

discussion title	date	commenter	comment body
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Fri, Dec 18 at 4:46 PM	Julie-Ann Bennett	<p>Public notification (Page 9)</p> <p>'The Commission proposes to amend the Code to exempt performance assessed development envisaged in zones from notification where it meets acceptable standards of built form or intensity and is not likely to result in substantial impacts on the amenity of adjacent dwellings located on land in another zone.</p> <p>In the residential "neighbourhood" zones in the Code, this means that most residential forms of development will not be subject to notification unless they exceed the maximum building height specified in the zone. Nonresidential forms of development (shops, offices, consulting rooms) will not be subject to notification unless they exceed the maximum gross leasable floor area limits in the zone (which are generally 50-200m2).'</p> <p>The reason PlanSA have given is...</p> <p>'A range of submissions from different stakeholders raised concern that public notification triggers appear to require much more public notification.'</p> <p>Public notification before a decision is made ensures members of the public and neighbouring properties are aware of the development and have the opportunity to make submissions which may improve upon the proposed development and minimise the impact on existing residents.</p> <p>Who are these stakeholders who want to simplify and speed up development approvals? I am concerned the negatives will outweigh any benefits like reducing admin work, costs and delays?</p> <p>#LOVECampbelltown</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Fri, Dec 18 at 4:22 PM	Susan Lloyd	<p>I would like to see a minimum percentage (at least 10 - 20%) of unroofed area on all residential blocks. Current new residences take up a large percentage of block area in Campbelltown and with inadequate storage provision in many properties, the remaining land is then covered in sheds and verandahs resulting in even less land for greenery and certainly very little hope for shade trees.</p> <p>Some charges to developers that actually seriously reflect the costs of replacing mature trees would also be good.</p> <p>At the moment in the overall cost of a development there is really very little incentive for developers to retain trees that provide vital habitat and shade in suburban areas.</p> <p>Distribution of at least a reasonable proportion of funds entering the Open Space Fund back to local councils to enable them to purchase additional land in areas with high density development would also be appreciated.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Fri, Dec 18 at 3:09 PM	Bas de Groot	<p>Could I ask how the Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects as mentioned in the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 is included in the Code? Is the register ever consulted when planning is done? Is the Aboriginal Heritage Committee ever involved in the planning process?</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Fri, Dec 18 at 1:34 PM	Darren Kerwood	<p>I am frustrated with developments that leave bumpy road patches on the roads when new services are provided for multiple houses where there used to be only one - developers should pay a fee to have the whole street re-bituminized ASAP after most of the street is done. There needs to be sufficient off-street parking - and parking alotments for busy times when guests visit. Kurrulta Park is particularly bad.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Fri, Dec 18 at 12:48 PM	Malgo Schmidt	<p>Planning is not my area of expertise. One thing is obvious to me, though: we can no longer clear any vegetation in Australia. 1) Australia is the global leader in animal extinction, due to deforestation and environmental degradation. 2) Australia is the global leader in CO2 emission per capita, while additionally exporting massive means of emission worldwide. 3) Australia's bush is being disproportionately and irreversibly destroyed by fires, to the acceleration of global warming and to the horror of the rest of the world. Meanwhile, the horrendous destruction of dune vegetation (being replaced by solar panels!) between Hallet Cove Beach and Lonsdale goes on. I recently heard that these are not the only dunes targeted by the South Australian environmental criminals. A newly planned anti-flora activity of the South Australian government, at the cnr of Cross Rd and Fullarton Rd, involves destruction of 20 trees, some of which are over 100 years old. They are to be replaced by a road (!) https://indaily.com.au/news/2020/12/04/historic-urrae-gatehouse-to-be-bulldozed-but-study-finds-relocating-it-is-feasible/ I wish to state that we urgently need Plant Protection Laws. Significant trees are not replaceable, as no new trees will grow to maturity in the new climate. All native vegetation must be preserved. New legislation is necessary, to the effect that no one, including local and state government, can "own" a tree, or destroy any native vegetation, by mechanical or chemical means. Perhaps the task of Plant Protection state-wide requires a full-time specialist, due to its crucial importance to the climate, and to the animals, including H. sapiens. By "specialist" i mean a person with degree & experience in environment/plant protection.</p>

discussion title	date	commenter	comment body
