

**From:** [Maria Trajkovic](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#) Fw:  
**Subject:** Proposed Planning Reforms Thursday,  
**Date:** 13 February 2020 3:51:42 PM

---

To whom it May Concern

**SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters**

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.

**General Neighbourhood Zone**

The draft Code places some areas (RPA2 & RPA5) of my Payneham Ward, in the General Neighbourhood Zone. The policy in this new zone is entirely at odds with current zone policy and allows for a far greater intensity of development than existing. The current zone focuses on preserving character rather than accommodating change and infill and does not envisage a greater range and intensity of development. I request that you move all residential areas to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone with TNVs to match existing conditions.

**All Existing Residential Areas**

Non-Residential land use: Currently 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 (e.g. office and shop) should be "restricted development". Alternatively, a new zone should be created purely for residential land use.

**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.

**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.

### **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.

### **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.

### **Public Notification**

The Code should reflect the 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.

### **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

Maria Trajkovic