From the office of the Mayor  
City of Onkaparinga

18 February 2019

Alison Collins, Project Lead  
Integrated Movement Systems Discussion Paper  
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

via email: DPTI.PlanningEngagement@sa.gov.au

Dear Alison

**Update on Submission on Integrated Movement Systems**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback through this submission on the Integrated Movement Systems Policy Discussion Paper.

Further to the council administration submission dated 3 December 2018, Council at its Strategic Directions Committee meeting held 5 February 2019 approved the submission subject to the following amendment:

- delete the following statement from page 4 (page 90 of the agenda) of the draft submission prepared in response to the Integrated Movement Systems Policy Discussion Paper:

  'Onkaparinga contains three airstrips; Aldinga Airfield (located within the Primary Production Zone) with two (smaller) airstrips at Seaford Meadows and Clarendon (CFS). Aldinga Airfield has a predominantly recreational/tourism focus and offers a range of specialist aviation service including scenic and aerobatic joy flights, charter flights and a light aircraft flying school'.

We ask that you acknowledge this resolution as Council’s formal position on the Integrated Movement Systems Policy Discussion Paper. A revised submission reflecting the above is attached.

**Submission on Integrated Movement Systems**

We commend the Department on developing the blueprint for South Australia’s Planning and Design Code (the Code), and in particular furthering the integration of land use and transport. The Discussion Paper has rightly focused on the role the Code can play in achieving optimal land use and development outcomes that complement and support the function of all transport modes.
With continued population growth, urbanisation, and increased congestion how we manage the way people move around their environment is of great importance to create healthy, liveable and affordable places to live, work and play.

We note the Discussion Paper suggests a number of improvements that the Department would like to make through the first Code transition. The nature of these changes are supported however without seeing the amended policy, it is not possible to provide an informed position or constructive feedback.

We further note the Department has identified some areas for more significant reform in relation to contemporary mixed use zoning and policy to consider the emergence of disruptive auto based technologies.

Introducing new contemporary mixed use zoning is supported and the current zone modules provided an appropriate starting point. However, the critical consideration is in the application of the right zone in the right location based on access to quality public transport. That said greater investment to provide frequent, quality public transport is required together with quality urban environments that enable walking and cycling as alternative modes of transport.

Whilst we support the intent of the Discussion Paper, we feel it has a city-centric focus, both in terms of destinations and travel behaviours. The Code needs to recognise the differences between urban, suburban and regional areas. A ‘one size fits all’ is not going to provide adequate transport policy in suburban and peri-urban / regional areas.

There are more than 172,000 people living in the City of Onkaparinga, and this is set to grow. More than half our working population (some 40,000 plus people) leave our city to travel to work. Less than 20 per cent (8,860) of our residents travel to Adelaide for work. Working residents travelling by train and bus is 1,011 and 1,511 respectively.

An increased population will require more diverse forms of housing and better utilisation of our existing housing areas, centres and remaining large development sites together with integrated transport and movement providing equitable access and choice of transport for our communities.

Policy alone will not achieve the desired outcomes of integrated land use and transport; a commitment and delivery of improved funding and provision of quality frequent services must also occur.

Our letter highlights matters of importance to council generally. The comments below summarise some of the more detailed comments enclosed in the attached analysis table.

**THEME 1: Aligning South Australia’s growth with transport infrastructure**

Land use policies must be coupled with transportation investment policies and programs to be successful and support behavioural change to encourage people to use public transport.
THEME 2: Capitalising on strategic transport infrastructure

Overlays within the Planning and Design Code can protect strategic transport infrastructure however this must be supported by appropriate policy.

THEME 3: Sustainable mobility, car parking and the impact of technology

Cities in transition are being shaped by emergent technologies, and planning policy should set out clear prioritisation criteria that encourage active transport methods. New technologies potentially offer reduced car parking demand whilst providing greater mobility choice for people. Planning policy can set the direction but all tiers of government need to participate.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss the matters raised in our submission or provide further explanation.

Should you have further questions, please contact Craig Jones, Development Policy Planner on [redacted] or email [redacted].

