Mr Michael Lennon
Chair
SA State Planning Commission
50 Flinders Street
ADELAIDE SA 5000

BY EMAIL: DPTI.planningreforms submissions@sa.gov.au

Dear Mr Lennon,

As the Member for Badcoe, I have been approached by hundreds of local people about the proposed zoning changes to Black Forest, Clarence Park and part of Everard Park. Residents are particularly concerned about the impact the change to a General Neighbourhood Zone would have on the character of their suburbs. Residents have expressed to me that they do not believe it is a 'like for like' transition as promised.

Detailed below are some of the main concerns people have raised with me about the effect of the change to a General Neighbourhood Zone:

• Loss of vegetation, particularly larger trees that provide canopy
• Decreased off-street parking
• Decreased minimum window sill height reducing privacy
• Congested streets
• Decreased minimum front setback for dwellings
• Decreased minimum block size
• No side or rear setback
• Decreased minimum dwelling footprint
• Increased subdivisions
• Increased removal of trees in the public domain
• No provision for the protection of character homes
• Increased maximum roof surface area
• No provision for the increased demand for services resulting from greater density

The General Neighbourhood Zone for Black Forest, Clarence Park and part of Everard Park is not consistent with the new zones for neighbouring suburbs. There appears to be no rationale for why these three suburbs have been singled out for different treatment to the adjoining suburbs, which are remarkably similar locales. Black Forest, Clarence Park and part of Everard Park are being treated unfairly.
I have also included emails from residents detailing their concerns about the impact of a General Neighbourhood Zone.

I, as the local MP, along with residents would like to see these concerns taken seriously and the zoning changed to Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, consistent with the surrounding suburbs. Residents believe that a Suburban Neighbourhood Zone would provide the 'like for like' transition they were promised by your Authority and the State Government.

I have also had scores of conversations with residents about this unfair zoning at forums and public events that I have organised.

I have also received many hundreds of letters, survey responses and calls raising serious concerns and errors in the Planning and Design Code. The broader feedback I have received about the Planning and Design Code is contained within the submission of Hon Tony Piccolo MP, Labor's Shadow Minister for Planning.

If you would like to discuss this matter further do not hesitate to contact me on 8371 5600 or badcoe@parliament.sa.gov.au

Regards

Jayne Stinson MP
Member for Badcoe

28 February 2020
Nankivell, Grace

From: Badcoe EO
Sent: Thursday, 27 February 2020 7:45 PM
To: Stinson, Jayne
Cc: Nankivell, Grace; Cocking, Melissa; Richardson, Tahmika; O’Hanlon, Cressida
Subject: FW: Planning and Design Code

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI - Everard Park. Copy printed for folder.

-----Original Message-----
From: Chris Cummins
Sent: Thursday, 27 February 2020 2:36 PM
To: Badcoe EO <badcoe@parliament.sa.gov.au>
Subject: Planning and Design Code

Dear Ms Stinson,

As a resident of Black Forest, I thank you for your commitment in attending the Public meeting regarding the proposed development on Norman Terrace, Everard Park.

I noted, and shared, the many concerns of the residents of Black Forest and Everard Park about the impact on their lives in our beautiful suburbs, where we purchased our homes because of the wonderful streetscapes lined with trees, lovely houses, proximity to good transport and other amenities and notwithstanding the kind and generous Neighbours!

I, like many of my neighbours, am dismayed by this proposed new code which will permit developments such as those intended for Norman Terrace, and I have sent the Hon. Stephan Knoll an email regarding this.

I trust that you as my local member will continue to fight for openness and transparency from the Liberal Government so that developers cannot invade our suburbs and destroy our environment.

I felt that the representative from LifeCare who spoke at the meeting gave scant regard or respect to the residents who spoke. I worry that should this Code be implemented then we will be subjected to more developments like this that will be totally detrimental to all residents of Black Forest and Everard Park.

Once again, thank you for your representation as our local member and I would ask that you register my email as a plea for your continued involvement in securing the continuation of our beautiful neighbourhoods.

Kind regards,

Chris Cummins
Black Forest 5035

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Minister Knoll

We, residents of Black Forest, respectfully request that you delay the proposed implementation of the new planning and design code until there has been a far more comprehensive community consultation process.

As residents of a classical Adelaide suburb with a majority of single dwelling period style homes, the pattern of urban infill which is already occurring is having an adverse impact.

. Increased on-street parking
. Closer 'living' noise
. Increased 'passing' traffic
. Loss of vegetation

Please consider
Yours sincerely
Roger and Dianne Thompson
Dear Minister Knoll,

Please find attached a letter concerning my views on the proposed design code for the suburb of Black Forest.

Mary Hood PhD (Social work and Social Policy)
Addison Rd, Black Forest.
RE : New legislation for Planning & Design Code Changes

I live in Addison Rd, Black Forest. I bought and extensively renovated an older home 6 years ago and thoroughly enjoy living in the suburb. Its extensive tree canopy is wonderful and the suburb has large numbers of tall eucalypts as well as established introduced species. I particularly value the community feel and practice of the neighbourhood. I also love the native bird life I have in my garden and hear in the trees around; kookaburras, currawongs, honey eaters, wattle birds, lorikeets, yellow tailed black cockatoos passing through.

My current development planning zone, has been under the City of Unley Development Plan RB350.

I vehemently object to the proposed transition of Black Forest as a whole, into a General Neighbourhood Zone. The changes this would bring are so major that they would completely change the suburb. The suburb should be transitioned “like for like”; that is, the current City of Unley RB350 zone be transitioned into the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone.

The proposal is for the area per dwelling to change from 350m2 to 300m2, (or down to 200m2 for row housing). Setbacks also are proposed to drastically change; the front setbacks effectively halved, from the current existing established setback of around 10m (suburban wide) to a mandatory 5m. This would radically alter the streetscape and ability of neighbours to see and communicate with each other, and also reduce the area for trees and gardens, and mean existing trees would be removed with a new development. Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% as is proposed, would see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

While I am not against infill development per se, we as a community need to be very particular about how it is done to work positively and retain the benefits our communities currently offer.

I have worked all my career in the social welfare sector and know the inter-connection between all aspects of community; housing, green environments (trees and open spaces), community support and connectedness, better mental health, reductions in anti-social behaviour vs. disconnection, isolation, mental illness etc. I expect governments to be able to make these connections. I expect governments to plan taking all these factors into account, not think and work in silos, not plan with a blinkered one dimensional perspective.

We have creative Planners and Architects in our midst. There are attractive infill development examples with enough open space and green canopy and parking to provide great community housing options. Let’s use them, not just cater to those wishing to make the most profit possible! Governments need to be involved in regulating planning design strictly, not just allow the private sector to get away with whatever they can.
We now have the old Le Cornu’s site vacant on Leader St. What about a beautiful demonstration project for apartment dwelling being done there?

Specifically in relation to Black Forest.... I have two very strong concerns about the proposals to change the Development classification for the Black Forest area.

Loss of Green Canopy. The changes to the size of dwelling and setbacks in the current proposal would inevitably lead to the cutting down of so many beautiful established trees on private land in Black Forest. Have you visited Black Forest? Climate change is upon us. Why would we raise the ambient temperature of a suburb by allowing all the shade and oxygen producing trees to be cut down? Why would we want to increase the use of air conditioners? Let alone the change in aesthetic appearance and the effect on general well-being and the loss of bird life in the area. **Setbacks must be retained at 10 metres** to allow for trees to be retained and new ones to be planted.

Adequate parking off street (2 per dwelling) to prevent Parking on the street. This must be required for any new developments. The streets of Black Forest are narrow. If cars are parked on both sides of my street, we have to wait and give way to oncoming traffic. I live on a bend in the street. Cars already go too fast around this bend before facing oncoming cars. I have to reverse out into this. I have a double block across the street from me which I believe the owner wishes to redevelop and he may currently fit 4 dwellings on the block. If each residence has two cars and park on the street I will never be able to exit. If dwelling sizes are changed it may be 6 residences with 12 cars. I will have to install my own stop lights! **2 usable, realistic car parks per new dwelling must be incorporated!**

I also understand that side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This must surely be a mistake? Think of all the possibilities for neighbourhood discomfort and misunderstandings which would result from such lack of privacy. Your dispute resolution services would be overwhelmed and that costs money.

