

Planning Reform

DPTI

I am an advocate of change and embrace some changes with gusto.

For example I am

- a backer of variations to shopping hours
- a whole-hearted supporter for the scramble crossing at the junction of George St and The Parade
- an enthusiast for the Space Industry and the development of Lot 14.
- enjoying the varying Adelaide skyline with the construction of CBD-centric buildings

I relate to friends and colleagues – both here and elsewhere – exemplars of the vibrancy and changes that typify Norwood and in a wider sense, my State.

I am against

- establishing a helipad atop the Peregrine Corporation Building
- the amendments to the Planning Code.

Both the issue of a helipad and the ‘abbreviating’ of the Planning Code appear to be a diminishing of engagement by the people, for the people!

As a society are we modelling that power is good and ultimate power is the ultimate good?

What are the consequences of this thinking for future generations?

Tragically, there seems an absence of longer-term thinking here.

Altering Planning under the pretence of ‘reform’ is to

- aid bureaucratic expediency
- to facilitate convenience for Developers
- to deny opportunities for community responses
- promote the economic as opposed to any social benefit

All of these “reforms” centralize power and control and are tools to assist subservience or to limit awareness and communication. The “quiet” Australians of which our Prime Minister spoke, are just that - “quiet” - they are *silent* because they are unaware (simply because they are denied access to information) ... or overwhelmed by complex administrative and regulatory systems.

This is *not* leadership in any true democratic governmental sense; rather it is control by a small group for their own purposes, namely an allegiance to generating jobs and to spawning business.

~ **The helipad atop the proposed new headquarters of Peregrine Corporation is an indulgence** by a very few under the guise of invigorating business.

It is as a consequence, detrimental to the vast majority and poses a significant safety risk given schools, residences, businesses, a service station, a swim centre and a major intersection in the immediate vicinity!

I attended a Community Consultation (18/2/2020) at The Norwood Town Hall that was anything but a consultation! In reality it was a ‘show-an’-tell’ as to the wonders of Peregrine and as such, merely a PR exercise. It allayed no misconceptions, clarified no major issues, and certainly did not gain any sort of positive traction with the audience.

One could have easily walked away from this particular meeting with a strong sense that this ‘consultation’ was a sham and in reality a ‘box-ticking’ activity for Peregrine or DPTI, with a decision to allow Peregrine to establish the helipad already made!

~ Similarly, the streamlining of the Planning Codes could seem to be a PR exercise with the decision to assist bureaucratic efficiency and pander to business interests rather than actually benefit communities by erecting additional dwellings and larger scale buildings. Such reshuffling divests power and influence from a broader group and invests it in one arena – and at the same time opens the door to possible exploitation.

I seek answers to the following:-

a) Have all existing Council Development Plans been replaced by an overarching 'one size fits all' approach across the entire state?

b) if a) is correct then are we removing an aspect of choice or the "idiosyncrasies" of locale and simply spreading mediocrity more evenly ("little houses all looking the same" syndrome)?

c) Is the direct consequence of b) above that elected Local Councils have minimal or no control over planning and development within their Council Districts?

(i) is the Planning "reform" heralding a quest to extinguish Local Government?

d) is a direct consequence of b) that our democratic engagement is being eroded?

e) As a resident do I have *any* Right of Appeal ... or obligatory notification by a builder (other than a site notice) ... for a development next door/adjacent to my home/in my neighbourhood?

f) Will developers be more at liberty to demolish Historic (as opposed to merely 'old') constructions?

g) What are the perceived positives/negatives of greater building heights on main roads and major traffic and freight corridors?

h) If there is loss of subdivision controls by Local Councils in Residential Character Zones - to support higher density dwellings – will infrastructure be enhanced accordingly? (e.g. if 40 people live in a single high rise where previously only a single story home with 4 residents lived, will sewage and gas lines be upgraded?)

i) How was the figure of 8% of a site re trees/vegetation/open-space arrived at?

j) I am a resident with a 7m wall on my immediate rear boundary. There exists an "overlooking-factor" and growing concern re noise from an air-conditioner. During construction (2 years ago) my avenues to control these were limited... will the new Code eliminate them altogether?

k) Am I correct in understanding shops/businesses can be built in areas other than centralized commercial areas (e.g. The Parade, Rundle Mall, Firlie Shopping Complex... and sites may include across the street from me or next to my home?

