

From: [Jane Edwards](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Friday, 28 February 2020 6:21:36 AM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Planning and Design Code. I ask that you extend the consultation period for the following reasons.

Consultation over a longer period would allow more people to reflect on and respond to the proposed changes to the Planning and Design Code. The documentation setting out the proposed changes is not only voluminous, it is very dense material that lay people, such as myself, need time to understand before offering informed comment. The need for extensive consultation, based in a good understanding of the draft, is particularly acute given the widespread disillusionment with, and mistrust of, the planning process that has developed in the past few decades. Many people currently feel disempowered by the planning process and have developed a profound sense that the system does not recognize, nor respect, the perspectives and needs of individuals and communities. Any system works more effectively and efficiently if it is perceived as just and legitimate by those who must operate within it. Longer consultation and the opportunity for more informed feedback may help generate greater trust in the Planning and Design Code that is finally enacted.

More time needs to be given to people to reflect on some details, specifically the intention to delete the 'contributory item' classification. On the face of it, it is difficult to understand this decision since contributory items often make an invaluable contribution to the heritage character of a location, while not themselves being strictly heritage items. As a resident of the Port Adelaide area, I am aware of many contributory items that are an essential part of its heritage value. A longer consultation period will allow the case to be coherently made and for appropriate evidence to be considered.

Finally, the public should be given the opportunity to fully consider the implications of the draft's capacity to weaken the restraints on the demolition of heritage and contributory item buildings. Adding apparent insult to potential injury, the process of appeal appears to be significantly and detrimentally weakened. It might appear that giving developer a 'free pass' will further weaken public trust in the planning process and entrench the widely held perception by the community that it represents the interests of developers, not those of citizens and taxpayers.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide this interim feedback. I do hope that the consultation period is extended to allow widespread feedback into a process that has such important ramifications for individuals and communities, now and into the future.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Edwards



Peterhead, 5016.