In relation to the overall new Planning & Design Code legislation ..... it seems riddled with problems and omissions and is so complicated even Professional Planners cannot understand it. I believe you have made the decision to delay its implementation and thank you for that. I look forward to being able to read the public report on what has been heard from the current public feedback consultation.

But to get this right, the South Australian Community needs the opportunity to make comment on the final draft of the new code, before it is implemented. Bring it back to us, the community, after the redrafting. Then we can look forward to communities that work.

Yours Faithfully

Mary Hood PhD (Social work and Social Policy)

Black Forest. SA 5035
Badcoe EO

From: Badcoe EO
Sent: Monday, 24 February 2020 6:42 PM
To: Stinson, Jayne
Cc: Nankivell, Grace; Richardson, Tahmika
Subject: FW: Planning & Design Code
Attachments: Planning and Design Code Op Ed.docx

Sorry if I’m doubling up here. Entered CC and filed in Chris Russell’s planning file.

From: Chris Russell
Sent: Wednesday, 19 February 2020 6:47 PM
To: Badcoe EO; Light EO
Subject: Re: Planning & Design Code

Hi Jane & Tony,

Jane great to have you respond so rapidly on radio today.

One issue I did not have a chance to mention on radio - but I phoned the DPTI Planning Hotline on Monday 10th to ask the question: Why Black Forest is being treated differently to the rest of Unley? - the guy who answered was puzzled at why we were not getting “like for like” and said he would get a planner to phone me back on that or the following day. On 13th I left a phone message with no response. I phoned again today around 9:30am and got a quick call back and apology no one had called back. I had to re-explain my question and was assured someone would get a planner to phone me back today. It’s 6.30pm and I have not heard back.

Well done by the way on helping get the Minister to extend the implementation deadline - although without extending the public submission date all it gains is more time for the bureaucrats to do their job in responding to the public input.

Chris Russell,
Mob: email:

On 10 Feb 2020, at 1:07 pm, Chris Russell > wrote:

Hi Tony, long time! and greetings Jane.

Confidentially I thought I would send you a copy of an Op Ed I have just submitted to the Advertiser. Of course they may not publish and I got the impression they currently have plenty of Op Ed material - so appreciate if you keep it under your hat until published.

I am in a pocket of Unley (Badcoe electorate) which is significantly affected by the new code. However I couldn’t walk past the absurdity of the consultation process. I have not mentioned that it is Unley - in part because I have no idea how widespread these sorts of issues are, but clearly the
lack of understanding in the community must be extremely widespread and if it helps encourage people to look at the issue its useful whatever changes apply in other areas.

I door knocked 12 houses in Black Forest over the weekend and only one had heard anything about changes (a councillor had spoken with him somewhere) - notwithstanding a council flyer in the latest rates notice and more provocative flyer from councillors in advance of a public meeting. I don’t recall seeing anything at all from government - although the council flyer did have State/Council logos on the bottom.

I am awaiting a promised call back from a planner in DPTI - in response to my questioning of why this particular area is having the zoning changed when the intention, as I understand it was to swap "like for like" between Development Plans and the new Code.

I trust you are keeping well.

Regards

Chris Russell,
Mob: [redacted] email: [redacted]
Good Morning

Please find attached my disapproval of the changes to the housing in Black Forest.

Regards

Lindy Browne

Kind Regards,

Lindy Browne  Customer Support Team Manager

Freecall: 1800 335 112  |  Email: 

, Tonsley SA 5042
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

Background

I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!

Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is Not “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350 also, which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood Zones [1].


Proposed Amendment to the Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration

I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park/Everard Park

The main contentious differences are:

1. **Dwelling Size.** The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350m² to 300m². This will accelerate the rate of land subdivisions and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.
2. **Setbacks.** The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. **Privacy.** The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals and impact family life.
4. **Sustainability.** The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.
5. **Street Appearance.** There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way to new garages and carports, again increasing urban heat.
6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, street parking, provision of utilities, NBN capacity, etc.).
To summarise, it is clear from the above points that **Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park will be severely affected by the proposed changes.** This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that *the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.*

In addition, I would want to ensure that in future any changes to zoning require consultation with property owners and residents, and the Unley Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. I would ask that you take my submission most seriously.

Lastly, I would make a special request that you note, and advise the Minister of, my concern regarding the short timeframe around these proposals. It is far more important to get the code right, than to keep to an arbitrary commitment to July 1st. I believe the implementation should be delayed to allow for detailed consideration of submissions and a further opportunity to comment on a revised draft code.

Yours Sincerely

L Browne

Name: L Browne  
Black Forest 5035
Hello Stephen,

We are forwarding the attached planning issues we have with the design code proposed for Black Forest and hope you will seriously take them into account in the coming months of decision making.

Thanks,

Derek and Carol Braysher

Black Forest 5035

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

Background

I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!

Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is Not “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350 also, which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood Zones (1).


Proposed Amendment to the Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration

I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park/Everard Park

The main contentious differences are:

1. **Dwelling Size.** The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350m2 to 300m2. This will accelerate the rate of land subdivisions and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.
2. **Setbacks.** The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. **Privacy.** The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals and impact family life.
4. **Sustainability.** The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.
5. **Street Appearance.** There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way to new garages access and carports, again increasing urban heat.
6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, street parking, provision of utilities, NBN capacity, etc.).

To summarise, it is clear from the above points that Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park will be severely affected by the proposed changes. This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

Background

I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!

Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is Not “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350 also, which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood Zones (1).


Proposed Amendment to the Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration

I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park/Everard Park

The main contentious differences are:

1. Dwelling Size. The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350m2 to 300m2. This will accelerate the rate of land subdivisions and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.
2. Setbacks. The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. Privacy. The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals and impact family life.
4. Sustainability. The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.
5. Street Appearance. There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way to new garages access and carports, again increasing urban heat.
6. Serviceability. A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, street parking, provision of utilities, NBN capacity, etc.).

To summarise, it is clear from the above points that Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park will be severely affected by the proposed changes. This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.
Badcoe EO

From: Paul and Jan Wallace
Sent: Thursday, 20 February 2020 3:44 PM
To: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au; Schubert EO
Cc: Unley EO; Badcoe EO
Subject: Fwd: Draft Planning Code Response
Attachments:

We wish to express our extreme concern at the proposed Draft Planning and Design Code for the following reasons.docx

Please find attached our extreme concerns re the proposed Draft Planning Code.
Kind regards
Jan and Paul Wallace

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Janet Wallace
Date: 20 February 2020 at 3:21:32 pm ACDT
To: Paul and Jan Wallace
Subject: Draft Planning Code Response

Important Warning: If you have received this email in error, please advise the sender and delete the message and attachments immediately. This email, including attachments, may contain confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright information, the unauthorised use of which is prohibited. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, except where the sender expressly, and with authority, states them to be the view of Immanuel College. Immanuel College Inc. CRICOS No 00362G
We wish to express our extreme concern at the proposed Draft Planning and Design Code for the following reasons:

1. Under the existing planning rules, if a house on a suburban block is demolished for redevelopment, the 350 square metre minimum allotment size effectively means a maximum of two dwellings can be built on most allotments.
2. Even under this provision, redevelopment has led to congestion. Our Clarence Park and Black Forest streets are simply not wide enough to cope with the resultant increase in on-street parking. A case in point is Margaret St which is frequently impassable because of cars parked on both sides of the road as a consequence of three two-storey townhouses having been built on the previous site of one home.
3. Under the Draft Code, Clarence Park and Black Forest have been designated a General Neighbourhood. These are the only two suburbs in the entire area NOT designated as Suburban Neighbourhoods. We sincerely hope this is an oversight, not an intention!
4. The impact of Clarence Park and Black Forest being designated as General Neighbourhood is that even higher density redevelopment will be possible than with the existing rules which are already proving untenable (see point 2).
5. Character homes previously not economically viable for purchase and demolition under the “350 sq m” rule will now be vulnerable for redevelopment because of the potential to build 3, 4 or 5 properties on the site. An example is a large corner block on East Ave which has received planning permission for the construction of 3 homes.
   a. However, under the proposed Code, it is likely that 5 new ‘homes’ could be built there and neither local residents or the Council would be able to object because it is possible under the ill-defined provisions of General Neighbourhood.
   b. A large number of homes in these two suburbs are attractive single storey villas built between 1920 and 1950. They are character homes with an attractive street-scape, at odds with the two-storey grey boxes which seem to be typical of the new builds. Apart from the traffic issues there are also concerns re loss of amenity and blocking of solar panels by overshadowing buildings.
6. Please note that we are not opposed to development per se. We live in a single storey detached property built in 2006 on a 380 sq m block. We have a double garage and off-street parking for two additional cars. We have only one car. We have the same offsets as the other houses in the street and the exterior colour of our house is sympathetic to the surrounding properties. Sadly, under the Draft Code almost none of the protections involved in the approval when our house was built would be available.

