

COMPLETE

Collector: Web_Link_Prod (Web Link)
Started: Friday, February 28, 2020 9:20:38 AM
Last Modified: Friday, February 28, 2020 9:57:09 AM
Time Spent: 00:36:30
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q1 Which part of the Planning and Design Code would you like to make a submission about?(Please click the circle to select which part of the Code you wish to comment on. You can also see which council areas are included in the rural and urban code via the links below.)

My submission relates to Statewide code

Page 2: Planning and Design Code for South AustraliaPersonal Details

Q2 Please provide your contact details below (Name, Postcode & Email are mandatory)Please be advised that your submission will be made publicly available on the SA Planning Portal.

Name **Steve Evans**
Address [REDACTED]
Suburbs/Town **CRAIGBURN FARM**
State **SA**
Postcode **5051**
Country **Australia**
Email Address [REDACTED]

Page 3: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q3 Which sector do you associate yourself with?

General Public

Page 4: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q4 Would you like to make comment on

General comments

Page 5: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q5 Enter your feedback for Rules of Interpretation

Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Enter your feedback for Referrals

Respondent skipped this question

Q7 Enter your feedback for Mapping

Respondent skipped this question

Q8 Enter your feedback for Table of Amendments

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q9 Please enter your feedback for overlaysclick next at the bottom of the page for next topic

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q10 Please enter your feedback for zones and subzonesclick next at the bottom of the page for next topic

Respondent skipped this question

Page 8: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q11 Please enter your feedback for general policyclick next at the bottom of the page for next topic

Respondent skipped this question

Page 9: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q12 Please enter your feedback for Land use Definitionclick next at the bottom of the page for next topic

Respondent skipped this question

Page 10: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q13 Please enter your feedback for Admin Definitionsclick next at the bottom of the page for next topic

Respondent skipped this question

Page 11: Planning and Design Code for South Australia

Q14 Please enter your general feedback here

28th February 2020

State Planning Commission,

Dept. of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure,

Government of South Australia.

Email: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au

SA Planning Code - Community Driven not Builder and Profit Driven Development

My submission to the planning code is based on close observation over 20 years and my personal experience of the negative outcomes of unbridled profiteering by builders. In the last few years I have seen problems in the Port Noarlunga area in particular and will mainly address those but would emphasise that similar issues arise elsewhere.

History of Profit Driven Over-Development in Port Noarlunga.

Port Noarlunga was a small, characterful township with access to the Great Southern Reef Marine Sanctuary. Uncontrolled levels of profit-driven building has created a chaotic influx of poor quality, too densely placed buildings; traffic jams; destruction of characterful historical houses and buildings; destruction of established gardens; forced closure of small businesses such as Cody's Café (a business that employed over 6 staff and was a significant nexus of community gathering); spill-over street parking that limits access to emergency services and pedestrians; unsafe footpath use by tradesmen working on houses, forcing residents to walk on roads; plus, increased littering and run-off into the Marine Park and Estuary. Similar problems are plaguing Aldinga, Christies Beach, Moana, etc.

I have contacted the council on these issues and consulted Katrine Hildyard, Member for Reynell, with no measurable improvement.

This situation cannot simply be called 'development' but profiteering without check or leadership from Council or State Government. Most of the builders profiting from their building activity in this area do not live here and they make no real investment in our community.

My submission covers several key areas.

1.) Community Driven not a Builders' Bulldozer Bonanza: development must be driven by the community and benefit the community not only the pocket of the builder, as is the current unbalanced situation in our suburbs.

Action Required: The Planning Code must have tight community benefit laws and policies that balance the Building Businesses' hunger for profit with community and environmental benefit. These laws should allow time for Community Consultation and approval of building plans and right of reply for Council or State Government plans.

State Govt. versus Local Council Approvals: 'Ping Pong Planning Approval Practice'

Builders and individuals must not be allowed to by-pass council to get an approval from State Government where a local council has objected to the plan on reasonable grounds. This is the current practice in Port Noarlunga and the result is multi-story buildings the community does not want and which destroy character and public amenity.

