

State Planning Commission

By email: [DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au)

To whom it may concern:

### **SUBMISSION ON REVISED DRAFT PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3**

I live in the Unley Council area and I wish to register my strong objection to a number of key issues in the draft Planning & Design Code, Phase 3, which will result in detrimental development outcomes in suburban Adelaide. Some of my concerns are listed below:

1. Setbacks from Boundaries:

I am extremely concerned that the current requirements for setbacks for development from side and rear boundaries will be substantially reduced, particularly for two-storey development. This will severely impact the amenity of residential properties and the streetscape, particularly in relation to access to privacy, sunlight, overshadowing and the space in and around buildings. The current setback provisions in my Council's Development Plan should be maintained for all suburban areas.

2. Commercial Development in Residential Areas

Under the new Code, non-residential uses will be allowed in existing residential areas, which will adversely impact traffic, parking, noise, neighbour amenity, and the character of our suburbs. This is unacceptable. All uses which are currently non-complying in residential areas should be "restricted development".

3. Historic Areas

The term "representative building" is potentially misleading. It infers that current Contributory Items are only of "representative" value, rather than each being of individual historic value as a significant member of the historic collective group, irrespective of their form or design. I suggest instead using the term "Contributory Building" or "Nominated Building".

4. Public Notification

The Code should include notification for all development that increases development intensity, including additional dwellings on the site, two storey development, earthworks where new dwelling is located 600mm above ground level, development on the boundary and change of use from residential to non-residential.

5. Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

The draft Code facilitates larger developments, the easier removal of trees on both private and public land, increased infill development opportunities, increased number of street crossovers, and reductions in minimum site areas, site coverage and setbacks. This will result in a significant reduction in canopy cover, habitat loss and climate resilience. The requirement to plant a reasonably sized tree as part of a proposed development should not be circumvented by paying money into a tree fund as this would allow the erosion of tree canopy in that specific location. Requirements for minimum tree planting size and ongoing maintenance should be written into both Code policy and conditions of approval.

6. Private Assessment of Development

Each of the design and land uses issues raised above are critical, given the increased role of private planning consultants in the decision-making process. Private assessors should not be able to make 'judgement' calls where proposed development deviates from Deemed to Satisfy criteria or where it involves the interpretation of minor variations.

Unless the above issues are addressed and the revised draft Code is amended to reflect these concerns, there will be an unacceptable loss of local character and amenity in our neighbourhoods. I urge you to give your full consideration to the above-mentioned concerns.

Yours faithfully  
Anne Wharton

[Redacted signature]

Email: [Redacted]

Phone: [Redacted]

14<sup>th</sup> December 2020