

**From:** [trish.hansen](mailto:trish.hansen)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 12:55:21 PM

---

Dear DPTI Colleagues

There are many aspects of the planning reform that I do not understand enough to engage meaningfully with despite investing many hours at forums, meetings and reading various documents.

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

Please pardon the font variation as I am sending this from my phone.

### Historic Area Overlay

I am very concerned that the changes will impact on the aesthetic beauty and cultural identity of my neighbourhood.

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

The proposed demolition control wording is much weaker than what currently exists in Historic Conservation Zones. I request that the Code adopts the wording in the previous SA Planning Policy Library, and does not place inappropriate emphasis on front elevations, visibility of building facades and economic viability.

I am also concerned that the vitality of my local main streets which is created by small shops and diverse retail mix of passionate business owners will be lost and become homogenised.

### Historic Area Overlay

I am very concerned that the changes will impact on the aesthetic beauty and cultural identity of my neighbourhood.

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

The proposed demolition control wording is much weaker than what currently exists in Historic Conservation Zones. I request that the Code adopts the wording in the previous SA Planning Policy Library, and does not place inappropriate emphasis on front elevations, visibility of building facades and economic viability.

I am also concerned that the vitality of my local main streets which is created by

small shops and diverse retail mix of passionate business owners will be lost and become homogenised.

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

### Public Notification

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

### Impact on Infrastructure and Essential Services

The potential rate and intensity of new development which will be facilitated through the proposed Code policies, could place existing local infrastructure, especially roads and stormwater systems, under stress, particularly in our older established areas.

### Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

Being in nature has profound benefits on our health and wellbeing - directly and indirectly. The tree canopy is an important aspect of this as well as mitigating the heat island effect so important in adapting to climate change.

The incremental removal of trees will insidiously reduce the tree canopy.

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

Unless the above issues are addressed and the draft Code is amended to reflect these concerns, there will be an unacceptable loss of local character and amenity in my neighbourhood as well as impacts in public health and climate change resilience

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

Yours sincerely

Trish Hansen

--

Trish Hansen  
Principal  
Urban Mind



[www.urbanmind.studio](http://www.urbanmind.studio)