A simple solution for our neighbourhood is to designate us as a Suburban Neighbourhood, just like all the surrounding suburbs. There may still be some issues for us but it will help us to preserve the area which we are very pleased to call home.
Badcoe EO

From: Kennedy HQ
Sent: Wednesday, 19 February 2020 9:26 AM
To: dpti.planningreformssubmissions@sa.gov.au
Cc: Schubert EO; Light EO; Badcoe EO
Subject: Submission - Planning and Design Code - Phase 3

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

Background
I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality suburb.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!
Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is Not “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350, which are being transitioned into the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone


Proposed Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration
I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Hon. Stephan Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park
The main contentious differences are:

1. **Dwelling Size.** The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350sqm to 300sqm, while row dwellings are being set at 200sqm. This will accelerate the rate of land subdivision and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.
2. **Setbacks.** The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. **Privacy.** The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals in their own property and impact family life.
4. **Sustainability.** The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open green spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.
5. **Street Canopy.** There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way for new driveway access, again drastically increasing urban heat.
6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, restricted street parking, under resourced utilities, NBN congestion, local school capacity saturated with increased enrolment demand, etc.).
To summarise, it is clear from the above points that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) will be severely affected by the proposed changes. This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephan Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.

Lastly, I would make a special request that you note, and advise the Minister Stephan Knoll, of my concern regarding the short timeframe around these proposals. I believe the implementation should be delayed to allow for detailed consideration of submissions and a further opportunity to comment on the revised Planning and Design code.

Mary-Ann Kennedy

Black Forest SA 5035
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed *Planning & Design Code, Phase 3*.

I live in Black Forest, currently zoned as RB350. It is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

*I object to the proposed transition of Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is NOT “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs currently zoned RB350 also, and which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood zones. The proposal will have a detrimental impact on Black Forest and part of Clarence Park, all within the Unley Council area.*

I am concerned that the current RB350 zoning for this area will be fundamentally changed under the proposed General Neighbourhood Zone classification. I understand most of the residential areas of Unley are expected to be transitioned “like for like”, which are most closely related to the proposed Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, thus retaining existing 350sqm minimum block sizes. Row dwellings of 200sqm are completely inappropriate for Black Forest, causing adverse strain on established infrastructure, reducing tree cover and increasing urban heat.

*I propose that our current RB350 zone be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, consistent with the proposed zoning of our surrounding suburbs (such as, Clarence Gardens, Cumberland Park, Forestville and most of Clarence Park).*

Lastly, I would make a special request that you note, and advise the Minister Stephan Knoll, of my *concern regarding the short timeframe* around these proposals. I believe the implementation should be delayed to allow for detailed consideration of submissions and *a further opportunity to comment on the revised planning and design code*.

Regards

Michael Kennedy

Black Forest SA 5035

19 February 2020
Jayne,
As discussed last night, forwarding to you the survey re Everard Park DPA for your information.
Regards,
Donna

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Your Say Unley
Date: 6 January 2020 at 9:20:20 am ACDT
To: 
Subject: Thank you for completing 'Everard Park DPA Survey'
Reply-To:

Hi

Thanks for completing the survey.

Your responses are listed below.

To what extent do you agree with the strategic aim of the DPA to provide greater housing opportunities for older persons through well-designed, smaller, independent and supported aged-care living located near public transport and shops, which enables older persons access to greater levels of service and support as their needs change?

Agree

Do you have additional comments regarding question 1?

The key word here is 'smaller' - not high density high rise enclaves!

To what extent do you agree with the aim of the DPA to provide for higher density and greater choice of residential accommodation within the area identified as the Norman Terrace Policy Area?

Strongly Disagree

Do you have additional comments regarding question 3?
The proposed development will have a major NEGATIVE impact on what is essentially a quiet suburban area. Five storeys is too high - and the roof top housing airconditioning and other infrastructure would effectively add another storey. The different levels of care proposed will mean 24 hour shifts for staff, a huge increase in traffic and parking demands, ambient noise and light, daily garbage collection, industrial kitchens or food delivery, overshadowing, loss of privacy, etc, etc. A 3 or 4 storey development of only independent living units with green space and tree planting would be acceptable.

To what extent do you agree with the the planning policy in the Norman Terrace Policy Area that intends to facilitate a lower two-storey height along local streets, with greater height (up to five storeys) focused towards the tram line frontage?

Strongly Disagree

Do you have additional comments regarding question 5?

Five storeys with a potential roof top level to accommodate infrastructure is too much. 3 or 4 storeys is acceptable.

Do you have any other general comments you would like to make?

I am hugely concerned about the potential negative impact of the DPA on what is a lovely quiet suburb. I believe further public consultation is required. I know several local residents for example who do not have access to the internet so cannot complete this survey. I'm also very much aware that few people seem to know about the proposed DPA. Please do not rush into something that will have such far reaching implications!

Do you plan to attend the Public Meeting on 10 February 2020?

Yes

Do you wish to speak at the Public Meeting on 10 February 2020?

Yes

Name

Donna Mayhew

Address

[REDACTED], BLACK FOREST

Email address

[REDACTED]

Thanks again

Your Say Unley
Ms Jayne Stinson

I would like to take the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code.

I live in Clarence Park (west of East avenue). My current zone, under the City of Unley Development Plan RB350 is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone.

Contradicting the assurances of the Minister and the Commission Chair that our zone would be transitioned into the new zone with little or no change the changes to my zone are significant. So significant, that I suggest the two zones simply are not compatible.

The changes are so impactful that they depict the zone in which I live as a zone presenting for complete renewal. Changes that I trust are not intended but which could see our population double in a short period of time.

**Differences and the Impact of these differences on Black Forest/Clarence Park.**

Not only has the area per dwelling changed from 350m2 to 300m2, (or down to 200m2 for row housing), setbacks have been drastically changed. The front setbacks have been effectively halved, 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. They will impact seriously on the visual amenity of the adjacent neighbours for years to come creating streetscapes of conflict rather than the harmony that exists now.

Side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This is surely in error. Such if included in the final draft will see the current spaciousness of our suburb disappear. Potentially streets could become a series of row housing.

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

Such redevelopment potential will artificially increase the value of most properties in Black Forest/Clarence Park. Affordability, for other than developers, will result as properties that are currently within the reach of the average person, will no longer be affordable.

This 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 plentiful.

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.
Overlooking restrictions have been reduced from 1.7m cill height on 2nd floor windows to 1.5m cill heights. An average height person can see over a cill height of 1.5m with ease, effectively eliminating the effort to minimise overlooking.

Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% will see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

**Summary**

The General Neighbourhood Zone has no numerical variation overlay.

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.

My 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. That, in so doing the current RB350 numerical values be used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay.

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

I 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 have.

This is currently being demonstrated with the City of Unley’s in depth analysis of what appears to be a draft Code full of errors and omissions. An analysis without which the new Code potentially would have been so disastrous as to destroy the amenity of the suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular my suburb. Likewise in their leading the Development Plan Amendment in the Life Care, Norman Terrace Precinct.

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

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.

**Finally**

I trust the intention of the Government is not for the RB350 zone to be a regeneration zone, that it was meant to be transitioned like for like. If this is the case then the numerical discrepancies noted in my submission are in error, and not deliberate.

If in error, this may reflect that the Commission is under severe pressure to put this mammoth exercise together in the time frame the parliament has decreed.

I ask the Parliament to provide the Commission with an extension of time to ensure that errors and omissions do not see their way through to actual development. Any resultant and unexpected abhorrent development that might occur as a result of not taking our time to get it right will surely impact on the Government’s re-election chances.

Regards,

Paul Bradley
Clarence Park
Mobile: [number]
Hi Tony, long time! and greetings Jane.

Confidentially I thought I would send you a copy of an Op Ed I have just submitted to the Advertiser. Of course they may not publish and I got the impression they currently have plenty of Op Ed material - so appreciate if you keep it under your hat until published.