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Thu, Dec 17 at 6:53 PM	Marty Cielens	<p>As a resident of Charles Sturt Council, I have long been disturbed by the ongoing sanctioned destruction of our city's tree canopy and associated understory vegetation. A new Design and Planning Code should stop this trend and include targets that significantly increase our tree canopy into the future.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of governments to mandate development of urban environments that foster the health and wellbeing of people who live in them. We should listen to research that points to the important role that trees play in the health of our urban landscape.</p> <p>“Trees play a critical role for people and the planet. Numerous studies have demonstrated that the presence of trees and urban nature can improve people's mental and physical health, children's attention and test scores, the property values in a neighborhood, and beyond. Trees cool our urban centers. Trees are essential for healthy communities and people. The benefits that trees provide can help cities and countries meet 15 of the 17 internationally supported United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.” J. B. Turner, Skoff and N. Cavender, Plant sciences for the Anthropocene: What can we learn from research in urban areas? New Phytologist Foundation, May 2020</p> <p>A 2003 paper by the Warwick District Council in the UK summarising research on the benefits of urban trees found benefits ranged from economic (consumer behaviour, inward investment and property values), social (crime reduction and outdoor activity) through to environmental (pollution interception, carbon sequestration and noise reduction).</p> <p>These reports scratch the surface of the research findings that stretch back many years, And yet we continue to ignore the obvious and sanction the destruction of established plantings while reducing targets going into the future.</p> <p>If the Covid pandemic has taught us anything, it is that decisions should be based on scientific evidence, not short term economic benefits. Governments that ignored the science inflicted incredible suffering on their citizens, while those that behaved rationally have so far avoided the worst of the pandemic.</p> <p>Not greening our urban landscape may not kill people in the short term, but it will compromise their long term health and well-being and deny them a range of future economic and social benefits. A soft approach to this issue economically benefits governments and developers in the short term and shifts the cost of these policies onto future generations.</p> <p>Trees should be considered an important part of the equation by developers, project managers and government policy makers as we all work towards reaching basic sustainability goals.</p> <p>A new code gives us an opportunity to enhance, rather than diminish our environment, and send a message that South Australia is a great place to live, one that values the health and wellbeing of everyone.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Wed, Dec 16 at 11:03 PM	David Bennett	<p>Re the reply you gave to my comments: Just repeating the planning code stipulations to me as a result of my comments implies you don't really give any credence to my thoughts at all. So much for public consultation. Your minds are all made up so why bother asking for our comments?</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Wed, Dec 16 at 8:54 AM	Julie-Ann Bennett	<p>I value trees in the City of Campbelltown. #LOVECampbelltown Please legislate adequate minimum green space for new development (both residential and commercial), to ensure current and future trees may grow and thrive. Minimum residential block sizes of 250 sqm here (up from 150 sqm last year), is still wholly inadequate given there has been no increase in quality public green space through the Open Space Fund. I agree with other comments stating that people are largely unaware of this consultation. In the City of Campbelltown there were no community information sessions held. Given infill development and planning policy is a major issue here I question why.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Wed, Dec 16 at 8:08 AM	Greg Toop	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to attend a public meeting held at Glenunga last week to review the proposed Plan SA changes for SA. In particular I would like to thank Brett Steiner for taking me through the areas of interest I have in the changes and how they may affect our Industrial Development in the Murray Bridge Council in particular the Primary Production Zone Central Policy Area 3 and more specifically Precinct 23 Flagstaff Road.</p> <p>A DPA for this Precinct was completed in 2018 creating an area within the Primary Production Zone to accommodate a whole range of Industrial and job creating industries. In particular a new Ingham's Chicken Feedmill supporting major SA Industries of Big River Pork, and Sunpork farm feed mill.</p> <p>The "Precinct 23 Flagstaff Zone" had a few issues when put to the "practical test" which were brought to Planning SA's attention by our Planners (Masterplan) and were to be rectified in subsequent reviews of the Plan.</p> <p>On reviewing the proposed Planning Code for this property and how it impacts on our Industrial development we found that this "Precinct 23 Flagstaff Road" provision has disappeared and reverted to "Rural Intensive Enterprise" with the inherent difficulties that this change makes to future development of the site and Precinct 23.</p>

