

From: [Gach_12_Wise](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Engagement](#)
Subject: Planning and Design Code feedback
Date: Sunday, 23 February 2020 10:08:16 AM
Attachments: [FB_IMG_1582414007816.jpg](#)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of Plympton and part of West Torrens Council. I would like to object to the zero Carpark space as part of the new zoning and planning proposals as outlined in the attached document.

There's already a heavy traffic overflow in the area. My children also attend school in the area. By allowing developers to build without adequate parking space as a requisite and compulsory component you're putting more pressure on neighbors and school zones. You also disadvantage potential new residents by restricting their privacy and security to their personal vehicles. Depending on location there's council restrictions in place thereby limiting available parking spaces and potentially leaving people open to fines.

Surely a minimum 1 vehicle space isn't too much to ask when considering the bigger picture. As an advocate of my children's school Plympton International College it'd be remiss of me not to point out child safety concerns by forcing vehicles off-site due to poor planning.

I seriously urge you to carefully consider this option.

Kind Regards,
Samantha Malliotis.


Plympton. 5038

Overlays

The introduction of overlays has identified a number of queries as to how they will operate. The examples considered below are two such circumstances.

Affordable Housing Overlay

The Affordable Housing Overlay introduces policy mechanisms that reduce car parking requirements and site area provisions whilst providing a height bonus of an additional storey. It is suggested that this overlay needs to be further considered and adequate consultation be undertaken on the expectations of community in relation to affordable housing. West Torrens Development Plan currently anticipates density bonuses in locations that have been specifically identified due to proximity to activity centres and public transport systems and located typically in medium density policy areas. The Development Plan seeks 1 undercover car park per dwelling. Table below, highlights differences between Development Plan and draft Code as it relates to affordable housing assessment criteria and bonus:

	Development Plan	Draft Code
Additional height allowed?	No	Yes - 1 storey
Site area discount	Only in the above zones where - Medium Density Policy Area 18 - Medium Density Policy Area 19 - Low Density Policy Area 21 And located within 400m of a Centre Zone	20% everywhere
Car parking	Min = 1 (undercover)	Min = 0 for apartment 1 = per dwelling for any other dwelling

The Affordable Housing Overlay is located within the Housing Diversity Neighbourhood Zone (anticipated site areas of 142m²) and adjacent Historic and Character areas. Administration support mechanisms to allow for housing affordability, but under the draft Code holds concern the cumulative impacts of Affordable Housing in this format (reduced to no car parking, increased building height and reduced site minimum sin some areas with small site areas proposed) within the locations identified.

The draft Code policy is unlikely to meet the needs and expectations of the local community and occupants who could reasonably expect that height limits identified by either the relevant zone provisions or TNV would be built as described.

Council does *not* support the following attributes of the Affordable Housing overlay:

- 20% reduction to the minimum site area when located within or adjacent Historic and Character Areas;
- Support of an additional storey
- Reduced minimum car parking provision

Affordable housing should seek different mechanisms to attain meaningful affordability (State Government taxes etc.) without undermining the functionality and character of an area.

Recommendation

It is recommended to Council that:

DPTI be requested to explore other mechanisms to provide affordable housing which are not at the detriment of functionality and heritage and character unless sound urban planning (generally site specific e.g. transport and connectivity, well serviced by open space and soft and hard infrastructure) support the reduction to minimums and additional height currently proposed.