

From: [Mark A Gill](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)
Subject: re new planning changes
Date: Monday, 24 February 2020 9:41:36 PM
Importance: High

Oaklands Park SA 5046
24/2/2020

Dear DPTI staff

I submit the following points with respect to the proposed planning reforms for South Australia from the viewpoint of a private SA resident :

By making planning at a statewide level with your plan as currently outlined in your viewer map tool and other documents, I hope there will be more certainty and uniformity across the metropolitan area, allowing increasing density to make downsizing in the same location more affordable to all who wish to access it.

Currently across Adelaide there is a patchwork quilt of zones, some allowing quite heavy density infill development, whilst in other areas plans have not changed in the last 50 years and marked restrictions to downsizing exist.

Downsizing gives, those who can access it, the capability to replace older often outdated and dilapidating houses, to upgrade and modernise but still stay in their preferred location and maintain the amenity afforded by it. However zoning restrictions are at the heart of its availability or otherwise to the individual.

This type of urban infill usually reflects the owners building for themselves, so the amenity and good design of the development will be paramount to them.

Currently in the Marion Council area where I live a development plan amendment was proposed and placed before state government some 18 months to 2 years ago for approval which gave the opportunity for smaller allotments with smaller frontages in hills face zones.

When finally approved it was apparent that the amended plan had been altered within weeks before final approval to arbitrarily change the document, allowing increased density in some hills face suburbs and not in others.

I feel that feedback for this process did not receive input from those supporting the initial proposal allowing for increased density as originally submitted , as it appeared to be happening and so people presumed it would come to fruition, or at least there would be some feedback if the amendment was to be altered before being enacted. Those opposing the development would have made vocal their opposition which I presume contributed to the negative outcome in some areas.

With your current information on your website I feel the same process is happening again.

Currently the SA planning portal encourages feedback and the information supplied lists large parts of the metropolitan area (and this includes hills face zones in the Marion Council area) as being in the general neighbourhood zone (which would allow the flexibility to meet many residents needs).

However, recently when I spoke to a SA government planner I was informed you intend to put any sloping land into suburban neighbourhood zone which apparently will rubber stamp current local Council development plans and leave the current Marion Council Development Plan details in place unchanged.

Thus, unless people interested have actually gone to the bother of speaking to your staff, but simply relied on information supplied being accurate, all those in support of your proposals will think that changes are happening and are unlikely to be contributing positive affirmations of something they think is going to take place, only to later find you have changed your minds at which time they will not have the option to voice their opinion.

Marion Council is opposing your stated planning changes and actively canvassing input only from those opposed to the changes, by letter dropping homes with leaflets inviting people to contribute to their submission opposing the new planning regulations before the deadline to respond. They specifically have not requested input from anyone supporting your changes.

Clearly unfettered developments down to allotment sizes of 200 square metres in any possible location is probably undesirable but I would maintain that the onerous restrictions of up to 1100 square metre minimums in other areas is also undesirable.

A more uniform approach to zoning restrictions in my opinion, would be better, rather than what has happened:

Some areas have clearly been allowed to “overdevelop” and now residents have a negative reaction to this as exemplified by Marion Councils proposals to reduce development north of Seacombe Road, an area in recent years the Council has allowed to have extensive subdivision; whilst in other areas subdivision or multiple dwellings are not allowed where the current zoning restrictions are more onerous than the original subdivision of the land mid last century.

If infill was enabled more broadly, but on a less intensive scale then one would expect to have less troublesome issues of overcrowding in specific areas.

Surely consideration for design and flexibility should be at the heart of the change of planning to state government level and the needs of all sectors of the community be heard; especially my request with respect to the ability for people to access downsizing their own homes in their preferred location.

Thus I write to support the consideration of good design and universal access to downsizing opportunities rather than the parochial and slavish application of current numerous different zones and in some cases their excessively restrictive allotment sizes and frontages.

I strenuously make the point that by supplying documentation to imply that such flexibility will occur with the new guidelines those supporting your information will see no need to respond but clearly those opposed, as evidenced by Marion Council, will clamour to oppose change.

I write on behalf of those who silently assume change is afoot. Is it?

Please let me know as soon as possible if there is any issue with the acceptance of this submission.

Yours faithfully

Mark Gill