Yours sincerely

Erin Thompson
Mayor

enc. Integrated Movement Systems Submission Analysis Table (revised 5 February 2019)
# INTEGRATED MOVEMENT SYSTEMS

## SUBMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Questions</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Suggested Policy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME 1: Aligning South Australia’s growth with transport infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 How can the Code better respond to the differences in public transport availability in urban and regional communities?</td>
<td>Cities require fast, efficient, reliable and accessible public transport networks, integrated with various forms of active travel, in order to be sustainable. Early planning of public transport services, including local bus services is critical and should be a key element that defines the structure of new neighbourhoods and revitalisation of areas that support medium density development. A ‘one size fits all’ is not going to provide adequate policy to deal with the variances in travel modes and trip purpose between urban, suburban and regional areas. The Code needs to be written to recognise the differences – this can be done by setting out different modules specifically addressing these differences. Promotion of an increase of densities in mixed use activity centres with quality public transport to create the necessity of critical mass for public transport viability. Dwellings in proximity to major transport corridors need to be designed in a manner that ensures a quality living experience. With evolving new transport technologies,</td>
<td>Land use policies must be coupled with transportation investment policies and programs to be successful. Support behavioural change to encourage people to use public transport. Public transport modal interchanges - fixed public transport routes combined in a single, stable network, bound together by opportunities for quick and convenient transfers (rail supported by Go Zones / rapid bus network). In regional areas, high-frequency routes are rarely an option, so services must instead be timed to connect at selected hubs (e.g. linking McLaren Vale to Seaford train line). A variable car parking ratio that recognises the progressive lack of quality public transport options as the distance increase from the Adelaide CBD and other Activity Centres. There is a need to develop other incentives for people to choose to use public transport especially relative to other modes • prioritise public transport in traffic management (e.g. priority bus lanes) • provide more cross region public transport links</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Discussion Questions** | **Response** | **Suggested Policy Direction**
--- | --- | ---
combined with changes to the way we work, how we socialise and shop, we also need to consider the changing nature of major transport corridors. Where we introduce such changes, we need to understand the impacts of reduced traffic on the activity centres in these areas. Main South Road (through O’Halloran Hill to Morphett Vale) prior to the Southern Expressway was the major transport corridor and is one such example where the impacts of changes have not been reviewed.

- have public transport planned and established to support new developments from the beginning.

Critical mass to support nodal and corridor development – increase the proportion of the population who live within the existing urban area where access to local services and facilities is more readily available through short walking, cycling and public transport trips.

Focus on revitalising key activity centres and increasing densities in and around to promote:

- accessibility to services
- walkable neighbourhoods
- high quality public realm
- integration with public transport
- creating destinations.

Key design principles should include:

- paths should be separated from traffic, direct and of sufficient width (particularly if the path is shared by pedestrians and cyclists)
- provide landscaping and street furniture for shade, comfort and street enclosure
- pedestrian crossings should be conspicuous and clearly indicate where
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Questions</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Suggested Policy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pedestrians can cross e.g. include zebra crossings, use of colour or raised pavement to delineate pedestrian priority spaces</td>
<td>• main pedestrian routes and public transport stops should be well lit, have good visibility and be DDA compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• car parking spaces for the mobility impaired should be very close to interchange entrances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• maps and way-finding signage should set out key destinations, including public transport stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• public transport, walking and cycling routes should connect to the heart of an area and be as close as possible to services and public spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pedestrian and cyclist access to public transport should be convenient and direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- similarly, access between bus, rail and tram should be direct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings in proximity to transport corridors should be required to provide better insulation, double or triple glazed windows, and cross ventilation to reduce the adverse effects of adjoining traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate investigations should be undertaken to inform the zone module</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Questions</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Suggested Policy Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 How should planning policy balance the need for airports in strategic locations against the impact of these facilities on adjacent land owners?</td>
<td>Major airports are critical infrastructure that underpins the success of a modern economy in a globalised world. Main South Road, Victor Harbor Road and the Southern Expressway are the major strategic routes within the City of Onkaparinga. Airports (and airfields) and transport routes can create noise and air pollution which have a detrimental impact on surrounding properties. An appropriate scale and considerate and careful management of existing airfields will reduce potential conflicts. We are optimistic that through the adoption of electric vehicles over the coming 20-50 years that road noise and air pollution will</td>
<td>The Code should ensure that dwellings built under flight paths are designed to minimise the impact of noise from aircrafts. Major transport facilities and strategic transport routes should be shown on overlays within the Planning and Design Code supported by appropriate policy to manage the interface and potential conflicts. Every effort should be made to accommodate strategic infrastructure, while maintaining minimum levels of quality of life for affected residents – this applies to sea, rail or air infrastructure. The Code needs to ensure that large new greenfield developments comprehensively model the traffic impacts on the surrounding existing road network, including state and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 How can the Code work to protect the operation of major transport facilities whilst managing the impacts on adjacent development opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 How can planning policy better manage and minimise the impacts of transport corridors on surrounding development (i.e. noise and air pollution for residents)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THEME 2: Capitalising on strategic transport infrastructure**

### 2.1 Strategic Transport Facilities
**INTEGRATED MOVEMENT SYSTEMS**

**SUBMISSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Questions</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Suggested Policy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q7</strong> How can planning policy better enable the delivery of more walking, cycling and active travel opportunities in our neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>progressively improve.</td>
<td>local government owned roads. There needs to be clear triggers where a new development potentially influences the role and function of an adjacent road sufficiently enough for it to be substantially upgraded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THEME 3: Sustainable mobility, car parking and the impact of technology**

3.1 Walking, cycling and other non-motorised transport

This can be achieved by developers working in collaboration with local government to add to the networks of open spaces and trails that support active lifestyles.

