

State Planning Commission

By email: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au

27/2/20

[REDACTED]
Dulwich 5065

To Whom it May Concern

I have lived in Toorak Gardens and now Dulwich for 60 years. Like my Father, I grew up in Toorak Gardens. Indeed my father's family lived in Toorak Gardens since the time when these "garden suburbs" were first created in the late 19th and early 20th Century.

I was fortunate that my childhood home was graced with a majestic Kurrajong tree, now well over 100 years old, that was planted by the far-sighted original owner when he built his home in 1910. Such stately trees, now considered so valuable in the fight against climate change were commonplace when I grew up in Toorak Gardens but are threatened by the proposed planning reforms.

The suburbs of Rose Park, Dulwich, Toorak Gardens and Tusmore have tree cover and lush vegetation in the streets, reserves and home gardens that collectively cool the city of Burnside and beyond. Alexandra Avenue and Prescott Terrace are also living war memorials. Those streets and the surrounding houses make up the heart of what know as the leafy eastern suburbs. They act as air conditioner suburbs.

It's not just the built heritage but the vegetative and botanical heritage that needs preservation and protection.

In a world suffering severe impacts from climate change any loss of tree cover and vegetation is to be discouraged and deplored. The demolition of existing buildings also impacts on overall emissions as we lose the embedded energy and waste more on the creation of new superfluous structures.

This planning code change appears to be more about greed than need, more about loss than gain and more about destruction than conservation. These suburbs were built well. They were laid out to house homes that were also designed well. The bungalows and villas with verandas are superb examples of their eras. Leave them be. They have stood the test of time. They are admired locally and nationally. It's hard to find a building that has replaced an existing one that has improved the amenity.

Nearly all the original existing housing stock is of superior quality and design to what is being offered to replace it. Commonsense dictates the only answer is to protect and preserve all existing historic residences and structures. We won't destroy the war memorial churches or avenues of trees so why would you ever consider demolition of any of the historic homes.

Thank you.

SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 (City of Burnside)

In response to the draft Planning and Design Code – Phase 3, which is currently out for public consultation, I wish to register my strong objections to a number of issues as summarised below.

1. All Existing Residential Areas

- a) Non-Residential land use: Currently in the City of Burnside's residential areas, shops, offices and educational establishments are non-complying. In the new Code existing residential areas will allow these non-residential uses which will adversely impact traffic, parking, noise, neighbour's amenity and the character of our suburbs. This is unacceptable. All uses which are currently non-complying in our residential areas (eg. office and shop) should be "restricted development". Alternatively, a new zone should be created purely for residential land use.
- b) Siting and Setbacks: Under the Code, building setbacks from side and rear boundaries will noticeably decrease, particularly at upper levels. This is unacceptable and will severely impact amenity and

privacy. Existing siting, setback and floor area criteria should be maintained throughout all our residential areas.

- c) Density and Allotment Sizes: The draft Code contains a number of errors and omissions. It is important that current minimum allotment sizes, heights and frontage widths match existing.

2. Historic Area Overlay

The lack of identification of Contributory Items in the Code, by either a map or list of addresses, will create uncertainty and confusion for owners, prospective buyers, neighbours and developers. Existing protections and identification of Contributory Items should be maintained.

3. Commercial Centres

The Code places large scale centres in the same zone as small local shops, allowing large scale development and more intensive land uses throughout all these areas. This is inappropriate. A hierarchy of centres should be maintained. Additional zone(s) are needed to cater for the lower intensity local centres, particularly in older established areas.

4. Public Notification

The Code should reflect the City of Burnside's current Development Plan policy with respect to the notification of neighbours and the public. The Code should include notification for all development that increases development intensity, including additional dwellings on the site, two storey development, earthworks where new dwelling is located 600mm above ground level, and change of use from residential to non-residential.

5. Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

The 30-Year Plan calls for an increase in tree canopy cover, however, the draft Code works directly against this by facilitating larger developments and the easier removal of trees on both private and public land. This will result in a significant reduction in canopy cover, habitat loss and climate resilience, due the increased infill development opportunities, reduction in minimum site areas, site coverage, setbacks and increased number of street crossovers.

Unless the above issues are addressed and the draft Code is amended to reflect these concerns, there will be an unacceptable loss of local character and amenity in my neighbourhood.

I trust that the concerns detailed above will be given your full consideration.

Yours sincerely,

David Scollin