

## Draft Planning and Design Code (Phase Three – Urban Areas)

Our City should be a healthy, attractive and pleasant place to live.

Our names are Julie-Ann and John Bennett. We have been residents of Athelstone for 20 years and are members of LOVE Campbelltown, a civic pride community group in the City of Campbelltown.

The 3000 pages document is impossible to decipher and respond to adequately which leaves us questioning whether this was the intention. In the City of Campbelltown, we have not been informed about or encouraged to participate in the Community Consultation process. We are interested to find out how many submissions are received from residents of our local government area.

### **Distinctive Neighbourhoods**

First and foremost, we strongly protest the homogenization of urban landscapes throughout the Adelaide Metropolitan area.

The pride and local identity of communities everywhere has been weakened by inappropriate development. Character-filled streets and attractive streetscapes have been negatively impacted by approved development which is not consistent with surrounding residential homes. This is a blight on our City as a whole.

We are very concerned by the diminishing value and protection of character homes and heritage properties, which are likely to be demolished rather than restored.

### **Trees and Green Space**

The majority development we are experiencing in the City of Campbelltown are carried out by profit driven developers with little regard for neighbours. Having no intention of living in the homes they have built they then utilize every possible inch of surface without due consideration for existing trees and vegetation which are removed and not replaced.

We support change to the current practice of demolition teams removing all vegetation and instead retain where possible.

We support the requirements for at least one tree per development and the requirements for a minimum percentage of all blocks and land to have permeable landscaped garden areas.

We support increased rear and side setbacks to achieve minimum green space requirements, enabling more privately owned trees as well as street trees and other vegetation to be planted. Setbacks should be consistent with adjacent homes and also permit the construction of footpaths that meet Disability Access Standards.

We have read and support the State Planning Commission's Update Report confirming that current lists of Significant Trees and Regulated Trees from Development Plans will be transitioned into the Code.

We do not support policy changes which will lead to inappropriate infill and a reduction in tree canopy e.g. smaller building sites.

We request that the Code include a new Overlay which includes policy on urban green cover and climate change adaptation specifically covering biodiversity.

We request that the Code recognise the existing tree canopy is an intergenerational asset, a primary factor in micro-climate cooling, helps to sustain habitat, biodiversity and neighbourhood amenity. Trees produce oxygen and filter pollutants contributing to the health of our environment.

We request additional policy which recognises that all large trees both indigenous and non-indigenous, whether in rural or urban environments have economic value and should be retained until dying of natural causes.

We request inclusion of specific policy regarding retention of Grey Box trees due to their endangered classification and the fact that they do not grow to a regulated tree size.

We request amendment of the Proposed Regulated Trees Overlay:

- To include reference to indigenous to the locality, important habitat for native fauna, part of a wildlife corridor of a remnant area of native vegetation and important to biodiversity of local area.
- To change the test for retention of significant trees from "retained where they make an important visual contribution to local character and amenity" to 'Significant Trees should be preserved'
- In the case of significant trees to include the test of "all other remedial treatments and measures have been determined to be ineffective".
- To make all tree affecting development application subject to public notification and consultation.

### **Amenity, Liveability and Affordability**

The ability to lawfully demolish established properties and carve them up into greatly reduced block sizes, has allowed developers/speculators to opportunistically snap up properties and land in the City of Campbelltown. It has reduced housing affordability (locking out many prospective homebuyers) and led to a reduction in the amount of privately-owned green space for families with children. Many small homes built by profit driven developers are low quality and not consistent with adjacent dwellings, diminishing the amenity and character of the area. Their design is often unsuitable for environmental conditions, providing inadequate thermal comfort and consuming more energy.

We support increasing minimum site areas and minimum green space requirements, believing it will benefit the physical and mental health and well-being of residents in our community. It permits more private space for relaxation and allows refuge from noise which serves to reduce physiological stress. Less dense residential development (and wider frontages), will facilitate greater connectedness between neighbours and encourage social cohesion. It enables the development of safer and more walkable / cyclable street routes within neighbourhoods. It is also more suitable for pet ownership.

We support increased minimum frontages to enable garages fit for purpose to be constructed. This prevents the need for bins to be parked in front of adjacent established properties which has resulted in property access issues, diminished visual appeal of properties and streetscapes and contributed to disharmony between neighbours.

We request that the Code encourage design guidelines to manage overshadowing and privacy / amenity issues.

## **Right of Appeal**

We support retaining public notification for all development involving two storey residential flat buildings is in the interests of full transparency and fair process. A person or group of people who consider themselves significantly affected should be able to lodge a written representation, in order to address the potential impact of a development on the existing elements of the locality, the character and amenity as well as environmental concerns such as noise, overshadowing, traffic congestion and overcrowding of local schools. A right of appeal should exist for residents of adjacent properties and dwellings, following the decision.

## **Summary**

Proposed man-made development should always give full and serious consideration to the impact on the natural environment and surrounding homes. Residential dwellings approved should generally be of a comparable scale and quality to adjacent development. Areas should be specifically ear-marked for multi-storey and increased density development, ensuring genuine public consultation and a staging process to transition. Local school capacity should be carefully considered, and integrated transport options and quality green space should be incorporated into the plans to rejuvenate/alter an existing neighbourhood.

In the City of Campbelltown, we are now living with inappropriately dense infill which has forever altered our streetscapes and neighbourhoods in negative ways as well as further straining ageing and inadequate infrastructure. Our city should be a healthy, attractive and pleasant place to live.

Our neighbouring Burnside Council heat map demonstrates there are significant increases in temperature in areas of dense housing development and subsequent reduction in green cover. As a matter of urgency, we request stronger policy in the area of tree planting and

landscaping for infill development in order to be effective in increasing by 20%, urban green cover in metropolitan Adelaide by 2045 (Target 5 in the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide 2017 update).

Thank you for your consideration of our feedback.

Julie-Ann and John Bennett

[REDACTED]

Athelstone SA 5076