

From: [Mary Hood](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform](#)
Subject: Planning
Date: Wednesday, 27 November 2019 10:21:13 AM

It is important to me that new infill higher density housing be of good quality materials and that this is regularly checked by government, not left to self-regulation by industry, as history shows we cannot trust them.

Also existing trees should be retained if at all possible and design go around them. Buildings should have set backs from roads and a required amount of open space/ green space around the building.

We need to consider how gardens and trees lower temperatures and create micro climates. Greenery is also essential for the mental health of residents/communities and tends to create more pride in residents to look after their environments.

Mary Hood
Black Forest



4th February 2020

Dept Planning and Transport

Submission on Planning Reforms

I live in [REDACTED] Black Forest. I bought and extensively renovated an older home 6 years ago and thoroughly enjoy living in the suburb. Its extensive tree canopy is wonderful and the suburb has large numbers of tall eucalypts as well as established introduced species. I particularly value the community feel and practice of the neighbourhood. I also love the bird life I have in my garden and hear in the trees around; kookaburras, currawongs, honey eaters, wattle birds, lorikeets, yellow tailed black cockatoos passing through.

My current development planning zone, has been under the *City of Unley Development Plan RB350*.

I vehemently object to the proposed transition of Black Forest as a whole, into the *General Neighbourhood Zone*. The changes this would bring are so major that they would completely change the suburb.

The proposal is for the area per dwelling to change from 350m² to 300m², (or down to 200m² for row housing). Setbacks also are proposed to drastically change; the front setbacks effectively halved, from the current existing established setback of around 10m (suburban wide) to a mandatory 5m. This would radically alter the streetscape and ability of neighbours to see and communicate with each other, and also reduce the area for trees and gardens, and mean existing trees would be removed with a new development. Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% will see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

While I am not against infill development per se, we as a community need to be very particular about how it is done to work positively and retain the benefits our communities currently offer.

I have worked all my career in the social welfare sector and know the inter-connection between all aspects of community; housing, green environments (trees and open spaces), community support and connectedness, better mental health, reductions in anti-social behaviour vs. disconnection, isolation, mental illness etc. I expect governments to be able to make these connections. I expect governments to plan taking all these factors into account, not think and work in silos, not plan with a blinkered one dimensional perspective.

We have creative Planners and Architects in our midst. There are attractive infill development examples with enough open space and green canopy and parking to provide great community housing options. Let's use them, not just cater to those wishing to make the most profit possible!

Specifically....

I have two very strong concerns about the proposals to change the Development classification for the Black Forest area.

Loss of Green Canopy The changes to the size of dwelling and setbacks in the current proposal would inevitably lead to the cutting down of so many beautiful established trees on private land in Black Forest. Have you visited Black Forest or are you only looking at a map? Climate change is upon us. Why would we raise the ambient temperature of a suburb by allowing all the shade and oxygen producing trees to be cut down? Increase the use of air conditioners? Let alone the aesthetic appearance and the effect on general well-being and the loss of bird life in the area. **Setbacks must be retained at 10 metres** to allow for trees to be retained and new ones to be planted.

Adequate parking off street (2 per dwelling) to prevent Parking on the street. This must be required for any new developments. The streets of Black Forest are narrow. If cars are parked on both sides of my street, we have to wait and give way to oncoming traffic. I live on a bend in the street. Cars already go too fast

around this bend before facing oncoming cars. I have to reverse out into this. I have a double block across the street from me which I believe the owner wishes to redevelop and he may currently fit 4 dwellings on the block. If each residence has two cars and park on the street I will never be able to exit. If dwelling sizes are changed it may be 6 residences with 12 cars. I will have to install my own stop lights! **2 car parks per new dwelling must be incorporated!**

I also understand that side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This must surely be a mistake? Think of all the possibilities for neighbourhood discomfort and misunderstandings which would result from such lack of privacy. Your dispute resolution services would be overwhelmed and that costs money.

Summary

So for **Black Forest** I vehemently insist that in the new legislation and regulations, the suburb is transitioned "like for like"; that is, the current City of Unley RB350 zone be **transitioned into the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone.**

Mary Hood PhD (Social work and Social Policy)



Black Forest. SA 5035