discussion title	date	commenter	comment body
			<p>We request an immediate review of why this change has been made and or how we can continue to develop this property.</p> <p>DA applications are ready to be lodged for some \$15million + of investment in industries, jobs and energy technology (Solar/Thermal Microgrid) on the understanding that no fundamental change was envisaged in this Land use but improvements already identified taken up in this Land use .</p> <p>All correspondence is available for consideration - on request.</p> <p>We remain very concerned that the Plan will be adopted without further consultation, review and rectification.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Sun, Dec 13 at 10:23 PM	David Bennett	<p>I couldn't agree more with the comments here. I only became aware of this consultation when a few days ago I wrote to the Port Adelaide council about the incredibly inappropriate development of flats on Fourth Avenue Klemzig. This shows how inadequate your offer of consultation is. The public at large have no idea of this code and the changes you are proposing. I looked up my own property on the Portal and found out nothing other than that it is apparently not subject to the PDI - whatever that means and it couldn't even find my Klemzig address when I went into the section about getting approvals for any kind of development. It seems to me that this is a huge bureaucratic, jargon filled document that, maybe, professional planners and, of course, developers will possibly make sense of. For example what do these terms mean to a layperson: 'strategic innovation zones', 'the principle (wrong spelling) organizing layer', 'assessment pathway', 'agency referral triggers', 'to exempt performance assessed development', etc, etc? And how can developments for housing that only need a 300 square metre area possibly have any room for meaningful plantings that may help in the mitigation of climate change? 24 metres to be set aside for this is a joke. It seems the whole code is designed to enable developers to squeeze in developments that will make them lots of money while denying local residents and our councils any say in the matter. In particular it is apparent that houses like mine built in the 60s are targeted for demolition to make way for two or three more dwellings to replace them. Klemzig is an example where this sort of change is rife. A hot suburb in the making which in 20 or 30 years will have to have these buildings torn down so that proper plantings can redress the damage that these so called developments will cause. None of this code pays any attention to climate change.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Sun, Dec 13 at 1:48 PM	Janice Gamble	<p>I want people to be informed of planned building projects/houses in their suburb and particularly next to homes. This is a right that taxpayers/ratepayers must be given. The government should be acting on our behalf not excluding us from decisions that can have major impacts on the value of our properties, quality of life and the amenity and feel of our suburbs.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Fri, Dec 11 at 7:47 AM	Rose Ashton	<p>I can't view the whole document as 84MB is too large to download. But what are the overarching principles to the new code? I would hope they would include sustainability - high energy-efficient buildings must be compulsory. Too many high-rise buildings in Adelaide have lots of north-facing & west-facing glass. "The west-facing glass facade looked cool, but was not cool from the inside. The transparent windows turned our living room and the bedroom into big solar panels, constantly absorbing energy from the midday sun. When the sun moved west, everything in the room started barbecuing. Arriving home at 6pm one day, I sat on the sofa, and my bottom was on fire. I was like the Monkey King in the alchemist's pot, fidgeting but helpless. The only way to cool down was to run the airconditioner at the highest level." Quote from SW newsletter Dec 20-Feb21, Marco Guan & wife Fei. Eaves at the angle to let winter sun in but summer sun out are easy to do & should be compulsory on every building in SA.</p> <p>Another current example of poor planning is the new Hampden development in Strathalbyn. There's only one exit, making it unsafe in the threat of a bushfire. These developments are not good enough for the long-term. Does the new Planning Code forbid unsafe developments like this?</p> <p>Climate Change is getting worse quickly. How does the Planning code encourage fossil-free transport over cars? Expanding roads adds to the heat of cities & encourages cars.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Wed, Nov 25 at 4:15 PM	Belinda Sullivan	<p>Given the recent lockdown and the continuing COVID restrictions, it has made it very difficult for community groups to gather together and evaluate this latest iteration of the Planning and Design Code. Especially seeing as we are now running into the festive season with holidays, deadlines etc. I live and work in a community with a high proportion of elderly people who are unable to use ZOOM or webinars effectively. You have cancelled just about every consultation event that was scheduled. For the deadline to remain as it is, being 19 December, it will discriminate against these people being able to be involved and give their genuine feedback. I might add that 6 weeks is an extremely short time for lay persons to evaluate such a complex document. Would you please consider extending the consultation period to the end of say January 2021, to facilitate genuine community consultation? With sincere thanks.</p>