It will be difficult for planning policy to achieve this alone. The introduction of Design Standards via the PDI Act will assist to implement these requirements.

There are practical policies such as those requiring storage and showering facilities to encourage active transport modes for travel to work which can also be implemented.

The Code can support this by the following:

- promotion of the BikeDirect network as well as the inclusion of green bike lanes and shared streets.
- development of infrastructure that supports cycling and minimises risk ie: roundabouts
- development of east/west connections
- prioritising the completion of network gaps
- development of wayfinding information
- high levels of both on and off road access
- investment within the key local and regional destinations and routes
**INTEGRATED MOVEMENT SYSTEMS**
**SUBMISSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Questions</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Suggested Policy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8 How can planning policy assist in balancing the tensions between prioritising</td>
<td>This is difficult to achieve – there will always be tensions between movement and space for passive activities. Planning policy should set out clear prioritisation criteria that guide the allocation of these functions (i.e. link or place) and corresponding policy that can direct treatment for buildings respectively in these areas.</td>
<td>• ability for footpaths / shared use paths to be required in open space reserves contributed in land divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the movement of vehicles (Link) and the quality of the space for pedestrians (Place) along our streets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 How can the Code promote development that contributes positively to streets and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the serviceability and quality of the public realm?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Code must ensure street trees are provided and provided with the space and underground infrastructure required to thrive. Trees provide a dual benefit of improving the aesthetics of a street while also reducing the heat island effect and providing an environment more conducive to active transport. In addition, the Code should support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • wide footpaths with space for landscaping, shelter and outdoor trading  
• separate service/parking lanes from main roads where possible  
• stronger policies/ encouragement of rear car parking, with shared access and parking where possible  
• promotion of the BikeDirect network as well as the inclusion of green bike lanes and shared streets  
• signage highlighting that cycle ways. This justifies the use and also increase the awareness of drivers. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
### Discussion Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10 Does the Code need to more explicitly anticipate the needs of an ageing population through provision for things like mobility scooters or access vehicles?</th>
<th>Yes the Code should encourage footpaths that facilitate a range of active transport methods. Doing so will support not just an ageing population but also those seeking active transport with young children (e.g. prams).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.2 Car parking and emerging mobility technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11 How can planning policy best respond to the impact of emerging technologies on our city and communities and how we move to and through them?</th>
<th>Cities in transition are being shaped by emergent technologies that require immediate regulatory planning responses to avoid inefficiencies due to ad-hoc and post-hoc legislation. One example of this is new transport technologies (autonomous, connected and shared), which are already beginning to disrupt twentieth-century models of transport provision and modelling. Technology advancement will continue to provide affordable methods that effectively distribute car parking (e.g. sensors, display boards, smart phone applications, etc.). This is expected to reduce the required level of car parking as existing car parks are better maximised. But governance of these solutions is problematic and outside the control of the planning system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Suggested Policy Direction

| As above. |
| --- | --- |

Acknowledgement of new technology based solutions that can maximise car parking areas, resulting in a reduced demand for new car parking spaces in inner-urban areas.
- consider a discounted ratio of car parks where a technology can demonstrate a reduced demand
- flexible policy to allow for innovation and dispensation when justified
- a planning system that allows for prompt and easy changes to policy.
**INTEGRATED MOVEMENT SYSTEMS**  
SUBMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Questions</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Suggested Policy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q12 How can the Code best respond to the variances in car parking requirements for different neighbourhoods?  
Q13 Will the current approach of minimum car-parking rates, with potential for discounted provision, adequately support the desired shift toward more sustainable mobility? Should the Code provide greater opportunity for low or no parking in appropriate circumstances or contemplate maximum parking rates? | Outer metropolitan car parking requirements should not be the same as inner metropolitan areas, due to higher car dependency, lower public transport service standards and longer distances to travel. An increase in minimum car parking standards will be required.  
The shift towards sustainable mobility and the use of autonomous transport or 'transport as a service' will eventually reduce demand on car parking. However, this is a long-term future. For the next 10-20 year period, the Code should maintain a precautionary approach (i.e. maintain minimum car parking standards) and allow the market to adapt and maximise these spaces for alternative uses in the future. | See response at Q1  
The two questions can be considered and responded to together.  
The current system can operate adequately by allowing for discounts where appropriate justification is made and/or car parking fund contributions are agreed to. |