I am in a pocket of Unley (Badcoe electorate) which is significantly affected by the new code. However I couldn’t walk past the absurdity of the consultation process. I have not mentioned that it is Unley - in part because I have no idea how widespread these sorts of issues are, but clearly the lack of understanding in the community must be extremely widespread and if it helps encourage people to look at the issue its useful whatever changes apply in other areas.

I door knocked 12 houses in Black Forest over the weekend and only one had heard anything about changes (a councillor had spoken with him somewhere) - notwithstanding a council flyer in the latest rates notice and more provocative flyer from councillors in advance of a public meeting. I don’t recall seeing anything at all from government - although the council flyer did have State/Council logos on the bottom.

I am awaiting a promised call back from a planner in DPTI - in response to my questioning of why this particular area is having the zoning changed when the intention, as I understand it was to swap "like for like" between Development Plans and the new Code.

I trust you are keeping well.

Regards

Chris Russell,
Mob: [redacted] email: [redacted]
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

Background

I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!

Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is Not “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350 also, which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood Zones.

Proposed Amendment to the Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration

I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park/Everard Park

The main contentious differences are:

1. Dwelling Size. The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350m² to 300m². This will accelerate the rate of land subdivisions and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.

2. Setbacks. The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. **Privacy.** The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals and impact family life.

4. **Sustainability.** The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.

5. **Street Appearance.** There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way to new garages access and carports, again increasing urban heat.

6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, street parking, provision of utilities, NBN capacity, etc.).

To summarise, it is clear from the above points that **Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park will be severely affected by the proposed changes.** This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that **the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.**

In addition, I would want to ensure that in future any changes to zoning require consultation with property owners and residents, and the Unley Council.

**Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. I would ask that you take my submission most seriously.**

Lastly, I would make a special request that you note, and advise the Minister of, my concern regarding the short timeframe around these proposals. It is far more important to get the code right, than to keep to an arbitrary commitment to July 1st. I believe the implementation should be delayed to allow for detailed consideration of submissions and a further opportunity to comment on a revised draft code.

Yours Sincerely

Michelle Hancock
Subject: SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S NEW PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE

Following a meeting with Cr Don Palmer we are fully supportive and endorse the following

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

We live in Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East avenue). Our current zone, under the City of Unley Development Plan RB350 is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. Contradicting the assurances of the Minister and the Commission Chair that our zone would be transitioned into the new zone with little or no change the changes to our zone are significant. So significant, that we suggest the two zones simply are not compatible.

The changes are so impactful that they depict the zone in which we live as a zone presenting for complete renewal. Changes that we trust are not intended but which could see our population double in a short period of time.

Differences and the Impact of these differences on Black Forest/Clarence Park.
Not only has the area per dwelling changed from 350m2 to 300m2, (or down to 200m2 for row housing), setbacks have been drastically changed. The front setbacks have been effectively halved, 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. They will impact seriously on the visual amenity of the adjacent neighbours for years to come creating streetscapes of conflict rather than the harmony that exists now.

Side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This is surely in error. Such if included in the final draft will see the current spaciousness of our suburb disappear. Potentially streets could become a series of row housing.

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

Such redevelopment potential will artificially increase the value of most properties in Black Forest/Clarence Park. Affordability, for other than developers, will result as properties that are currently within the reach of the average person, will no longer be affordable.

This 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 plentiful.
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.

Overlooking restrictions have been reduced from 1.7m cill height on 2nd floor windows to 1.5m cill heights. An average height person can see over a cill height of 1.5m with ease, effectively eliminating the effort to minimise overlooking.

Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% will see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

Summary
The General Neighbourhood Zone has no numerical variation overlay.
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.

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. That, in so doing the current RB350 numerical values be used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay.

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

We 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 have.

This is currently being demonstrated with the City of Unley’s in depth analysis of what appears to be a draft Code full of errors and omissions. An analysis without which the new Code potentially would have been so disastrous as to destroy the amenity of the suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular our suburb. Likewise in their leading the Development Plan Amendment in the Life Care, Norman Terrace Precinct. Their ability to engage with the community in both exercises demonstrates they are far more equipped to conduct community consultation than is the department.

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.

**Finally**

We trust the intention of the Government is not for the RB350 zone to be a regeneration zone, that it was meant to be transitioned like for like. If this is the case then the numerical discrepancies noted in our submission are in error, and not deliberate.

If in error, this may reflect that the Commission is under severe pressure to put this mammoth exercise together in the time frame the parliament has decreed.

We ask the Parliament to provide the Commission with an extension of time to ensure that errors and omissions do not see their way through to actual development. Any resultant and unexpected abhorrent development that might occur as a result of not taking our time to get it right will surely impact on the Government’s re-election chances

Marilyn and Theresa Dixon
Clarence Park SA 5034
Mob. [Redacted]
Email. [Redacted]
I would like to register my objections to the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

**Background**

I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

**Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!**

Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park is being transitioned into the **General Neighbourhood Zone**. This transition is **Not** “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350 also, which are being transitioned into **Suburban Neighbourhood Zones**.


**Proposed Amendment to the Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration**

I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the **Suburban Neighbourhood Zone**, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

**Note:** This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

**Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park/Everard Park**

The main contentious differences are:

1. **Dwelling Size**. The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350m\(^2\) to 300m\(^2\). This will accelerate the rate of land subdivisions and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.
2. **Setbacks**. The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. **Privacy**. The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals and impact family life.
4. **Sustainability**. The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.
5. **Street Appearance**. There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way to new garages access and carports, again increasing urban heat.
6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, street parking, provision of utilities, NBN capacity, etc.).

To summarise, it is clear from the above points that Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park will be severely affected by the proposed changes. This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.

Regards

Andrew Bartlett

BLACK FOREST 5035
Please find attached my feelings on this.
I have worked hard on it as a member of Community Alliance.
The Liberal Government does not want to talk to its constituents in its electorates or only in very tightly controlled situations,
We know the Act will come in but there are some things that need to be altered for one that will be much fairer and bring a better outcome for all.
Sincerely,
Rowena Dunk
Norwood
(Property Owner, Addison Road)
SUBMISSION on PLANNING and DESIGN CODE

BLACK FOREST

The Planning and Design Code of the State Planning Commission, currently out for consultation promised many things when originally released and legislated under the Rau government in 2017.

Many things promised in that, promised what would appear to be best practice but now in the fine print that has been delivered, we find that many items have been watered down, which will lead to a decrease in living standards. Commissioner Lennon has been asked about this but seems unable to answer the questions. It is imperative that these aspects of the Planning and Design Code are altered before the Act becomes fully operational.

This can be done by delaying the implementation of the Act until July 1, 2021 instead of implementing it on July 1, 2020.

Items that need to be dealt with as a matter of urgency are:-

- Allowed minimum size of dwellings to be retained at 200 sq. m.
- Allowed minimum size of lots, which has been very much reduced
- Allowed % coverage by building of lot, which has been increased
- Green cover as we are losing our trees, despite what the Commission says to the contrary
- Overlooking provisions as privacy in greater densification will become a real issue
- Setbacks, since more developments would be allowed to be built with NO setback
- Quality development in the right places, especially as Kaufland will be vacating the site on Anzac Highway
- Ability to enshrine the protection of buildings that matter to the local populace in the Act

Many of your constituents are unaware of the far-reaching consequences of the changes the implementation of the Code will bring, if it is allowed to proceed in its current form.

We currently have a very liveable city but will be left with an unliveable city if this is proceeded with as proposed. Growth and change must happen but we need to value the good things we have, look at those and not lose what we don’t need to lose due to some grand design, which I fail to see how grand it is.

The promises of 2017 have been metamorphosed into something else, into wind tunnels in the suburbs, high density where there is no underlying infrastructure, roads that are not wide enough for the proposed developments. It seems to be town planning gone mad.

In all the Draft Planning and Design Code is not holding out hopes of providing residents with something that will last into the future, that is fair to all stakeholders or appears to provide ecologically sustainable goals. It is not holding out the hope that the wrong building won’t be built in the wrong place.

Please use your vote and influence to prevent this bill from passing in its current form in the Lower House.

