

## **SUBMISSION ON PLANNING REVIEW – Margaret Dingle**

### **Re Summary Paper Character and Heritage in the Planning and Design Code (**

There is a need to protect character of areas, as well as designated heritage buildings and include streetscape in assessing applications. I support streamlined approval for buildings considered to be in character but more detailed consideration by heritage experts for other proposed developments. I support the use of heritage overlay and historic conservation areas, as an area may have few if any heritage listed buildings but its character still needs to be preserved. Preserving one building in a street and replacing the rest with buildings of a completely different character would not be a desirable outcome.

I support Prong 1: Elevate Character Areas to Historic Areas Support and help councils to undertake Code Amendments to elevate existing Character Areas to Historic Areas. This allows demolition controls across a broader area whilst maintaining the integrity of the Code.

I support Prong 2: Character Area Statement Updates Support and facilitate councils to review and update their Character Area Statements (and Historic Area Statements) to address gaps or deficiencies. This might include updating themes of importance, incorporating additional design elements, and including illustrations.

I support Prong 3: Tougher demolition controls in Character Areas This proposal is to introduce a development assessment pathway that only allows for demolition of a building in a Character Area (and Historic Area) once a replacement building has been approved. This is to ensure that existing buildings in Character or Historic Areas are only demolished when the replacement building matches the character or historic value of the area.

However, I support more stringent demolition restrictions in historic areas than indicated in Prong 3, but demolitions could be approved in some circumstances. If a house were deemed uninhabitable or damaged beyond repair it could be demolished but careful consideration should be made of the impact on character and the replacement building should reflect the character of the precinct. In other instances demolition of the main building in these areas should rarely be approved. I support assistance to maintain local heritage buildings.

Demolition of the rear of houses for renovation should be more easily approved where streetscape is not impacted or the impact is minor. There is a need to balance heritage against energy efficiency and often the modern house is more energy efficient/has a higher energy rating. However, high ceilings, thick walls and surrounding trees tend to make older houses cooler in summer, although heat tends to build up in the walls and takes a lot of ventilation to disperse. If possible, new builds and renovations should have 7 star energy rating or higher. Outbuildings need not be protected unless they have historic significance.

#### **Tree discussion**

Distance from Development The SA regulatory framework currently says that a tree that would be protected based on its trunk circumference may be removed if it is within ten (10) metres of an existing dwelling or existing in-ground swimming pool (with some species exemptions). I support reducing this distance. If this were applied to my own property (with a land area of 313<sup>2</sup> m. and building just over 100<sup>2</sup>m) all trees on my property would be exempt even if significant or regulated.

As it is, they are, none are classified as significant or regulated. Danger of structural damage, however, needs to be considered. I also would support reducing the trunk circumference necessary to make a tree regulated and taking into account tree canopy.

There is a danger of trees being cut down to prevent them from attaining a size which mandates protection. If a regulated tree is considered potentially dangerous this should be assessed by a government or council arborist. It should never be assessed by an arborist who would be paid to cut down the tree, and even if this is not the case, there is a possibility of collaboration between private arborists. Pruning options should be preferred to total removal.

Tree replacement should be on site if feasible. However, tree planting in parks and public gardens is also desirable. It should be taken into account that it takes many years to grow a mature tree, and sometimes accidents intervene so that the trees do not attain maturity. Nevertheless, planting of new trees is important because trees do not live forever. Street trees should be able to be removed and replaced if age or disease is making them dangerous or moribund or if there is a decision to replace them with trees of a more desirable species on the basis of environmental factors or safety. Shade should also be taken into account as some native species are less shady in summer than deciduous trees. As far as possible all streets should have trees and footpaths and the footpaths should be well maintained.

If a block is subdivided all significant or regulated trees that are not dangerous should be retained, regardless of the implications for future development. If the tree needs to be removed to facilitate development the tree should be retained and the development not approved. However, innovative architecture should be able to “build around” trees.

### **Infill**

I consider infill to be of two kinds: subdivision of large housing blocks to build extra houses, and large area infill.

The comments above on trees apply to the subdivision of housing blocks. Any new houses built should be in character with the area but need not be replicas of surrounding styles.

I support the use of disused industrial sites etc., such as the Bowden TOD development, and Norwood Green, on the site of the Caroma factory, for medium rise developments to 6 storeys. Bowden has made use of viable old buildings and this is desirable. It is also close to Bowden Station, the Entertainment tram stop and various bus routes. Car parking requirements should be relaxed in cases like this.

Norwood Green is still under construction. It has certain desirable features:

- Open space in the middle
- Aldi supermarket adjacent and small shops planned on ground floor of apartment building
- Adjacent to Magill Road buses (3 routes)
- Some of the townhouses/apartments overlook a park (Chimney Park) outside the development.

It has certain drawbacks:

- The 7 storey apartment building is somewhat too high for the site
- There is a row of townhouses with black metal upper storeys. These have some pretty plants on the street in front but tiny concreted over gardens in front of the houses. At the back

they also have pretty plants and garage exits but no trees in sight. The back opens onto the driveway into the Aldi car park. I haven't noticed a footpath on this side. These dwellings would need a lot of air conditioning in summer, with consequent high greenhouse emissions. There is also the question of safely should the residents want to walk to Aldi or other parts of the estate. The development is not sufficiently progressed for me to examine pedestrian access for other residents.

### **Car Parking**

Car parking requirements should not be increased and could be relaxed in areas with good public transport and walkable facilities, including TODs.

### **General Planning Principles (apart from heritage)**

- Infill and green field developments should have public transport from the outset if not already there.
- Building close to public transport is to be mandatory or public transport provided from the outset.
- There should always be facilities for safe walking and cycling.
- While large shops at public transport nodes etc., are good, there should also be small local shops so that most people can walk to the shops.
- Primary schools should be fairly small and close together and where possible co-located with early childhood/child care facilities.
- Sports facilities should be accessible to those without a car.
- Large green field developments should include a multipurpose hall for use of residents unless there is suitable building already there. These buildings could cater for meetings, some sports, cultural and religious activities, etc.
- Parks and gardens should be included in green field developments and elsewhere where possible.
- Energy efficiency of buildings, solar energy and protection of the natural environment should be priorities.

In general planning should be designed for community cohesion, reduced car dependence, reduced greenhouse emissions and access to nature.

Margaret Dingle

