

# South Australia Planning, Development and Infrastructure ACT 2016

## Representation on Application

Organisation:

First name:

Last name:

Email: \*

---

### Consultation Document Submissions

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > General Neighbourhood Zone > Table 3 - Applicable Policies for Performance Assessed Development

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

'Demolition' appears to be PA. Currently in these areas demo is Building Consent Only. There also doesn't appear to be any relevant policies to assess demolition against. Seems like this isn't the intent.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Suburban Neighbourhood Zone > Table 3 - Applicable Policies for Performance Assessed Development

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

'Demolition' appears to be PA. Currently in these areas demo is Building Consent Only. There also doesn't appear to be any relevant policies to assess demolition against. Seems like this isn't the intent.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Urban Renewal Neighbourhood Zone > Table 3 - Applicable Policies for Performance Assessed Development

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

'Demolition' appears to be PA. Currently in these areas demo is Building Consent Only. There also doesn't appear to be any relevant policies to assess demolition against. Seems like this isn't the intent.

---

Part 1 - Rules of Interpretation > Interpretation > Definitions and other rules of interpretation

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

Tables within the zone refer to 'Partial Demolition of a Building or Structure' and 'Demolition' Is there a definition for these forms of development? If not, there may be confusion particularly in areas affected by Historic Area Overlay

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Table 2 - Deemed-to-Satisfy Development Classification

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

All outbuildings are PA due to Heritage Overlay exception - currently outbuildings can potentially be complying in RSBF & RLBF. This should be amended to allow small outbuilding to the rear as DTS.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Table 2 - Deemed-to-Satisfy Development Classification

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

Dwelling additions are DTS - but many will not meet the TNV side setback requirement so will be PA - the TNVs seem to pick up the combined width between dwellings (as per current policy areas) rather than the setback from actual boundary.

---

Part 3 - Overlays > Urban Tree Canopy Overlay > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF)

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

Doesn't seem to appear for dwelling additions in ENZ, GNZ, HDNZ, SNZ, which are often substantial developments with similar impacts as replacement dwellings

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Urban Renewal Neighbourhood Zone > Table 3 - Applicable Policies for Performance Assessed Development

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

Demolition is PA. Why? Particularly when replacement dwellings are potentially DTS. This is the same as issue 1- possibly the 'linkage' issue Nitsan mentioned.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Urban Renewal Neighbourhood Zone > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

Primary street setback - DTS/DPF 3.1 - is 3.0m. The previous setback was 6.0m picked up by the Policy Area

---

Part 4 - General Development Policies > Design in Urban Areas > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) > All Development - 4 or more Building Levels

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

High density / tall buildings - on site waste, deep soil zones, environmental, design/appearance policies etc. only applicable on 4 or more storeys. This used to be 3 storeys or more...

This will result in a poorer/sub-standard built form and functional outcome . Less landscaping and tree canopy

Should be amended to reflect current policy (i.e. applying to building of three storeys of more).

---

Part 4 - General Development Policies > Design in Urban Areas > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) > Residential Development - 3 Building Levels or less > Car parking, access and manoeuvrability

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

DTS/DPF 23.1 - car parking design. Internal dimensions are significantly less than current plan and will result in less functional car parking spaces and further pressure on street parking.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Table 5 - Procedural Matters (PM) - Notification

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

'Swimming Pool' meets Accepted Development criteria in Table but is excluded by the Historic Overlay so is PA - It is not clear from the notification table whether notification is needed- does it mean that if the class of development is listed in accepted development or DTS table, then it is not notified?

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria > Appearance > PO 10.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

Garages- have a total garage door / opening width not exceeding 30% of the allotment or site frontage, to a maximum width of 7m. Why use the door/opening width? The width should be measured for the external dimensions of the structure. This would allow more effective control on the appearance of parking structures and their relationship to associated dwellings .

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Table 5 - Procedural Matters (PM) - Notification

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

Row 3 (A&B) is ambiguous - does this mean that anything listed in Accepted or DTS (despite not meeting a DTS requirement and therefore moving into PA) would not need notification? This probably applies to all notification tables

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria > Primary Street Setback > PO 5.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

No minimum setback provided in the instances where the two adjacent allotments are vacant. The Historic Area statements are also silent (i.e. doesn't mention prevailing setbacks). Nominating the prevailing character in the Historic Area statements would help guide expected front setbacks.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria > Side Boundary Setback > PO 8.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

The minimum side boundary setbacks are very substantial. E.g. 4.0m setback in Established Neighbourhood zone where the allotment is only 16m wide . Should it be less, but still achieve the ~4.0m gap between the buildings, as per current policy?

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Established Neighbourhood Zone > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed to Satisfy (DTS) / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) Criteria > Rear Boundary Setback > PO 9.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

### Your Feedback

This has been reduced from 5m to 4m at ground; and from 8m to 6m at second level. This would encourage greater development within the rear of the site at the expense of private open space and tree canopy opportunities.

---

Part 2 - Zones and Sub Zones > Suburban Main Street Zone > Assessment Provisions (AP) > Performance Outcomes (PO) and Deemed-to-Satisfy (DTS) Criteria / Designated Performance Feature (DPF) > Building height and setbacks > DTS/DPF 3.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

**Your Feedback**

One policy is 45 degree BIE - should this be 30 degree? That would seem more consistent with other zones.

---

## Attached Documents

File
------

No records to display.