Rowena Dunk (Electorate of Dunstan)

Property holder Addison Rd, Black Forest
Notes for Carol and Ken

Campbelltown is a great big SILENCE

However what this means in its new classification as Suburban Neighbourhood

- Low density 1-3 story dwellings
- Multi-use buildings to serve the community so that there businesses, retail, some doctors etc
- Some row housing (will this be an improvement? i.e. terraces
- Wider driveways but narrower garages so that the garage doesn’t monopolise the streetscape
- Possibly less street trees but there are supposed to be more backyard trees as we are supposed to be increasing green cover
- Increased methods of retaining rainfall
- Parks within a given distance of each residence
- Public transport stops within a given distance
- School within a given distance of a residence

This is the ideal but will it come to fruition?

The ideals laid down in 2017 to many complaints have been whittled away with

- Building heights increased
- Setbacks decreased
- Minimum living areas decreased
- Area of block allowed to be covered increased
- Building on property line allowed
- Much more overshadowing
- Privacy issues due to taller buildings and non-necessity of one-way glass
Dear Jayne Stinson,

Re: Removal of Existing Healthy trees in Black Forest & considerations in the People and Neighbourhoods Policy Discussion Paper (DPTI, September 2019)

We live in Black Forest in the electorate of Badcoe and are writing to express our concern about the ongoing loss of existing large trees on private land in recent years that has continued to occur on our street block. This block is bounded by Byron Rd, Gordon Rd, Addison Rd and Canterbury Terrace. In the last three years, at least three large established, and apparently healthy, eucalyptus trees have been cut down on residential properties on our street block.

- Rear of property at 26 Byron Road, Black Forest
- Very large gum tree at the front of the property at 16 Byron Road, Black Forest
- Rear of the property at 5 Gordon Road, Black Forest

In each of these cases we, and other neighbours, only became aware that the trees were being cut down on the day of removal.

The ongoing removal of large trees in Black Forest reduces the amenity of living in our suburb as one of the attractions for us buying into the suburb was the number of established trees around the suburb. And among other factors, the presence of trees has positive environmental and economic benefits (page 1).

With the number of hot days above 35°C predicted to dramatically increase in the future, the reduction of the urban heat island effect (page 58) will become increasingly important. A strategy to achieve this, in addition to new plantings, is not to remove large established and healthy trees, regardless of their species or their location on private properties. The established trees provide shading and evaporative cooling that is unable to be quickly replicated when they are removed. We can attest to this as our maturing garden has been more enjoyable to be in this summer, despite the extraordinary heat, than in previous summers.

The Proposed policy response in the Code within the State Planning Commission’s People And Neighbourhoods Policy Discussion Paper (page 58-59) states that Trees contribute to biodiversity, urban cooling, the character and liveability of our suburbs as well as our physical and mental health, then the policy response does not comment on the need to maintain existing trees on private property. This implies that we could continue to experience rapid loss of established trees in our suburb.

The Proposed Planning and Design Code should include ways to ensure healthy large established trees, regardless of their location, are sufficiently protected with measures such as:
• A council assessment of tree health when removal is being considered.
• Where possible, encouraging pruning rather than removal of trees
• As the benefits of the trees occur regardless of their location on public or private land, these benefits can be monetised to incorporate the amenity and ecological value of the tree. This could be an extension of the Melbourne City Council's Urban Forest Tree Valuations for their public trees.
• Reducing council rates or land tax (where applicable) for properties that maintain significant vegetation such as 25% tree cover on their properties.

We would like you and your party to be aware of this when considering amendments to the Draft Planning and Design Code or other relevant legislation.

Kind Regards,

Andrea Baas & John Hicks
Ms Stinson,

As the State Member for Badcoe, I thought you might be interested in the email that I sent to the DPTI

Despite assurances made by Minister and the Commission chair that the Black Forest/Clarence Park area in the City of Unley would be NOT transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone and that few changes would occur to this area, I see, on the contrary that the proposed changes are significant - so much so that they will change the whole nature of these suburbs.

Indeed the changes are so dramatic that it will make this zone equivalent to one of complete renewal - thus totally negating the reason why people have bought into this area in the first place.

The population could double in a short period of time, street scapes will be forever altered, significant trees - both on properties and on the street scapes could all but disappear and set the tone for this area to become a ghetto of the future.

There would be nothing to stop streets scapes from becoming a series of row houses COMPLETELY AT ODDS WITH THE EFFORT TO ATTENUATE THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE - and making public comfort and sense of well being totally unsustainable by taking away a valued component of leafy suburbs - "leafiness" which, I might add is fast declining whenever developers purchase sizeable blocks in what must reduce the well-being and the pleasure of living in an area with an adequate green canopy.

Particularly disconcerting is the change from 350m² per block to 300m² - or in the case of “row housing” down to 200m². Front setbacks have been halved from the current 10m, and side and back setbacks ARE NON EXISTANT.

If the private open space area is reduced from 20% to 8%, as the sizing of new blocks suggests will happen - what scope will there be for open spaces at all? This is NOT a Greenfield development - there is NO space for public open spaces (The Unley council area has the least open space in the whole metropolitan area).

Road networks and other amenities will be severely stretched. Already cars are parked on suburban streets 24/7 where commuters access trams or trains. What will happen when a unit/house with parking for one car has two vehicles to cater for? Streets will resemble a permanent car park, even more so than they do now!

In summary, I would like to see the submission prepared by the City of Unley that Black Forest and Clarence Park be developed under The Suburban Neighbourhood Zone be supported and accepted, and that individual Councils be allowed to have a say in any proposed and future change - after all, it is the local council which has the immediate knowledge of the character of their area and the ability to consult with their local community.

It would be ridiculous for the State Govt to control all development.... a one fits all policy is totally fallacious and unrealistic if we are to preserve the nature of our suburbs.
Furthermore, I request that the Commission be provided with time to re-visit this policy so that the many errors and omissions to be found in it are adequately explored, rectified and indeed abandoned if necessary.

I cannot see any unexpected and abhorrent developments that might occur as a result of not taking sufficient time to get it right being of any benefit the Govt’s re-election’s chances.... and isn’t that after all the bottom line for all Governments???

Aura Valli

Black Forest
SA 5035
Following several meetings with Cr Don Palmer and after attending the recent public forum at the Clarence Park Community Centre we are fully supportive and endorse the following

Opening Observations
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code.
We live in Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East avenue). Our current zone, under the City of Unley Development Plan RB350 is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone.
Contradicting the assurances of the Minister and the Commission Chair that our zone would be transitioned into the new zone with little or no change the changes to our zone are significant. So significant, that we suggest the two zones simply are not compatible.
The changes are so impactful that they depict the zone in which we live as a zone presenting for complete renewal. Changes that we trust are not intended but which could see our population double in a short period of time.
Differences and the Impact of these differences on Black Forest/Clarence Park.
Not only has the area per dwelling changed from 350m2 to 300m2, (or down to 200m2 for row housing), setbacks have been drastically changed. The front setbacks have been effectively halved, 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. They will impact seriously on the visual amenity of the adjacent neighbours for years to come creating streetscapes of conflict rather than the harmony that exists now.
Side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This is surely in error. Such if included in the final draft will see the current spaciousness of our suburb disappear. Potentially streets could become a series of row housing.
The current zoning does allow a 2 for 1 redevelopment of the average site in Black Forest/Clarence Park. The changes that the draft indicates would allow for most sites a 3 for 1 redevelopment opportunity. In many cases, particularly corner sites, this grows to 4 for 1, or more. We trust the Government/the Commission is not intent on seeing a whole suburb with 3 houses on each property.
Such redevelopment potential will artificially increase the value of most properties in Black Forest/Clarence Park.
Affordability, for other than developers, will result as properties that are currently within the reach of the average person, will no longer be affordable.
This 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 plentiful.
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.
Overlooking restrictions have been reduced from 1.7m cill height on 2nd floor windows to 1.5m cill heights. An average height person can see over a cill height of 1.5m with ease, effectively eliminating the effort to minimise overlooking.
Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% will see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

**Summary**
The General Neighbourhood Zone has no numerical variation overlay. 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.

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. That, in so doing the current RB350 numerical values be used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay.

**Council as a preferred driver of Development Policy into the future**
We 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 have.

This is currently being demonstrated with the City of Unley’s in depth analysis of what appears to be a draft Code full of errors and omissions. An analysis without which the new Code potentially would have been so disastrous as to destroy the amenity of the suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular our suburb. Likewise in their leading the Development Plan Amendment in the Life Care, Norman Terrace Precinct.

