

██████████
Clarence Park
SA 5034



27 January 2020

DPTI
Planning Reform Submissions
GPO Box 1815
Adelaide,
South Australia 5001

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write with regard to the Draft Planning and Design Code for Phase Two and Phase Three.

When I looked at the map on your website for the areas around where I live I was surprised and then became annoyed.

It seems our suburb and the one immediately north, Black Forest, are to become a dumping ground for high rise and smaller blocks with higher density than all surrounding suburbs.

I could go on at some length about the discrepancies between our proposed zoning and our surrounding suburbs, however I ask that the zoning for Clarence Park and Black Forest be homogenized with the surrounding suburbs and be set as "Suburban Neighbourhood Zone".

As I walk around the suburbs on my usual walks, I have noticed that where there are units/houses that are 7.5 metres wide, the garages/carports are not used for cars and the household cars are left in the driveway and when more than one car is owned by the family, the other car is parked in the driveway and overhangs into the footpath or is parked in the street.

With a setback of only five (5) metres from the footpath, there is usually only room for one car in the driveway. With a setback of ten (10) metres, there is room for two normal cars, which is what is required in this day and age and into the future when everyone wants to/has to charge their electric cars at home.

I notice that the frontage for a garage is set at 30 percent of the frontage, which is one reason for the parking problems and I am disturbed at the proposal to increase the percentage to 50 percent.

It seems the real answer would be to leave the percentage at 30 percent or the garage door (access) width to 2.8 metres, whichever is the greater.

This would solve the usage problem of trying to open a car door in a small garage and open up the block to on site car parking and recharging.

It would also stop the property looking like a garage/garages and more like a home.

Reducing the area per dwelling from 350 to 300 square metres in our area also presents other problems.

As there are most of the properties with a 15 metre frontage and deep blocks, if the existing house is to be destroyed and replaced by three units, then parking becomes a problem again on the small block sizes and side access.

Currently the average block size around here allows for the existing bungalow style house to be retained and the rear yard sold off to form a "hammerhead" block with enough space for a new house and parking.

This keeps the integrity of the streetscape whilst doubling the population and not putting too much strain on the existing infrastructure/green space/access roads/etc.

I would suggest keeping the existing 350 square metres per property.

I see that sill heights are planned to be lowered to 1.5 metres from 1.7 metres.

You may as well have no sill height as the majority of adults can see over a 1.5 metre height, so no privacy for next door neighbours.

A lot of people can currently see over a sill height of 1.7 metres.

I would suggest that this height be set at 1.9 metres as the population is getting taller each year, rather than shorter and we need to plan ahead.

Council members have informed me that the population of the area will double over the years without State Government intervention and they are the best placed to oversee this transition and apply the rules to make the environment sustainable.

I would ask you to make the Councils the main driving force and listen to their concerns.

Property Developers are in the business of making money from us and if their job is made easier by having less rules and regulations, then they will push that perspective at other people's cost and certainly not at theirs.

If population expansion can be accommodated within the existing rules and regulations, then changing the existing situation may be more harmful than productive.

I hope the State Government passes the Bill to extend the time of introduction of the proposed Code as it seems very hastily thought out.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'G Pring', written in a cursive style.

Graham Pring