What are your thoughts on the revised draft Planning and Design Code?	Sun, Nov 22 at 4:20 PM	Peter Holmes	<p>Whilst the Amendment to the code to include Established Neighbourhood Zones and Representative Buildings to reflect/protect built form characteristics, they do not align with the Urban Corridor policy that would allow multistorey buildings abutting the Established zones - the Code can only honour the intent of retaining local built form and local character if there a height limitations along corridors that abut these Zones - trees and setback can only address at best 2x storeys</p> <p>2. Who and how will Contributory Items be classified as 'Representative Building' - simply by Code 'definition' inclusion, or some other process?</p>

Created At	Commenter Name	Body
10/11/2020 14:38	Jodie Sheldrick	Can you please ensure productive farmland is protected in the Adelaide Hills particularly Hahndorf. The entrances to township are not protected by Heritage. The open areas on the approach to Hahndorf need to be protected and increased. The protection area should be increased to maintain the entrances to township.
10/11/2020 22:17	Jodie Sheldrick	The plan should ensure that child care centres are built in good places for children like schools. It is crazy how many child care centres are built on main roads that are noisy dangerous and busy. All child care centres should have to pass a test as to whether they are suitable places for children. Councils don't check if they are too noisy or dangerous first. There must be someone looking out for kids instead of letting developers decide where they can make a dollar. Please add something to the plan that makes sure an child-focused expert reviews locations first.
19/11/2020 18:10	Alayna de Graaf	The code hardly provides any protections what so ever for Aboriginal Heritage. FIX IT PLEASE.
22/11/2020 16:36	Peter Holmes	Urban Corridor policies need to ensure maximum building heights of not more than 2x storeys where they directly abut Residential Neighbourhood Zones and Representative Buildings Can someone point to a definition of "storey" in terms of metres !!
4/12/2020 8:20	Iyall ross	I just want to note that every one wants to do everything on line, so you can track and trace it all, but not every one has a computer or can afford expensive internet , so it makes it hard for these people to get service when you close down public access to this sort of information.
5/12/2020 17:54	Tyler Hughes	The code needs to incentivise developers to maintain and keep trees rather than demolish them. Trees are vital to our community and land value. It's about time that the DPTI started caring.
11/12/2020 8:05	David Hay	Hi there, I am very much against any proposed changes to planning laws that remove street appeal and aesthetic (trees, frontages), to create ugly, high density living developments that are cheap, fast-tracked and look identical. Kind regards
12/12/2020 14:25	Cornelis Escabache	Allowing to build large houses on small blocks is now causing major problems in suburbia. In our area it is already to late to change. If there have to changes than I believe that every house build should have room for 1 more car park than the amount of bedrooms available. If a house has 2 bedrooms it should have 3 car parks. No hammerhead development should be allowed as this is causing the people living in the back parking on the road in front of the people living in front. No commercial properties to be allowed in suburbia. Also every home should have more open space as what is acceptable on the moment. We are destroying the Australian way of living.
15/12/2020 16:18	Adam Flatau	You're reducing space for nature on private land. You're moving towards a cityscape, making more Australians live in concrete boxes (small boxes that you can lock up) and put a greater strain on the ecosystem and environment surrounding. Quality is not in the interest of the Code, as the code is promoting a development company/business to cater to a customer for profit. The State Government workers all involved in changing this Code should grab a camp chair and sit in it for a day in 40+ Degrees Celsius heat on a paved driveway, to ponder and understand the "Quality" they are envisioning. Cars are an eye-sore and should be stored out of sight such as basement driveways under houses, neither on the roads, or on potential vegetation-producing land. The Adelaide plains used to be flat mangroves with a complex ecosystem, now destroyed by development. It is disappointing the land is further being subdivided for more immigration, rather than supporting environmental equilibrium and better service. The council, state government AND federal government could start by supporting Australians wanting to own their own house. Subdivision and profit growth charts are what appears to be behind the "iron curtain" (or better coined "concrete curtain") to the State Governments proposed Code. My disappointment to the obfuscations that go on surrounding grand decisions in Australia cause me grief and make me even more depressed in this spoiled country.