2.) Transparency of Building Plans and Time for Community Consultation: proposed residential and commercial building plans must be easily accessible on government Internet sites and published in local newspapers, well ahead of the start of build, allowing opportunity for community consultation.

Action Required: the code must mandate accessible, timely advice to residents on proposed residential and commercial buildings and embed residents' right of reply in policies.

3.) Quarantine Green Space in Urban Areas – Mandated to Benefit Community Mental Health:

a. Scientific evidence shows a clear relationship between urban green space and community mental health. There are multiple references, one is provided below:

Reference: Associate Professor Marco Amati RMIT, <https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/lifematters/how-to-increase-the-green-in-our-urban-spaces/11157184>

Consultation Submission Form

green in our urban spaces/1107107

b. No green space allocation has been made by Onkaparinga council for the Port Noarlunga area in the last 10 years, bar the Anderson Avenue Park that was forced on the council by the South Coast Forum: a community action group.

Action Required: Quarantine large areas of quality land for green space, parks etc. This must be mandatory in council and state planning.

There should be a scientifically based ratio of quarantined natural space and green space built into all urban development and policed through planning departments.

4.) Environmentally Sustainable Development Supporting Pollinating Birds and Bees and Permeable Surfaces in residential and commercial building sites.

Virtually all non-owner builder houses and commercial buildings have had established gardens removed and entire blocks cemented. This is environmentally damaging.

Damage caused includes:

- a. Increased run-off into the Marine Sanctuary because rain cannot soak into the ground.
- b. Decreased pollination by birds and bees due to fewer flowering shrubs and trees.

Action Required:

Retention of Established Gardens: Builders must be obliged to retain established trees and gardens and not cover all or most of an entire block in cement or the building footprint as is the current practice. A good architect and building plan can accommodate this. Mandating and Increasing the area of Permeable Surfaces on housing and building sites to improve run-off and greening of urban areas.

Rejecting subsequent applications by homeowners and builders to cement over gardens and land, as this is a 'cement by stealth' approach that worsens the permeable surface situation.

Budgeting by councils and State Government for staff to monitor and audit builders for permeable surface and garden retention.

Rejection of building plans where established garden and permeable surface coverage is environmentally damaging.

Quarantine large areas of quality land for green space, parks etc.

5.) Parking in streets: spill over parking due to Poor Garaging Design: Inadequate garaging in housing plans pushes cars onto streets. Buildings and planners must be obliged to plan and build appropriate garaging, not the current tiny toy-sized garages. There is often minimal distance between a garage door and the front boundary, resulting in cars being parked across verges or footpaths.

Action Required: Councils and State Government must reject housing plans that deliberately minimise garaging in order to create the illusion of a larger house that is more marketable and produces greater profit for the builder. This imposes an externality on the community, reducing safety.

6.) Retention of Historical Character of a Suburb

Places such as Port Noarlunga and Willunga are historically significant townships. Many heritage style houses and buildings have been summarily demolished without consultation of the community.

Other buildings, multi-story commercial and residential that are clearly out of character of the area have been approved by the State Government. This dilutes the character and community cohesion of a township. Many people voice their disappointment and dismay at the speed and destruction occurring in our locality.

Currently in Port Noarlunga, historical buildings will be destroyed to make way for multi-story commercial enterprises. The plans are not easily accessible and the community is not properly consulted.

Action Required: Councils, State Government, Builders and individuals must make plans known to the community well ahead of start dates, particularly where the proposed new building conflicts with historical character of a township.

Community consultation prior to destruction of older, historical buildings and houses.

Housing and building plans to be carefully assessed for architectural and design sympathy for existing houses and other buildings, with rejections of poorly designed or ubiquitous, cheaply designed projects.

Ample time and a right of reply from the community must be part of this process.

