

From: [Paul and Jan Wallace](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions; schubert@parliament.sa.gov.au](#)
Cc: [unley@parliament.sa.gov.au; badcoe@parliament.sa.gov.au](#)
Subject: Fwd: Draft Planning Code Response
Date: Thursday, 20 February 2020 3:43:57 PM
Attachments: [We wish to express our extreme concern at the proposed Draft Planning and Design Code for the following reasons.docx](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

Please find attached our extreme concerns re the proposed Draft Planning Code.

Kind regards

Jan and Paul Wallace

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Janet Wallace <[REDACTED]>
Date: 20 February 2020 at 3:21:32 pm ACDT
To: Paul and Jan Wallace <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Draft Planning Code Response

We wish to express our extreme concern at the proposed Draft Planning and Design Code for the following reasons:

1. Under the existing planning rules, if a house on a suburban block is demolished for redevelopment, the 350 square metre minimum allotment size effectively means a maximum of two dwellings can be built on most allotments.
2. Even under this provision, redevelopment has led to congestion. Our Clarence Park and Black Forest streets are simply not wide enough to cope with the resultant increase in on-street parking. A case in point is Margaret St which is frequently impassable because of cars parked on both sides of the road as a consequence of three two-storey townhouses having been built on the previous site of one home.
3. Under the Draft Code, Clarence Park and Black Forest have been designated a General Neighbourhood. These are the only two suburbs in the entire area NOT designated as Suburban Neighbourhoods. We sincerely hope this is an oversight, not an intention!
4. The impact of Clarence Park and Black Forest being designated as General Neighbourhood is that even higher density redevelopment will be possible than with the existing rules which are already proving untenable (see point 2).
5. Character homes previously not economically viable for purchase and demolition under the "350 sq m" rule will now be vulnerable for redevelopment because of the potential to build 3, 4 or 5 properties on the site. An example is a large corner block on East Ave which has received planning permission for the construction of 3 homes.
 - a. However, under the proposed Code, it is likely that 5 new 'homes' could be built there and neither local residents or the Council would be able to object because it be possible under the ill-defined provisions of General Neighbourhood.
 - b. A large number of homes in these two suburbs are attractive single storey villas built between 1920 and 1950. They are character homes with an attractive street-scape, at odds with the two-storey grey boxes which seem to be typical of the new builds. Apart from the traffic issues there are also concerns re loss of amenity and blocking of solar panels by overshadowing buildings.
6. Please note that we are not opposed to development per se. We live in a single storey detached property built in 2006 on a 380 sq m block. We have a double garage and off-street parking for two additional cars. We have only one car. We have the same offsets as the other houses in the street and the exterior colour of our house is sympathetic to the surrounding properties. Sadly, under the Draft Code almost none of the protections involved in the approval when our house was built would be available.

A simple solution for our neighbourhood is to designate us as a Suburban Neighbourhood, just like all the surrounding suburbs. There may still be some issues for us but it will help us to preserve the area which we are very pleased to call home.