)

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. All Existing Residential Areas

- a) Non-Residential land use: Currently in the City of Burnside's residential areas, shops, offices and educational establishments are non-complying. In the new Code existing residential areas will allow these 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 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 existing.

Many subdivided blocks now contain small houses with even smaller garages that owners fear driving into. As a consequence they park on the street – often with multiple cars. This effects neighbour's visibility when reversing, increases street noise and reduces street amenity.

2. Historic Area Overlay

It is essential to the character of Adelaide and residential areas that properties of architectural value be protected. There should also be penalties for developers who let homes of significant heritage worth be degraded and vandalized with the aim to clear the block for subdivision/development (eg Osmond Tce Norwood).

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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

It seems as though density stats for international cities has been used as a guide for Adelaide – one of the hottest cities worldwide. We know the heat is increasing with climate change. We know a leafy back yard provides a cooling mechanism with benefits for the wider community. We can't rely on just street trees or the odd park to help reduce the heat in Adelaide (increased by concrete structures). More than ever we need large trees in backyards – not more subdivision resulting in tiny paved courtyards.

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, and the wider community.

I hope that the concerns detailed above will be given your full consideration.

Yours sincerely

Jen Light


TOORAK GARDENS 5065