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

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.

**Finally**
We trust the intention of the Government is not for the RB350 zone to be a regeneration zone, that it was meant to be transitioned like for like. If this is the case then the numerical discrepancies noted in our submission are in error, and not deliberate.

If in error, this may reflect that the Commission is under severe pressure to put this mammoth exercise together in the time frame the parliament has decreed.

We ask the Parliament to provide the Commission with an extension of time to ensure that errors and omissions do not see their way through to actual development. Any resultant and unexpected abhorrent development that might occur as a result of not taking our time to get it right will surely impact on the Government’s re-election chances.

Leigh and Sandra Mortimer
Clarence Park SA 5034
Mob. [redacted]
Email. [redacted]
Dear Jayne,

For your consideration, I am resending you my letter of January 8th regarding zoning for Clarence Park (west) 5034. Thank you.

January 8th

TO: HON JAYNE STINSON, MP
   Member for Badcoe

RE: Proposed SA Planning & Design Code Clarence Park West/Black Forest

Hello,

I am a resident and property owner in Clarence Park West (2A Lorraine Ave). I am writing to object to the proposed zoning changes which will transition my neighbourhood currently zoned as RB350 to a new “General Neighbourhood” zone. I request that the proposed zoning change be reviewed and that Clarence Park (west) be transitioned into a “Suburban zone” and treated the same as our neighbouring Unley suburbs of Clarence Park (East), Goodwood and Millswood.

The review is requested because:

1. A change from RB350 to “General Neighbourhood” will result in significant changes to the numerical parameters of the existing RB350 code. Alternatively, a shift to “Suburban Neighbourhood” would result in Clarence Park (west) retaining the numerical recommendations as currently exist in the RB350 zoning.

2. The established Clarence Park and Black Forest precincts (with their 800m2 – 1,000m2 sites) are inappropriately being considered as being compatible to newer developed areas (with 350m2-500m2 sites) such as Seaford Meadows, in the South, Hewett, Blakeview and Walkley Heights north of Gawler.
3. The numerical parameters of the draft code have the potential to allow substantial replacement of existing housing stock. Under the parameters of the new code recommended block size will be reduced from the current 350 m² to 300 m² or even 200 m² in the case of row dwellings. Additionally, under “General Neighbourhood” recommended heights will be substantially increased; setbacks, open space and overlooking parameters will be significantly reduced. Such changes will result in a loss of trees, open spaces and amenity for the long-standing residents of this zone.

4. Currently there are just under 1,000 houses in the Clarence Park/ Black Forest precinct. Both the current RB350 and the new “Suburban Neighbourhood” classification allow for a potential extra 500 homes or 800 people to accommodate population growth in this area. However, under the “General Neighbourhood” code there is the potential for an extra 800 plus homes over time, or 1,000 plus people in this small suburban area.

We trust this was not expected by the Minister or the Department and request that Clarence Park and Black Forest be treated as our neighbouring suburbs have been and be classified “Suburban Neighbourhood” not as “General Neighbourhood” and retain the same numerical recommendations and potential population growth as currently exist.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards,

Rachel Bradley
Clarence Park, SA 5034
TEL:

From: Rachel Bradley
Date: Wednesday, 8 January 2020 at 11:57 AM
To: <badcoe@parliament.sa.gov.au>
Subject: ZONING 5034 CLARENCE PARK

Please consider my request as outlined in the attached letter. Thank you

Rachel Bradley
Tel:
To the Honourable Stephan Knoll MP, Minister for Planning,

I urge you to reconsider the current changes to the Planning and Design Code for the suburbs of Black Forest and Clarence Park, residing within the City of Unley Council. We are a character suburb dating back to the late 1800’s. We have the popular Princess Margaret Playground located near the Clarence Park Railway Station, and is a very popular playground for local and surrounding residents. We also have the highly respected Black Forest Primary School, opened in 1919, and the highly regarded Clarence Park Community Centre. We are strong community minded suburbs, active, and cohesive suburbs who value each other and our suburbs character.

Black Forest and Clarence Park are historical suburbs built predominantly with character homes of the 1920’ and 1930’s. We have leafy streets with well-maintained beautiful character homes in excellent condition, due to the pride the local residents of both suburbs. Our larger trees, Blue and Red Gums, Native Grey-box with Sheoak Trees dominate our suburbs.

In summary we are established suburbs, owned by proud South Australians, and wish to ensure the character and integrity of our suburbs are maintained. Our suburbs are not greenfield sites, or sites that have changed their zone, and should be respected.

The proposed changes to ‘General Neighbourhood’ are out of step to all the neighbouring suburbs of the City of Unley. All our surrounding suburbs are zoned as ‘Suburban Neighbourhood’, and to ensure consistency and respect, Black Forest and Clarence Park should also be zoned as ‘Suburban Neighbourhood’ with the same numerical recommendations as exists, which was assured by you Minister there would be no changes. General Neighbourhood zoning are more appropriate to ‘greenfield sites’, or suburbs where wholesale zoning has significantly changed, for example Bowden and Lightsview.

Black Forest and Clarence Park are not a Bowden or Lightsview, and should not be considered in the same code.

I urge you Minister to;

1. Reconsider the proposed zoning for Black Forest and Clarence Park to reflect all neighbouring suburbs from ‘General Neighbourhood’ to ‘Suburban Neighbourhood’.
2. To delay the implementation of the Code as per Mark Parnell’s Bill before Parliament to ensure you Minister and your Department the appropriate time to document and scrutiny any further changes to eliminate any errors in this significant change.

Respectfully yours,

Julie de Ruyter
Black Forest SA 5035

Phone: [redacted]

CC emailed to:

Member for Unley; Honourable David Pisoni MP

Member for Badcoe; Honourable Jayne Stinson MP

Opposition Leader; Honourable Peter Malinauskas MP

DPTI Planning Reform Submissions.
January 8th

TO:  HON JAYNE STINSON, MP
      Member for Badcoe

RE: Proposed SA Planning & Design Code Clarence Park West/Black Forest

Hello,
I am a resident and property owner in Clarence Park West (2A Lorraine Ave). I am writing to object to the proposed zoning changes which will transition my neighbourhood currently zoned as RB350 to a new “General Neighbourhood” zone. I request that the proposed zoning change be reviewed and that Clarence Park (west) be transitioned into a “Suburban zone” and treated the same as our neighbouring Unley suburbs of Clarence Park (East), Goodwood and Millswood.

The review is requested because:
1. A change from RB350 to “General Neighbourhood” will result in significant changes to the numerical parameters of the existing RB350 code. Alternatively, a shift to “Suburban Neighbourhood” would result in Clarence Park (west) retaining the numerical recommendations as currently exist in the RB350 zoning.

2. The established Clarence Park and Black Forest precincts (with their 800m2 – 1,000m2 sites) are inappropriately being considered as being compatible to newer developed areas (with 350m2-500m2 sites) such as Seaford Meadows, in the South, Hewett, Blakeview and Walkley Heights north of Gawler.

3. The numerical parameters of the draft code have the potential to allow substantial 3 for 1 replacement of existing housing stock. Under the parameters of the new code recommended block size will be reduced from the current 350 m2 to 300 m2 or even 200 m2 in the case of row dwellings. Additionally, under “General Neighbourhood” recommended heights will be substantially increased; setbacks, open space and overlooking parameters will be significantly reduced. Such changes will result in a loss of trees, open spaces and amenity for the long-standing residents of this zone.

4. Currently there are just under 1,000 houses in the Clarence Park/ Black Forest precinct. Both the current RB350 and the new “Suburban Neighbourhood” classification allow for a potential extra 500 homes or 800 people to accommodate population growth in this area. However, under the “General Neighbourhood” code there is the potential for an extra 800 plus homes over time, or 1,000 plus people in this small suburban area.

We trust this was not expected by the Minister or the Department and request that Clarence Park and Black Forest be treated as our neighbouring suburbs have been and be
classified “Suburban Neighbourhood” not as “General Neighbourhood” and retain the same numerical recommendations and potential population growth as currently exist.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards,

Rachel Bradley
Clarence Park, SA 5034
TEL: [REDACTED]
Dear Jayne Stimson,

Please find attached copy of a submission I’ve sent into the State Planning Commission. I am very concerned at the process of consultation, the state of the draft Code, and what is proposed for this area. I wonder if I could make a time to meet with you to discuss this please?

