

DIT:Planning Reform Submissions

From: DIT:Plan SA
Sent: Monday, 21 December 2020 8:07 AM
To: DIT:Planning Reform Submissions
Subject: FW: Planning code Feedback



From: david woodhouse [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 18 December 2020 10:36 PM
To: DIT:Plan SA <PlanSA@sa.gov.au>
Subject: Planning code Feedback

I received your response to the Marion council yesterday afternoon (24 hours before feedback is closed). If this supposed to be connecting and have listening and address the peoples concerns and addressed them your response is a complete farce. In reality it is no more than a bureaucratic response that the proposed plan is superior than any of outside inputs received by making statements and cherry picking statistics and then interpreting the people's needs are matched by the proposed the code.

To say that people living alone need different housing as they age is not required for a majority is a fallacy, I know personally, who are in their eighty's that still do volunteer work e.g. Meals on Wheels, Justice of the Pease to name a couple. Many of these people live alone due to the death of the partner, maintaining their home is important to them, enabling to provide accommodation for visiting family members and their children who reside interstate or distance that require at least an overnight stay. For many maintaining the family home is beneficial for their health and wellbeing.

Your dismissive of traffic congestion due to infill is also false, even if the largest proportion of households have only 1 car per dwelling is correct you do not provide any evidence of the proportion, is it 50.01% or greater? Households with only one car are likely to be family's that their children have left home to establish their own family's but they would have 2-3 cars on site for the preceding 15-20 years. The setback for houses was 20 feet and for the majority, the frontage was 50 feet this in the main allowed all of the cars to park on site.

Today the set back is 5 metres or less that with the proposed frontage of 9 metres, only a narrow garage of carport can be constructed, I have noticed that many if the infill dwellings use the carport/ garage as a storage as it difficult to open the car door, The car remains on the driveway and the second parking on the street. Add to this the on street parking is reduced due 2 to crossovers where only one was.

In my opinion

- This Proposed Planning Code is more about reducing infrastructure costs that expanding the suburbs would incur, this is why the proposed 9 Metre frontage is deemed to be sufficient (It allows two dwellings on an existing 50 feet wide block). It appears that S.A. planning has already made its position and is now only trying to sell its planning to the public, promoting only the positives
- It also does not take into account that younger families with both working are likely to have 2 cars, one being presently being park on the street. Since the infill I now have to stop on what was a street that had only casual

parking we have cars parked on both sides of the road (opposite each other) this allows only one car to pass between them, normal traffic flow is disrupted.

I can still remember that Anzac Highways had a bike track on both sides until the Government decided that they were no longer an were removed The along came a need to replace the trees in the median strip and reduce the width to allow better spacing of the lanes. Once the public accepted that and a number of years past Lo and Behold the Government decided that Bike Lanes should be introduced the bike lanes were placed at the minimum cost on the side of the road thus removing any of the benefits of reducing the medium strip. No doubt the Government assumed that everyone would have forgotten the previous decisions that led to this.

W.D. Woodhouse