

South Australia Planning, Development and Infrastructure ACT 2016

Representation on Application

First name:

Graham

Last name:

Pring

Email: *

Consultation Document Submissions

Part 1 - Rules of Interpretation

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

Your Feedback

[REDACTED]

Clarence Park

SA 5034

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing with my comments on the State Planning and Design Code Amendments.

DO 1 Please describe exactly what is meant by “consistent with the existing local context and development pattern.”

Does this mean **“What can be seen from the proposed development”**?

Does this mean **“for this street”** only?

Does this mean **“for this street and one either side of this street.”**?

Does this mean **“any property in the existing suburb”**?

Does this mean “for any property in this Zone, even if no-where near the proposed building”?

A local development in the street I live in has conditions which apply to the proposed Code, however no-one could define what was meant by “Local Outlook/Properties/Area” meant and everyone had a different view of the definition.

It turned into a property being approved which did not fit in with the **“Local Character”**, however that is defined and by whom, hence is very obtrusive and looks totally out of place for the street.

The street’s existing character is why people wanted to live there in the first place and then look after it.

PO 4.1 I would suggest that **Solar tilt panels are acceptable or even encouraged.**

Solar panels need to angled to produce the maximum productivity and output for the time of you’re the year when the owner and State requires the greatest benefit.

This means that the most productive angle for panels is at about 34 degrees from horizontal towards the sun for a City like Adelaide.

Restricting panels to be laid parallel to a roof is therefore quite inefficient for solar output and storage.

Any property should have the option of panels at various angles, not restricted by the angle of the roof.

Various properties have roof angles sloping away from the sunlight with some having vertical glass panels facing north to allow for more light into a building which is something you stress in environmental performance requirements.

They would be wasting their time fitting solar panels and batteries which is something you advocate in section PO 4.3 if they were not allowed to use tilt panels.

PO 10.1 (a) The obscured screening should be at **1.8 metres or higher above floor level.**

This is because humans are getting taller, not shorter.

It is because anyone looking in or looking out can see through the rest of a window next door, which is not what human beings need when being overlooked either way.

PO 10.1 (b) Should be **greater than 1.8 metres.**

PO 10.1 (c) If there is to be an external mounted opaque screen then it needs to **cover all contingencies re viewing in or out.**

It therefore probably needs to be no more than 300mm from the window and have blocking in place that is perhaps 30 degrees below sill height and above window height.

It also needs to have width to cover all contingencies for viewing in or out, allowing no viewing of neighbours or them viewing the occupants from any levels.

PO 10.2 (b) Should simply be **full length opaque end panels** for any porch. All side panels to be obscured.

PO 14.1 (d) **Not to have a width greater than 50** percent regardless of the number of storeys.

The description of a two storey house on an allotment of 7.5 metres width is “Garages with front door”. No house to be seen.

If you haven’t seen one then now is the time to have a look.

It is also in opposition to PO 4.1 re maximising natural sunlight.

If there is more than one building such as this alongside each other, then on-street parking is no longer an option.

PO 15.1 Suggest make the time be **a minimum of five hours** between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.

Scientists have discovered recently that lack of sunlight is the major cause of short-sightedness and why we are currently having an explosion in numbers of people becoming so.

Vitamin A is produced by the body when in sunlight and is a large factor in bone density reduction in humans, resulting in fractures and hospital/medical costs plus foot/wheelchair traffic access.

PO 19.5 **Remove “on average”.**

An “average gradient” can go from zero to vertical and anywhere in between over a distance.

That means you can have a gradient which is absolutely vertical somewhere in the “average”.

Please contact me if you would like to see some 24 degree gradients, which seems to be the “On-road” maximum I have found around South Australia.

PO 19.6 **On-street car parking is going to disappear!**

For an example of dwellings which are on 7.5 metres block and full width dwellings, with four bedrooms each, with an example being the houses approved over the road from us and statistics are frightening.

An average dwelling has over two cars per dwelling.

The above dwellings have facilities for two car storages, however on-street parking has been removed entirely.

Have more of these dwellings in a street and no on-street parking will become a bit of a nightmare for all residents in that street with more vandalism, theft and degradation of vehicles.

PO 20.1 **Double garaging on a 7.5 metre block** detracts from the streetscape and appearance of a dwelling.

PO 20.2 (a) Suggest a **minimum of two metres be the distance the second storey be set back** from the building line to reduce “bulk” seen from the street.

PO 20.2 (b) **Porch to be on ground floor only.**

Front of porch to be classified as setback distance from street.

-

PO 20.2 (c) Suggest **Balcony frontage setback is to be a minimum of 2 metres from building ground floor building line.**

PO 20.2 (f) **Remove altogether.** Makes the mass of the building appear much larger than it is.

PO 22.4 Suggest something like **“Battle-axe blocks are allowed”.**

Then you would need to put legislation in place and in the Code to cover this option.

There are a lot of battle-axe blocks around this suburb as people like them for various reasons.

Developers may not like them for cost reasons, however they are an excellent opportunity to double the existing number of dwellings and density, which is what the State Government seems to want to do.

A “Win-win” for owners and Government.

PO 23.2 Suggest something like **“A minimum of 25 square metres”**, rather than the 5 metres minimum dimension.

Perhaps we will end up with triangles, or a lot less than 25 square metres if that is what you are proposing as an acceptable option.

PO 31.4 See PO 22.4 above.

PO 32.2 See PO 23.2 above.

There is nothing in this document which relates to how this Code is to be implemented or applied.

Yours sincerely,

Graham Pring

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