The draft Code (in total the text component is 3,031 pages, noting the Unley Council Specific Code Extract is 995 pages) was released on 1 October 2019, together with on-line access to a Consultation Map Viewer to interpret the spatial application of zones.

Additionally, an Update Report (30 pages), Historic Area Statements (in total 368 pages and for Unley area 62 pages) and Code Updated Classification Tables (2,200 pages) were released on 23 December 2019. This supplementary material is intended to highlight some of the Commission’s proposed improvements to the Code following initial feedback and to provide additional information and corrections.

It is a total nightmare trying to find relevant information on line, and most people have no idea what is pending. Those that do care, have great trouble in accessing relevant information.

My attached letter outlines some of my concerns, which are much wider than just where I live. But I hope you can consider supporting my submission in Parliament when the Upper House bill to extend the time for the Code to be activated on the 1st July to enable the Minister to ensure the Code is ready for use comes before the Lower House, The Liberals will be unlikely to support it.

In its current state, the pending system including the Code is totally dysfunctional.

Kind Regards
and hope to hear from you my number is

Dr Iris Iwanicki
Life Fellow, Planning Institute of Australia,
PhD, M. Env, Law, GDTP, BA, Accredited Planner, MICOMOS,

Begin forwarded message:

From: Iris Iwanicki
Subject: Submission regarding Phase 3 - with reference to proposed zoning of Black Forest and Clarence Park/Gardens
Date: 26 January 2020 at 9:40:20 am ACDT
To: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au
Hi please find above my submission for Phase 3
thanks
Dr Iris Iwanicki
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning and Design Code.

I have lived in the suburb of Black Forest for 25 years, and I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes in zoning in Black Forest and Clarence Park to a General Neighbourhood Zone.

There is currently significant development and infill taking place, single residences are being demolished and replaced by 2 dwellings which is understandable and acceptable in line with our current (low) population growth. However residents do NOT want this increasing to 3 or 4 dwellings on one block, as will happen with the proposed zone change.

From a heritage perspective, Black Forest and Clarence Park has many beautiful and solidly built, bungalows and villas, similar to those in the rest of Unley Council. These houses have historical value and they also create many jobs in the restoration, maintenance and extension of these homes. We need to recognize and encourage the economic value of old houses, instead of only the economic value of new builds. The proposed changes in zoning will only encourage more knocking down of these lovely old homes.

Like most of Unley Council, Black Forest and Clarence Park already has very little public green space, and increasing the density of houses will significantly decrease the amount of trees on private property and also the number of street trees. This in turn will increase air temperatures, decrease wildlife and biodiversity, reduce the visual amenity and negatively impact the health of residents. (There are many scientific studies on the mental and physical health benefits of green space.)

Traffic and parking is already problematic in these suburbs. Increasing the numbers of dwellings will significantly increase the number of vehicles in our narrow streets, causing safely issues on the roads and footpaths, and conflicts between neighbours regarding parking.

I am opposed to the increase in width of carports from 30% to 50% of frontage. Similarly, I am opposed to the reduction in setbacks from 10m to 5m. Visually this is particularly ugly, and leaves little space for front gardens and trees, and also reduces privacy.

The issue of an unwanted zone change is only one of many problems with the new Planning and Design Code. I support the five proposals by the Eastern Region alliance of six councils, including Unley, in regards to Heritage, High Density Interface, Tree Canopy and Code Amendments.

I also believe that Parliament should provide the Commission with an extension of time, as it is clear that the Planning and Design Code is simply not ready to be implemented on 1 July 2020.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Hubmayer
Good evening

We are writing to advise of our concerns with the proposed SA Government Planning and Design Code and its adverse impact on the suburb of Black Forest within the City of Unley and seek your support in addressing the anomaly as outlined in my consultation submission to DPTI below.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Kind Regards

Emma and Chris Hosking

Black Forest

| M: |

From: Emma Hosking
Sent: Monday, 20 January 2020 10:28 PM
To: 'DPTI.PlanningEngagement@sa.gov.au' <DPTI.PlanningEngagement@sa.gov.au>
Subject: Consultation SA Government Planning & Design Code - feedback and concerns

Good evening

I am writing to lodge my feedback and concerns and request that the Government address the negative impact on the inner city suburb of Black Forest within the City of Unley.

I understand the intent was to adopt the principle of “like for like” in transitioning to the State Government legislation and Code. I would like to draw your attention to the following changes of significant concern which are not “like for like” and I believe will promote overdevelopment and adversely impact on the unique positive and vibrant heritage, character and community within Black Forest.

My concerns regarding the changes in the single Planning and Design Code relates to the change in zoning the suburb of Black Forest from the current RB350 zone to General Neighbourhood zone. They include:
• Decrease of minimum size for development from 350m² to 300m² (which in reality could be less than this in application). This has the potential to allow substantial 3 for 1 replacement of the existing housing stock.

• While Black Forest did not have specific historic preservation or character overlays, the existing numeric criteria protected many of the character bungalows from development and preserved the character of our return service era bungalow community.

• All our surrounding neighbourhood zones which are similar and in some cases different councils have maintained their existing numeric criteria zoned as Suburban Neighbourhood rather than a decrease with General Neighbourhood. Black Forest should be the same.

• The zoning proposed is classifying us similarly to outer Adelaide suburbs of completely different character.

• Use of Private Certifiers to approve applications, who will be driven by contractual and revenue focussed KPIs rather than the delivering on the philosophy and intent of the Code and governing legislation.

I respectfully but strongly request that the Government considers amending the Code to zone Black Forest into the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone like every neighbouring suburb surrounding us.

Given the significant size and complexity of the Code, I would also strongly request that consideration is given to delaying implementation of the Code to allow the Minister and his Department to ensure errors and omissions are adequately addressed.

Yours faithfully

Emma Hosking

Black Forest
Dear Ms Jayne Stinson MP,

My wife and I are writing to you with regards to the proposed planning and design code changes that are scheduled to occur on the first of July 2020.

In April 2019, we moved into [redacted], Black Forest. The house is a late 1920's Californian style bungalow on 697m2 and is surrounded by a street full of other houses of a similar period and beautiful jacaranda trees. The zone is currently classified by the Unley Council as RB350 (residential, 2 story, 350m2 minimum) and is one of the primary reasons why we chose to move here. This current zoning permits development to increase urban density to sustain population growth but limits the impacts to the surrounding streetscape.

As part of the revised planning code, we have noticed that the proposed changes have zoned Black Forest as a General Neighbourhood. Under this classification, the minimum size block will reduce from 350m2 for all site areas to 200m2 for row dwellings and 300m2 for detached and semi-detached dwellings.

We are concerned that this level of increased density will:

- diminish the surrounding streetscape amenity, with the removal of established street trees to accommodate additional driveways and new building frontages and heights that don't suit the neighbouring properties. Due to our smaller block size we also have the potential to be ringfenced by a greater level of smaller shoe box developments as neighbouring properties are bigger than ours.
- increase the surface rainfall catchment area, as the maximum roof surface area will increase from 50% of the property area to 60% of a property area. Not only will this increased catchment area put pressure on the states inadequate stormwater system but will also change the soil moisture patterns for the suburb. This change in soil moisture locations can then result in existing older buildings sustaining new damage (movement and salt damp) and could cause more water pipes to break due to new sections of the network being exposed to changes in different soil movement loadings.
- Increase pressure loads on street parking. We have noticed that most areas zoned as general neighbourhood are newer suburbs and have a larger road surface to land parcel ratio, which can accommodate off-street parking. However, we feel that the street parking in Black Forest is at its limit. Many of the roads are used by southern suburb daily commuters to shortcut in and out of the city, or by public transport commuters to park near train and tram stations. As a result, to drive in and out of the street is difficult already and would only get worse when South Road is upgraded, and South Road traffic is moved onto East Terrace. We hope that this is considered as part of the future road upgrade.
When looking at the planning maps, we have noticed that the suburb of Black Forest has been zoned as General Neighbourhood, yet many surrounding suburbs including, Glandore, Forestville, Millswood, Clarence Park, Cumberland Park, Clarence Gardens and Daw Park have been zoned as Suburban Neighbourhoods. This zoning for Black Forest does not look logical to us and we seek that it be reviewed. If there are reasons why then we would be keen to understand it before the consultation period is finished in February so that we can respond as part of the consultation period.

