

DPTI

Planning Reform Submissions

Via email: [DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code.

We note in recent media [InDaily 30/01/2020](#) that there are sectors within the Development Industry, Local Councils, their residents and the Local Government Association calling for the Government to delay the rollout of the new Code.

We **strongly support this approach** and urge the Government to listen to the people who are in touch with their local communities to enable (most importantly) the consultation and feedback from Council's and their communities so they can be carefully considered before a premature rollout.

We live in Clarence Park on the western side of East Avenue.

We purchased in this suburb some 32 years ago and particularly this street because of the large allotments with a high quality and mix of old and new homes.

The current zoning of our property is contained within the City of Unley Development Plan RB350 Zone which provides reasonable opportunity for redevelopment and infill but sufficient protection from *over development* of allotments within the area. However, we have come to understand that this zoning is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone.

This change is in direct contradiction of the assurances of the Minister and the Commission Chair that our zone would be transitioned into this new zone with little or no change. Our advice on this matter is that the changes to our zone have significant differences by allowing far greater density of development even though the current RB350 zone (with the current numerical overlay) already allows for a significant growth in residents (population).

The proposed General Neighbourhood Zone has no numerical variation overlay whereas the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, on the other hand, does.

This zone provides the opportunity for the Commission to reflect the public promises being made to transition zones like for like from the Council Development Plan to the Planning & Design Code

In the proposed General Neighbourhood Zone, not only has the area per dwelling changed from 350m<sup>2</sup> to 300m<sup>2</sup>, (or down to 200m<sup>2</sup> for row housing), setbacks have been drastically changed from the current existing established setback of around 10m (suburban wide) to a mandatory 5m.

New developments will, under this change be predominant in the streetscape and will impact severely on the visual amenity of the adjacent neighbours creating streetscapes of conflict rather than the harmony that exists at present and is protected by the current zoning requiring staggered setbacks between existing dwellings.

The current zoning does allow a 2 for 1 redevelopment of the average site in Black Forest/Clarence Park. It is important to note that the changes that the draft proposes would allow for most sites a 3 for 1 redevelopment opportunity. In many cases, particularly corner sites, this can possible grow to a 4 for 1, or more. I trust the Government and the Commission is not intent on seeing a whole suburb with 3 houses on each property.

The change in zoning results in Black Forest/Clarence Park realistically being not a like for like, but a zone that is seen as a regeneration zone. A zone with a potential to double the population. Doubling the population in an area with a road network and infrastructure that cannot sustain such.

The amount of roofed area is increasing from 50% to 60% of the site area, with private open space reducing from 20% to as little as 8%. This may work in a future Greenfields development where public open space is strategically planned by the Local Council to service the new community.

It does not and cannot however work in an infill environment where public open space is minimal. Particularly in the City of Unley which (at around 2.5%) has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area. This would place pressure on the City of Unley to find more open space, which would be a significantly costly exercise.

#### **Infrastructure - other**

Given the RB350 zone already allows for a significant growth in residents (population), we can only assume that the Government and Commission have consulted all service authorities in regards to not only the capacity of their respective existing infrastructure but the condition of the infrastructure given the age? For example:

-

- Council stormwater systems and downstream capacities given retention of stormwater on medium density sites in nothing like that designed and implemented on greenfield sites;
- SA Water potable water main capacity – consider the recent increased number of water main issues;
- SA Water sewer main capacity;
- SAPN electrical capacity; and let's not forget...
- NBN capacity in older suburbs, especially Clarence Park which infrastructure is totally inadequate.

#### **Council as a preferred driver of Development Policy into the future**

We also understand it is the Parliament's intention to remove/restrict what input Councils will have in the future with changes to the Code. Councils (Local Government) are surely best placed to actually be the driver of investigations into future changes. They have the empathy with the amenity of the community that State Government Departments can't and never will have.

This is currently being demonstrated with the City of Unley's in-depth analysis of the draft code which appears to be riddled with errors and omissions. Without a reanalysis the new Code has the potential to be so disastrous as to destroy the amenity of the suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular our suburb.

Their ability to engage with the community in both exercises demonstrates they are far more equipped to conduct community consultation than is the department.

Our request then is to support the submission prepared by the City of Unley, particularly the observations on their part that the current RB350 zone be transitioned into the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone and not the General Neighbourhood Zone. That, in so doing the current RB350 numerical values be used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay.

We request in all sincerity therefore that you should respect the role that Councils can and do provide. Please, not only re-include them in the process, but consider allowing them to be the driver of future considerations for change.

Kind Regards,

Sachi & Asha Thattengat

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [DPTI:Minister\\_Knoll](mailto:DPTI:Minister_Knoll)  
**Cc:** [DPTI:Planning\\_Reform\\_Submissions](mailto:DPTI:Planning_Reform_Submissions); [dpalmer@unley.sa.gov.au](mailto:dpalmer@unley.sa.gov.au)  
**Subject:** Planning and design code  
**Date:** Wednesday, 26 February 2020 4:23:14 PM

---

The Minister for Planning & Infrastructure  
The Honourable Stephan Knoll MP  
GPO Box 1533  
Adelaide SA 5000  
[ministerknoll@sa.gov.au](mailto:ministerknoll@sa.gov.au)

re: Planning & Design Code

We thank you for your decision to delay the implementation of the new Planning & Design Code. We too, for the commitment you and your Department have made to prepare a public report on what you have heard from the current public consultation. In so doing you have shown good faith, which is appreciated.

Notwithstanding this, we implore you to provide the South Australian Community the opportunity to make comment on the final draft, before it is implemented.

Only by doing this can we all (you, the Government and the Parliament, Councils, Industry and the larger Community) have the confidence that errors or unintended consequences will not still exist in this final draft. Errors and unintended consequences that could yet have long lasting grave and negative impacts on the built form of our environment.

Thanking you in anticipation that you will accept and implement this common-sense approach.

Yours Faithfully

Sachi & Asha Thattengat

Email: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]

Sachi Thattengat

Email: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]