

From: [Jordan Craig](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Engagement](#)
Subject: Planning and Design Code: Transport and Integrated Movement Submission
Date: Saturday, 1 December 2018 1:11:01 PM

Dear DPTI Planning Engagement Team,

I am writing to have my submission included in the Integrated Movement Systems and Transport Discussion Paper.

I note and acknowledge that the theme of this paper isn't exclusively discussing airports, however, the views and concerns of residents must be known to policy makers. Theme 2 detailed on page 20 is particularly worrisome:

"Our planning policies should protect major transport corridors and strategic transport facilities from incompatible development to ensure their ongoing, uninterrupted and efficient operation. Examples of such facilities include major airports (including flightpaths), sea ports, intermodal or bulk handling facilities, mass transit corridors and strategic freight routes."

What about planning policies to protect the opposite? Planning policies to protect communities from incompatible transport facility growth? I bring forward two examples:

Example A - A family purchase a home in the northern suburbs of Adelaide in 1970 knowing that Parafield Airport exists. Over the next 48 years, the continual growth of the airport and its operations, particularly training flight circuit operations has made the area unliveable due to the constant aircraft noise. The family has no recourse and the planning policies have failed them in favour of private business.

Example B - A family purchase a home outside of Adelaide to enable them to live a quiet lifestyle away from the hustle and bustle, especially the traffic. Over the next few years, the State Government decide to build a major arterial super-way with an exit planned for their street. The family has no recourse, could not have anticipated such a development and the planning policies have failed them.

A vision on page 4 sets a tone for:

"Enable Adelaide to grow as a sustainable city – carbon efficient, with high air quality, low congestion and improved productivity."

I struggle to understand how Adelaide can grow sustainably, in a carbon efficient way and with high air quality when thousands of people are suffering every single day for the sole benefit of private businesses such as the training flight institutions operating out of Parafield Airport. By having the Parafield Airport Master Plan approved earlier in 2018, the number of flights has been approved to almost double. More planes = less carbon efficiency, lower air quality and a further deterioration in the health of the residents affected by the already-out-of-control training flight noise.

As somebody who is currently stuck where they live, suffering every single day by the constant training aircraft noise, I wish to see planning policy take people and communities into consideration, and indeed, as a priority above all else.

I look forward to having my views communicated and mentioned in this discussion paper.

Kind regards,
Jordan Craig