Consultation Submission Form

7.) Over Densification and Over Population in Suburbs that border Natural Assets. – e.g. Port Noarlunga, Aldinga, etc. Urban density is not appropriate for nature sanctuaries in this area, which is part of the Fleurieu Peninsula. It should be limited to suburbs closer to the city.

The current over-densification of residential building, 3 or 4 x 250m² blocks close to a Marine Sanctuary, including the proliferation of inappropriate business activity, has resulted in overpopulation of this area.

Current damaging issues are:

- a. Unpoliced and unsafe use of a proliferation of Jet Skis and Boats within the sanctuary – posing a threat to human and marine life
- b. Littering of broken glass and plastics and plastic straws from new businesses such as Copenhagen Icecream and Hortas Beach Bar.
- c. Increased commuting of residents and CO₂ emissions into the estuary and marine park and resultant degradation of air quality.

Action Required: rezoning these and other outlying suburban areas that border natural parks, estuaries and marine parks as inappropriate for urban infill development.

Increasing block size allocation to 500m² per building to encourage owner-builders and families not businesses and profit-driven builders.

8.) Uncontrolled Abuse of Public Footpaths by Builders and Contractors Plus Neglect of Safety Signage and Protocols.

Builders and their contractors routinely use public footpaths as their work benches, park on both sides of the street where they are working, and neglect to put up safety signs advising motorists of work in progress and speed limits.

As a result pedestrians, older residents using 'gophers', mothers with prams, and children are forced to walk in the middle of the road and dodge oncoming traffic.

Council rarely responds to call-outs by residents complaining about these practices as they do not have delegated staff for this task.

They routinely pass on the query to rangers who seldom attend to complaints due to their workload.

Builders rarely put Site Supervisor's contact details on building site fencing, so it is impossible to contact them directly.

Action Required: These issues should be attended to at the contract point and embedded into each builder's and contractor's contract as a condition of building approval.

Additional budget for staff should be appointed to council to monitor and audit site safety practices, in real time as they occur, and with effective penalties for non-compliance.

Site Supervisor's and Builders' contact details must be visibly displayed on building sites, and this needs to be embedded in the Planning Code and each individual building contract with penalties for failure to comply.

The current explosion of building and demolition in Port Noarlunga and surrounding beach-side suburbs in the Onkaparinga Council Area is less progress than it is a profit party and bulldozer orgy.

Tighter controls on building practices and abuses, reflecting community benefit, long-term environmental care, respect of historical character, urban sustainability, and public amenity must be entrenched into the code. A protocol of spot-check audits and appropriate fines could then be enacted.

Please show some leadership.

I would also like a detailed, non-bureaucratic response to the points I have made as the time investment was considerable. If you have any queries regarding any of the points above, please email me on the address below.

Yours Sincerely,

Associate Professor Steve Evans
Bec, MA, PhD, GradCertHigherEd

cc: Katrine Hildyard – Member for Reynell
Planning and Development – Onkaparinga City Council

Q15 Do you have any attachments to upload?(pdf only)

State Planning and Design Code Submission 2020.pdf (90.2KB)

28th February 2020

State Planning Commission,
Dept. of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure,
Government of South Australia.

Email: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au

SA Planning Code - Community Driven not Builder and Profit Driven Development

My submission to the planning code is based on close observation over 20 years and my personal experience of the negative outcomes of unbridled profiteering by builders. In the last few years I have seen problems in the Port Noarlunga area in particular and will mainly address those but would emphasise that similar issues arise elsewhere.

History of Profit Driven Over-Development in Port Noarlunga.

Port Noarlunga was a small, characterful township with access to the Great Southern Reef Marine Sanctuary. Uncontrolled levels of profit-driven building has created a chaotic influx of poor quality, too densely placed buildings; traffic jams; destruction of characterful historical houses and buildings; destruction of established gardens; forced closure of small businesses such as Cody's Café (a business that employed over 6 staff and was a significant nexus of community gathering); spill-over street parking that limits access to emergency services and pedestrians; unsafe footpath use by tradesmen working on houses, forcing residents to walk on roads; plus, increased littering and run-off into the Marine Park and Estuary. Similar problems are plaguing Aldinga, Christies Beach, Moana, etc.

