
From: Barbara Clayton [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 4 October 2018 9:02 AM
To: DPTI:Planning Engagement
Subject: CONSULTATION: DRAFT STATE PLANNING POLICIES FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA - late submission

Firstly, my apologies for the lateness of this submission. I was not even aware of this process until speaking to a planning officer at a recent ER&D Court hearing which we both attended, and so I have done some research and now feel able to respond with a degree of knowledge.

Prior to last year I had no interest or knowledge of urban planning. That was until the public notification by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield of a proposal by Michael Calabro Pty Ltd to build a 6 storey, 61 apartment building at the corner of Kintore Avenue and [360 Prospect Rd, Kilburn](#). This is about 200 metres from my home.

Within days of the public notification, local residents were discussing this proposal with concerns and we all wondered why Council would even consider allowing such a development.

Now, of course, I understand the planning system much better, and know what is involved, but regardless of my understanding of the system, I am still opposed to this proposal and have joined myself to ER&D Court proceedings against the developer's appeal against refusal by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield DAP last year.

Hence, my reference to discussing planning policy above, and this submission.

After having read the CONSULTATION: DRAFT STATE PLANNING POLICIES FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA, I was appalled by some of its contents.

I do not pretend to know everything about urban planning, but I am seriously concerned by some of what is being proposed.

My concerns about individual policies and my suggested amendments are below.

1. Policy 1 Page 21 refers to *Middle Suburbs and Masterplanned Communities* as "medium density". Middle suburbs encompasses a large proportion of metro Adelaide, much of which have character zoning for a reason. Change to "Defined local areas needing regeneration and masterplanned communities".

2. Policy 1 Page Page 22 "...reduced car parking..."
Current urban consolidation and recent DPA changes have intensified a massive increase in on street car parking with no evidence of an increase in public transport usage or bicycle usage (apart from Bowden development due to tram). Local suburbs are clogged with more cars on their streets than ever.
Delete "less car parking".

3. Policy 1 Page 22 "predominately low to medium rise city"
NO. Adelaide, is a predominately low rise city, and I acknowledge the need for urban consolidation, but turning large areas of suburbia into 6 storeys is not the way to IMPROVE the city, especially with the opposition of the population.
Delete the word "medium".

4. Policy 2 Page 25 "Design Standards should be developed over time..."

No, Design Standards should be developed now and become part of the Design and Planning Code or where they are legally enforceable.

Change to reflect this.

5. Policy 8 Page 36 "Permissive and enabling..."small lot housing and aged care accommodation" implies enforcing infill especially for aged care accommodation. One of the very reasons people want to stay in their own homes is that most aged care accommodation is rack them, pack them and stack them and lacking natural surroundings or sufficient open space for residents. It is more like a prison.

Delete "Permissive and enabling" and "small lot".

6. Policy 11 Page 51 discusses encouraging non-car related transport usage. The private car will continue to be the vehicle of choice for most Australians until governments spend big money to make alternatives more attractive both economically and convenience wise. It seems planning policy is being used to make car use inconvenient - this simply annoys people and gives the planning industry a bad name.

Change wording to include "provision of new and improved transport infrastructure to encourage decreased usage of private motor vehicles."

I am also concerned with the lack of reference to public notification or involvement overall, a worrying trend in planning in SA. If changes are so desirable then the community should be brought on board via education rather than exclusion.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission.

Barbara Clayton

[Redacted signature block]