

28 February 2020

Reference: 0062-01

Attention: State Planning Commission

By Email: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au

DRAFT PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE – PHASE 3 (URBAN CODE)

CONSULTATION SUBMISSION

We act for Land Vision Group and Platinum Property Retirement Pty Ltd in respect of their site at 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich.

We express our concern regarding the proposed introduction of a Suburban Business and Innovation Zone over the subject land and believe that the strip of land along Greenhill Road from Fullarton Road to Kitchener Avenue should be zoned Urban Corridor (Boulevard) Zone (as occurs elsewhere along Greenhill and Fullarton Roads in close proximity to the subject site). This zone better reflects the intended mix of residential, retail and commercial land uses and the scale of development befitting its grand boulevard location.

The subject property is located in an area that was identified for height and density uplift as part of the original Inner Rim DPA released in 2012 and ultimately authorised in October 2013.

The rezoning proposed for this section of Greenhill Road at the time of the DPA's public exhibition allowed for apartment development of up to 10 storeys. As a result of representations made by local residents at the time of exhibition, the development potential of this area was reduced to only 2 storeys and limited to buildings of 250m² in area, reflecting the original Local Business Zone in this locality and effectively eliminating the incentive for redevelopment proposed by the original DPA. Council also introduced a Mixed Use and Activity Centres DPA which proposed an uplift to the locality (to 4 storeys), which was not progressed to authorisation.

We believe that this strip of properties along Greenhill Road should be reconsidered as an area for higher density and height development for a number of reasons, including:

- Its proximity to the Glenside Redevelopment. The subject area is directly across the road from the Glenside Redevelopment now being delivered by Cedar Woods. This development is expected to comprise multi-storey buildings, with the north western corner of the site (immediately opposite the subject land) having the greatest propensity for height due to its location away from existing one and two storey residences along the eastern boundary of the Glenside site and away from the heritage buildings in the centre of the site. The subject strip of land could represent a transition from the higher building environment by providing, say, up to 6-8 storey development;
- Its proximity to the CBD, bus routes, the Parklands and the consequential desirability for higher density apartment development (and its inherent conformity with the ideals of the Inner Rim DPA and the Inner and Middle Metropolitan Corridor Infill Amendment);

- Its existing occupation by commercial land uses and, therefore, not representing an intrusion into an established residential community;
- Its ability to deal with interface issues with existing residential development to the north through the application of a building envelope which prescribes a 45 degree plane measured from a height of 3 metres above natural ground level at the allotment boundary with a residential allotment (as prescribed by DTS 3.2 in the currently proposed zone.)
- It is noted that the land in question is located to the south of the existing residential area of Dulwich and, accordingly, is ideally situated so as not to overshadow those residential properties, while is bounded by a 35m wide road reserve (Greenhill Road) to the south, over which overshadowing is irrelevant.

In the event that the zone is not amended to Urban Corridor (Boulevard) Zone, we would seek increased clarity regarding the application of polices relevant to a Performance Assessed proposal to the exclusion of Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) or Designated Performance Feature (DPF) policies. We are most concerned that the relevant planning authority will be encouraged to apply to the current 2 storey limit when, in fact, a Performance Assessed proposal is not intended to be limited to 2 storeys.

Specifically, we would recommend the following:

- Introduce greater clarity with respect to Performance Assessed proposals by:
 - » Removing the DTS from the Assessment Provisions and insert them into Table 2 (similarly to the way Classification Criteria are used in Table 1);
 - » Delete DPF from the Assessment Provisions and Procedural Matters such that performance assessed development is on its merits; and
 - » With the removal of DTF altogether, remove the last paragraph under “Rules of Interpretation: Policies – Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes” and replace it with the following: “Performance outcomes do not need to meet a DTS. A DTS represents only one way a PO might be met”.

We would be pleased to be heard in respect of this matter.

Yours sincerely



Stephen Holmes
Director