I have contacted the council on these issues and consulted Katrine Hildyard, Member for Reynell, with no measurable improvement.

This situation cannot simply be called 'development' but **profiteering** without check or leadership from Council or State Government. Most of the builders profiting from their building activity in this area do not live here and they make no real investment in our community.

My submission covers several key areas.

- 1.) **Community Driven not a Builders' Bulldozer Bonanza:** development must be driven by the community and benefit the community not only the pocket of the builder, as is the current unbalanced situation in our suburbs.
Action Required: The Planning Code must have tight community benefit laws and policies that balance the Building Businesses' hunger for profit with community and environmental benefit. These laws should allow time for Community Consultation and approval of building plans and right of reply for Council or State Government plans.
State Govt. versus Local Council Approvals: 'Ping Pong Planning Approval Practice'
Builders and individuals must not be allowed to by-pass council to get an approval from State Government where a local council has objected to the plan on reasonable grounds. This is the current practice in Port Noarlunga and the result is multi-story buildings the community does not want and which destroy character and public amenity.
- 2.) **Transparency of Building Plans and Time for Community Consultation:** proposed residential and commercial building plans must be easily accessible on government Internet sites and published in local newspapers, well ahead of the start of build, allowing opportunity for community consultation.

Action Required: the code must mandate accessible, timely advice to residents on proposed residential and commercial buildings and embed residents' right of reply in policies.

3.) **Quarantine Green Space in Urban Areas – Mandated to Benefit Community Mental Health:**

- a. Scientific evidence shows a clear relationship between urban green space and community mental health. There are multiple references, one is provided below:

Reference: Associate Professor Marco Amati RMIT,

<https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/lifematters/how-to-increase-the-green-in-our-urban-spaces/11157184>

- b. No green space allocation has been made by Onkaparinga council for the Port Noarlunga area in the last 10 years, bar the Anderson Avenue Park that was forced on the council by the South Coast Forum: a community action group.

Action Required: Quarantine large areas of quality land for green space, parks etc. This must be mandatory in council and state planning.

There should be a **scientifically based ratio of quarantined natural space and green space** built into all urban development and policed through planning departments.

4.) **Environmentally Sustainable Development Supporting Pollinating Birds and Bees and Permeable Surfaces in residential and commercial building sites.**

Virtually all non-owner builder houses and commercial buildings have had established gardens removed and entire blocks cemented. This is environmentally damaging.

Damage caused includes:

- a. Increased run-off into the Marine Sanctuary because rain cannot soak into the ground.
b. Decreased pollination by birds and bees due to fewer flowering shrubs and trees.

Action Required:

Retention of Established Gardens: Builders must be obliged to retain established trees and gardens and not cover all or most of an entire block in cement or the building footprint as is the current practice. A good architect and building plan can accommodate this.

Mandating and Increasing the area of Permeable Surfaces on housing and building sites to improve run-off and greening of urban areas.

Rejecting subsequent applications by homeowners and builders to cement over gardens and land, as this is a *'cement by stealth'* approach that worsens the permeable surface situation.

Budgeting by councils and State Government for staff to monitor and audit builders for permeable surface and garden retention.

Rejection of building plans where established garden and permeable surface coverage is environmentally damaging.

Quarantine large areas of quality land for green space, parks etc.

5.) **Parking in streets: spill over parking due to Poor Garaging Design:** Inadequate garaging in housing plans pushes cars onto streets. Buildings and planners must be obliged to plan and

build appropriate garaging, not the current tiny toy-sized garages. There is often minimal distance between a garage door and the front boundary, resulting in cars being parked across verges or footpaths.

Action Required: Councils and State Government must reject housing plans that deliberately minimise garaging in order to create the illusion of a larger house that is more marketable and produces greater profit for the builder. This imposes an externality on the community, reducing safety.

