

**From:** [Meredith Kaesehagen](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Draft Development Code  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 9:06:13 PM  
**Attachments:** [State Planning Code.docx](#)

---

Attached are my concerns re the proposed new Code.

I am especially concerned that the 28 February 2020 deadline for community feedback on the code of 3000 pages has been unrealistic for most people.

I attended an information session at The hub, Glenunga in December 2019, and left substantially unenlightened.

Many, if not most, people to whom I have spoken are unaware of the proposed Code, so legitimate consultation has not been possible.

I am most alarmed at the potential for unrestrained urban infill and high rise development in metropolitan residential areas.

Dr Meredith Kaesehagen

[REDACTED]

St Peters SA 5069

Ph [REDACTED] mob [REDACTED]

State Planning Commission

By email: [DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au)

To Whom it May Concern

### **SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3**

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 many 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.

#### 2. Historic Area Overlay

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.

Demolition controls have been weakened in the draft Code, despite promises to the contrary. The introduction of economic viability tests is new. As is the test for being able to contribute to the streetscape. The vague language in the Code and practice guidelines opens it all up for interpretation. It begs the question, can a historic building, which was previously a contributory item, be demolished because a fence blocks the view from the street and therefore can't contribute to the streetscape? And a building be demolished because the owner can't afford to repair the veranda?

#### 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 Norwood Payneham & St Peters 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.

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.

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

Yours sincerely

Dr Meredith Kaesehagen

██████████

St Peters SA 5069