

From: [Lynda Yates](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)
Cc: [David Speirs \(MP\)](#)
Subject: Submission on Phase 2 of the Code
Date: Thursday, 28 November 2019 7:22:07 PM

To the State Planning Commission

I am disturbed that the whole reform of planning is being done too hastily when much of the mapping and overlays in the Conservation Zone do not appear to be working correctly, have significant omissions and mistakes in the overlays map and zone plus they are difficult to access. The draft Code is complex and the on-line document is confusing and difficult to drill down into to get to the detail. I urge that implementation of the new Code be postponed rather than that the current unworkable system go live just to conform to a date that was no doubt considered achievable but now really is not. That could lead to more problems and yet more hasty revisions to fix the problem which is never a good way to produce a new system.

I was disappointed to hear at a forum I recently attended that the Significant and Regulated Tree legislation will be left unchanged. I think the existing rules about tree species and distance from buildings and inground swimming pools should be dropped and each case be considered individually on merit.

I was a local councillor for the past 8 years and our council wanted to protect trees as far as possible and to increase its tree canopy cover with new plantings as per the aims of the State Government in the amended 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. However, I imagine tree canopy coverage is actually reducing despite these efforts due to the infill development in Holdfast Bay that leads to large greened and treed gardens being completely cleared for subdivision and building. It takes a young tree many years to produce a reasonable tree canopy and many old trees are being lost, often on or near land boundaries where they could easily be kept. I urge DPTI to look at statistics on tree loss and then consider how to improve large tree protection as per the State Government's requirements, especially during infill and road development. DPTI could set a good example in the latter!

One suggestion is that the value of trees should be scientifically determined using eg. the Burnley tree valuation method and then developers should pay the full value if they wish to remove one or more trees from a development site. This will give them an incentive to retain trees on boundaries or to adapt the plans to include trees. Many people will pay more to have the feature of a mature tree so developers, once they adapt to the idea, will actually benefit from the increased house prices they can command. I support the suggestion to have one tree per house lot but I think more than 1 tree should be asked for on bigger lots and native species encouraged for their habitat value. Several larger trees could also be required as part of the landscaping plan for any urban consolidation development of high rise housing to help provide screening of the buildings. In rural zones, encouraging perimeter plantings of drought resistant trees to provide stock shelters, reduce erosion and also ground temperatures as well as promoting biodiversity if native trees are used.

In Victoria developers pay up front into a tree deposit scheme for all trees on a development site and the full deposit is only returned if all the trees remain healthy and whole at the end. This avoids loss by 'accident' and encourages developers to use and enforce proper tree protection zones. See

<https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/Tree-valuations.DOC>

The Significant and Regulated Tree overlay for the whole state needs to be revised to be accurate and also added into the Biodiversity and Climate Change policies.

Biodiversity must be considered important for all rural zones. To that end, contact with the Native Vegetation Council should be mandatory before development applications are lodged so that native vegetation can be retained and incorporated in the design, rather than removed as usually occurs. Endangered species also need to be identified early in the process so they can be protected. Native vegetation is important for promoting land resilience, soil health and good hydrology.

One other problem is that the Conservation Zone allows merit assessment for alternative energy facilities and they can be identified as suitable development for the Conservation Zone but yet not in the Significant Landscape Character overlay. Unless park management plans specifically recommend installation of alternative energy facilities, this should not happen and park management plans need to be included and considered in the Code.

In conclusion, the whole Code needs revision so as to be clear, concise and accurate and also be peer reviewed. It needs to be accessible for public comment before being released but in a state that allows the public to access it easily. The City of Melbourne has produced good standards and it is suggested a review of the draft Code be done using their standards.

Submitted by Lynda Yates

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Lynda Yates](#)
To: [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)
Cc: [David Speirs \(MP\)](#)
Subject: Submission on Phase 2 of the Code
Date: Thursday, 28 November 2019 7:34:27 PM

To the State Planning Commission

I just made a submission but forgot another concern - how notification is made for national parks, especially remote ones. I suggest that notification is made to the Friends of Parks group and to the specific Friends of this Park if there is one, also to the local paper if there is one. The public should be notified and able to comment on changes/developments to public land. Park Management plans should be referred to for decisions on green energy, tourist accommodation etc. so that there is no conflict with their aims.

Submitted by Lynda Yates

6 Young St, Seacliff SA 5049

0417 484 717

mallynd@aapt.net.au