6.) Retention of Historical Character of a Suburb

Places such as Port Noarlunga and Willunga are historically significant townships. Many heritage style houses and buildings have been summarily demolished without consultation of the community.

Other buildings, multi-story commercial and residential that are clearly out of character of the area have been approved by the State Government. This dilutes the character and community cohesion of a township. Many people voice their disappointment and dismay at the speed and destruction occurring in our locality.

Currently in Port Noarlunga, historical buildings will be destroyed to make way for multi-story commercial enterprises. The plans are not easily accessible and the community is not properly consulted.

Action Required: Councils, State Government, Builders and individuals must make plans known to the community well ahead of start dates, particularly where the proposed new building conflicts with historical character of a township.

Community consultation prior to destruction of older, historical buildings and houses.

Housing and building plans to be carefully assessed for architectural and design sympathy for existing houses and other buildings, with rejections of poorly designed or ubiquitous, cheaply designed projects.

Ample time and a right of reply from the community must be part of this process.

7.) Over Densification and Over Population in Suburbs that border Natural Assets. – e.g. Port Noarlunga, Aldinga, etc. Urban density is not appropriate for nature sanctuaries in this area, which is part of the Fleurieu Peninsula. It should be limited to suburbs closer to the city.

The current over-densification of residential building, 3 or 4 x 250m² blocks close to a Marine Sanctuary, including the proliferation of inappropriate business activity, has resulted in overpopulation of this area.

Current damaging issues are:

- a. Unpoliced and unsafe use of a proliferation of Jet Skis and Boats within the sanctuary – posing a threat to human and marine life
- b. Littering of broken glass and plastics and plastic straws from new businesses such as Copenhagen Icecream and Hortas Beach Bar.
- c. Increased commuting of residents and CO² emissions into the estuary and marine park and resultant degradation of air quality.

Action Required: rezoning these and other outlying suburban areas that border natural parks, estuaries and marine parks as inappropriate for urban infill development.

Increasing block size allocation to 500m² per building to encourage owner-builders and families not businesses and profit-driven builders.

8.) **Uncontrolled Abuse of Public Footpaths by Builders and Contractors Plus Neglect of Safety Signage and Protocols.** Page | 4

Builders and their contractors routinely use public footpaths as their work benches, park on both sides of the street where they are working, and neglect to put up safety signs advising motorists of work in progress and speed limits.

As a result pedestrians, older residents using 'gophers', mothers with prams, and children are forced to walk in the middle of the road and dodge oncoming traffic.

Council rarely responds to call-outs by residents complaining about these practices as they do not have delegated staff for this task. They routinely pass on the query to rangers who seldom attend to complaints due to their workload.

Builders rarely put Site Supervisor's contact details on building site fencing, so it is impossible to contact them directly.

Action Required: These issues should be attended to at the contract point and embedded into each builder's and contractor's contract as a condition of building approval.

Additional budget for staff should be appointed to council to monitor and audit site safety practices, in real time as they occur, and with effective penalties for non-compliance.

Site Supervisor's and Builders' contact details must be visibly displayed on building sites, and this needs to be embedded in the Planning Code and each individual building contract with penalties for failure to comply.

The current explosion of building and demolition in Port Noarlunga and surrounding beach-side suburbs in the Onkaparinga Council Area is less progress than it is a profit party and bulldozer orgy.

Tighter controls on building practices and abuses, reflecting community benefit, long-term environmental care, respect of historical character, urban sustainability, and public amenity must be entrenched into the code. A protocol of spot-check audits and appropriate fines could then be enacted.

Please show some leadership.

I would also like a detailed, non-bureaucratic response to the points I have made as the time investment was considerable. If you have any queries regarding any of the points above, please email me on the address below.

Yours Sincerely,
Associate Professor Steve Evans
Bec, MA, PhD, GradCertHigherEd

cc: Katrine Hildyard – Member for Reynell
Planning and Development – Onkaparinga City Council