As a preference we are writing to request that we keep our RB350 zone, or as a minimum, be zoned like the surrounding suburbs as General Neighbourhoods, with numeric overlay to determine minimum land size allotments. This will then limit the development impact but will still provide flexibility for future state growth.

We hope that this oversight can be addressed through the consultation process and rectified before the planning submission takes place in July 2020.

Regards
Michael and Lucy Nicholas
[Redacted], Black Forest 5035
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new *Planning & Design Code, Phase 3*.

**Background**

I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality suburb.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

**Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!**

Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) is being transitioned into the *General Neighbourhood Zone*. This transition is *Not “like for like”* and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350, which are being transitioned into the *Suburban Neighbourhood Zone*.


**Proposed Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration**

I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

*Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Hon. Stephan Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.*

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

**Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park**

The main contentious differences are:

1. **Dwelling Size.** The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350sqm to 300sqm, while row dwellings are being set at 200sqm. This will accelerate the rate of land subdivision and lead to an *unsustainable* increase in the number of dwellings.

2. **Setbacks.** The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.

3. **Privacy.** The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals in their own property and impact family life.

4. **Sustainability.** The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open green spaces. This will drastically *increase urban heat*, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.

5. **Street Canopy.** There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way for new driveway access, again drastically increasing urban heat.

6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will *strain established infrastructure*. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, restricted street
parking, under resourced utilities, NBN congestion, local school capacity saturated with increased enrolment demand, etc.).

To summarise, it is clear from the above points that **Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) will be severely affected by the proposed changes**. This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephan Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.

Lastly, I would make a special request that you note, and advise the Minister Stephan Knoll, of my concern regarding the short timeframe around these proposals. I believe the implementation should be delayed to allow for detailed consideration of submissions and a further opportunity to comment on the revised Planning and Design code.

Mary-Ann Kennedy

Black Forest SA 5035
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

I live in Black Forest, currently zoned as RB350. It is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

I object to the proposed transition of Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is NOT “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs currently zoned RB350 also, and which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood zones. The proposal will have a detrimental impact on Black Forest and part of Clarence Park, all within the Unley Council area.

I am concerned that the current RB350 zoning for this area will be fundamentally changed under the proposed General Neighbourhood Zone classification. I understand most of the residential areas of Unley are expected to be transitioned "like for like", which are most closely related to the proposed Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, thus retaining existing 350sqm minimum block sizes. Row dwellings of 200sqm are completely inappropriate for Black Forest, causing adverse strain on established infrastructure, reducing tree cover and increasing urban heat.

I propose that our current RB350 zone be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, consistent with the proposed zoning of our surrounding suburbs (such as, Clarence Gardens, Cumberland Park, Forestville and most of Clarence Park).

Lastly, I would make a special request that you note, and advise the Minister Stephan Knoll, of my concern regarding the short timeframe around these proposals. I believe the implementation should be delayed to allow for detailed consideration of submissions and a further opportunity to comment on the revised planning and design code.

Regards

Michael Kennedy
Black Forest SA 5035
19 February 2020
Ms Jayne Stinson

I would like to take the opportunity to comment on the proposed new Planning & Design Code.

I live in Clarence Park (west of East avenue). My current zone, under the City of Unley Development Plan RB350 is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone.

Contradicting the assurances of the Minister and the Commission Chair that our zone would be transitioned into the new zone with little or no change the changes to my zone are significant. So significant, that I suggest the two zones simply are not compatible.

The changes are so impactful that they depict the zone in which I live as a zone presenting for complete renewal. Changes that I trust are not intended but which could see our population double in a short period of time.

**Differences and the Impact of these differences on Black Forest/Clarence Park.**

Not only has the area per dwelling changed from 350m² to 300m², (or down to 200m² for row housing), setbacks have been drastically changed. The front setbacks have been effectively halved, 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. They will impact seriously on the visual amenity of the adjacent neighbours for years to come creating streetscapes of conflict rather than the harmony that exists now.

Side and rear setbacks do not exist in the draft. This is surely in error. Such if included in the final draft will see the current spaciousness of our suburb disappear. Potentially streets could become a series of row housing.

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

Such redevelopment potential will artificially increase the value of most properties in Black Forest/Clarence Park. Affordability, for other than developers, will result as properties that are currently within the reach of the average person, will no longer be affordable.

This 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 plentiful.

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.
Overlooking restrictions have been reduced from 1.7m cill height on 2nd floor windows to 1.5m cill heights. An average height person can see over a cill height of 1.5m with ease, effectively eliminating the effort to minimise overlooking.

Increasing the width of carports from 30% of the frontage of the site to 50% will see carports/garages dominate the streetscape.

**Summary**
The General Neighbourhood Zone has no numerical variation overlay.

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.

My 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. That, in so doing the current RB350 numerical values be used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay.

**Council as a preferred driver of Development Policy into the future**
I 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 have.

This is currently being demonstrated with the City of Unley’s in depth analysis of what appears to be a draft Code full of errors and omissions. An analysis without which the new Code potentially would have been so disastrous as to destroy the amenity of the suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular my suburb. Likewise in their leading the Development Plan Amendment in the Life Care, Norman Terrace Precinct.

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

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.

**Finally**
I trust the intention of the Government is not for the RB350 zone to be a regeneration zone, that it was meant to be transitioned like for like. If this is the case then the numerical discrepancies noted in my submission are in error, and not deliberate.

If in error, this may reflect that the Commission is under severe pressure to put this mammoth exercise together in the time frame the parliament has decreed.
I ask the Parliament to provide the Commission with an extension of time to ensure that errors and omissions do not see their way through to actual development. Any resultant and unexpected abhorrent development that might occur as a result of not taking our time to get it right will surely impact on the Government’s re-election chances.

Regards,
Paul Bradley
Clarence Park
Mobile: 

---
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I would like to register my objections to the proposed new Planning & Design Code, Phase 3.

Background
I live in Black Forest, which is home to a community of middle income professional, and business families who have invested their savings to live in a quality area.

As per the current City of Unley Development Plan, our zone is defined as RB350.

Proposed New Planning & Design Code – A fundamental change for Black Forest!
Under the proposed new Planning & Design Code, the current RB350 zoning for Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park is being transitioned into the General Neighbourhood Zone. This transition is Not “like for like” and is at odds with our surrounding suburbs, currently zoned RB350 also, which are being transitioned into Suburban Neighbourhood Zones (1).


Proposed Amendment to the Change to Black Forest Zoning, Submitted For Consideration
I propose that Black Forest/Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) be transitioned to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone, with the current RB350 numerical values being used for the Technical Numerical Variation overlay, as supported by the City of Unley submission.

Note: This proposal is consistent with the proposed new zoning of surrounding suburbs and provides a transition with little change, as pre-empted by Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Such a proposed amendment will ensure a “like for like” transition into the new zoning arrangements and would address most of the contentious issues described below.

Impacts of Proposed New Zone on Black Forest/Clarence Park/Everard Park
The main contentious differences are:

1. Dwelling Size. The dwelling footprint is being reduced from 350m2 to 300m2. This will accelerate the rate of land subdivisions and lead to an unsustainable increase in the number of dwellings.
2. Setbacks. The front setbacks have been halved, from 10m to 5m. The side and rear setbacks have been left out of the proposal, leading to uncontrolled and controversial developments.
3. Privacy. The proposed decrease of sill height from 1.7m to 1.5m will erode further the privacy of individuals and impact family life.
4. Sustainability. The increased housing density will accelerate, impacting on liveability and sustainability by reducing tree cover and private open spaces. This will drastically increase urban heat, impacting further on quality of life. The City of Unley already has the least amount of public open space in the whole metropolitan area.
5. Street Appearance. There will be a growing pressure to remove street trees to make way to new garages access and carports, again increasing urban heat.
6. **Serviceability.** A population explosion will strain established infrastructure. Any upgrades required to accommodate the increased population density would be very onerous and extremely difficult to provide within the confines of the existing landscape (traffic flow in traditionally narrow streets, street parking, provision of utilities, NBN capacity, etc.).

To summarise, it is clear from the above points that **Black Forest, Clarence Park (west of East Avenue) and part of Everard Park will be severely affected by the proposed changes.** This is in contradiction to the assurances of Hon Stephen Knoll, Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, that the transition to the new zoning will occur with little or no change.

*Regards*

*Andrew Bartlett*

*BLACK FOREST 5035*