I hope you can respond to my disquiet at these so-called "reforms".

Sincerely

Colin

To Whom it May Concern

SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3

* I find it somewhat disconcerting that I am forwarding this to someone anonymous. Anonymity can be used as a shield or a blanket. When responses are supplied by members of the community in good faith - would it be feasible to have a name to respond to?

Should a community perceive it is not being heard or subject to cynical tokenism, then all society AND democracy starts to shrivel.

I wish to have questions below clarified.

General Neighbourhood Zone & Housing Diversity Zone

* *Am I correct reading the new Zone Codes conflict with the existing Zone Codes?*

~ The draft Code places some areas in the General Neighbourhood Zone and others in the Housing Diversity Zone.

~ The policy in these new Code Zones is different to current zone policy.

* *Is it correct to understand that as a direct result of this difference, a greater intensity of Development than that which currently exists, will occur?*

~ The current zones focus on preserving Character rather than providing for greater Urban Infill, in keeping with the understandings of current residents and property-owners.

* *Recognizing change is inevitable (and that Developers ARE strong proponents), is it community divisive to alter conditions that may well be absolutely at odds with existing conditions?*

Existing Residential Areas

~ Within NPSP Council's Residential Zones, shops, offices and educational establishments are non-compliant and so not present.

* *Am I correct in understanding the new Code for existing residential areas will permit non-residential use?*

* *What are the ramifications for traffic flow, parking, noise, neighbourhood Amenity and the Character of my suburb and surrounding suburbs?*

~ Under the Code, building setbacks from side and rear boundaries will noticeably decrease, particularly when the new Development is, as most will be, multi-storey.

* *What safeguards do I, as a resident of Norwood have that my suburb's Amenity and privacy will not be compromised?*

* *What was defective with the current set-back and floor-area criteria throughout all our residential areas?*

* *Why don't the current density and allotment Sizes for minimum allotment sizes, heights and frontage widths match the new Planning?*

Commerce Centres

* *The new Code seemingly installs large scale shopping centres in the same zone as small local shops ... correct?*

* *Does this amendment regarding Commercial Centres allow for large scale Development and more intensive land use?*

** Does DPTI have any concerns that long-established residential areas will now be compromised by commercial enterprises?*

** Does DPTI concede that such commercial developments will be 'socially poor planning' - as communities will now be enmeshed in a conglomeration of different-purpose buildings (with differing trading hours?)?*

** Could I have a shop next door?*

Notification Protocols

**Should neighbours and those residents close-by - as contributing members of a community - be informed as to a Development?*

~ The Code in NOSP as I understand it currently respects notification of neighbours and the public.

** Why doesn't The new Code continue this established protocol of notification for all Developments that increase trades' intensity, additional dwellings on a site, multi-storey Development, earthworks where build-up or digging below current surface and change of use from residential to non-residential?*

Infrastructure & Essential Services

Does the intensity of Development to be facilitated through the new Code place existing local infrastructure under duress?

~ additional residents in higher density dwellings will stress water/sewage/power/gas supplies/removal of stormwater/street-side parking/diminish the tree canopy/possibly create more vehicular congestion/strain emergency services (speed of attendance at accident sites, fires etc) particularly in our older established areas.

Does the proposed creation of a helicopter landing pad atop the large Development at the junction of Portrush Rd and The Parade ... the sole such helipad in Australia ... compromise any of the new Code?

... compromise safety for residents, traffic, pedestrians (not least school students)?

Tree Canopy and Climate Concerns

~ The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide calls for increased tree canopy cover.

** If the new Code works directly against this by enabling larger developments and the increased removal of trees on both private and public land could people in the local and wider community perceive this as either governmental hypocrisy or merely an opportunistic move by Developers?*

** Would DPTI say significant reduction in canopy cover, increased infill Development, reduction in minimum site areas, more site coverage and reduced setback is in line with current climate concerns within the global community?*

My current response is that the amended Plans are not in my – or my communities' – best interests.

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

Yours sincerely

Colin