15/12/2020 16:55	Deane Crabb	Still does address conflict between broadacre agriculture and more intensive horticulture/viticulture when there is a change from broadacre to more intensive farming.

Created At	Commenter Name	Body
15/12/2020 16:55	Adam Flatau	<p>Hi Planning Reform Team,</p> <p>It seems as there are a lot of hopeful keywords in the statements replied by the Planning Reform Team. Words such as "will", "policy" and "aim" are words that do not provide firm assertion.</p> <p>"Demand for well-designed, high quality infill" - They key word is "demand" and therefore not "set in concrete", as demand can fluctuate, or even evaporate. I do not see a bottom-line, financed appeal that customers will ultimately be drawn to, to "the policy in the revised Code". For customers, I am referring to YOUR INDIVIDUAL RESIDENTS and not some over-empowered developer who is in bed with the councils financial interests.</p> <p>In earlier posts, you mention "highly sensitive" information about Aboriginal heritage. How do we know that similar decisions for example, removal of a tree by a developer, are NOT kept "highly sensitive" and confidential similarly from the public, due to obfuscation of the project objectives and profiteering? How is this established by the Code?</p> <p>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindmarsh_Island_bridge_controversy</p> <p>Looking forward to cheaper, sparser and lesser human-invaded development.</p> <p>K, tnx</p> <p>Bye</p>
15/12/2020 23:18	David Donaldson	The previous system was so provincial in outlook. Whatever the technical objections of some people, this at least is an overall plan for the state.
16/12/2020 10:15	Julie-Ann Bennett	<p>I agree with this comment by Jodie Sheldrick.</p> <p>'The plan should ensure that child care centres are built in good places for children like schools. It is crazy how many child care centres are built on main roads that are noisy dangerous and busy. All child care centres should have to pass a test as to whether they are suitable places for children. Councils don't check if they are too noisy or dangerous first. There must be someone looking out for kids instead of letting developers decide where they can make a dollar. Please add something to the plan that makes sure an child-focused expert reviews locations first.'</p> <p>On Gorge Road a child care centre is being constructed next to a petrol station and pub/pokies/bottle shop with a serious lack of quality and quantity green space. The play equipment is metres from the road, an obvious safety hazard. Fire risk and evacuation is another issue. Noise, traffic, air pollution... This is a clear example of letting developers make a dollar without consideration for what children and families need.</p>
16/12/2020 23:07	Renae Schmidt	<p>I may have missed it, but does the code have anything in there about when people submit applications for subdivisions or zone changes and who approves the applications or does not allow them. As we have previously requested this and been told no to our land, but others who applied after were given approval because they obviously knew the right people. People in the city saying money can be made off the land and zoning it primary production when the land size is not big enough and the rainfall not high enough to produce anything viable on it. It is and would be great for small acreage blocks where people can grow there food on it with decent backyards.</p> <p>I think we need to stop allowing good farm land to be turned into urban residential. There is plenty of land in the country to live on that is not farm able. How about decreasing urban sprawl. Adelaide and surroundings were once great farmland. We won't be able to feed ourselves soon</p>
17/12/2020 23:33	Trude Paladin	I oppose the proposed provisions in the Master Planned General Neighbourhood Zone that would allow developments such as student accommodation, flats etc., to be built without any notice or consultation with neighbours. I understand that some resident groups have made it hard for developments to go through, and that NIMBYs are very annoying, and that it's very tempting to just get on with developments without the locals even knowing, but the proposed provisions for General Neighbourhood zones go too far the other way. Anything higher than two stories should require consultation, anything changing the use of a street should require consultation. i.e., if a street has never had shops, then residents should be consulted because their street will now be used differently, by traffic that may not be local. People, South Australian people, voters live in neighbourhoods. They are there everyday. Their neighbourhood is their home and they deserve that to be treated with respect, and to be consulted about things which may change how they live in their home.