By email: DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au

SUBMISSION ON PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 (City of Burnside)

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

1. General Neighbourhood Zone and Housing Diversity Zone:

The draft Code places some areas (PRA18, RPA20 & RPA28) of my Eastwood & Glenunga Ward, in the General Neighbourhood Zone, and RPA19 in the Housing Diversity Zone. The policy in these new zones is at odds with current zone policy and allows for a greater intensity of development than existing. The current zones focus on preserving character rather than accommodating change and infill and do not envisage a greater range and intensity of development than currently exists. I request that you move all residential areas to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone with TNVs to match existing conditions.

2. All Existing Residential Areas

   a) Non-Residential land use: Currently in the City of Burnside’s residential areas, shops, offices and educational establishments are non-complying. In the new Code existing residential areas will allow these non-residential uses which will adversely impact traffic, parking, noise, neighbour’s amenity and the character of our suburbs. This is unacceptable. All uses which are currently non-complying in our residential areas (eg. office and shop) should be “restricted development”. Alternatively, a new zone should be created purely for residential land use.

   b) Siting and Setbacks: Under the Code, building setbacks from side and rear boundaries will noticeably decrease, particularly at upper levels. This is unacceptable and will severely impact amenity and privacy. Existing siting, setback and floor area criteria should be maintained throughout all our residential areas.

   c) Density and Allotment Sizes: The draft Code contains a number of errors and omissions. It is important that current minimum allotment sizes, heights and frontage widths match existing.

3. Historic Area Overlay

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, prospective buyers, neighbours and developers. Existing protections and identification of Contributory Items should be maintained.

4. Commercial Centres

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.

5. Public Notification

The Code should reflect the City of Burnside’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.

I would be very upset if my neighbour sold their house to a developer who built a two storey house on the property as that would completely destroy my current view down to the coast (one of the main reasons we purchased in the first place and would considerably devalue our home).
6. Tree Canopy and Climate Resilience

The 30-Year Plan calls for an increase in tree canopy cover, however, the draft Code works directly against this by facilitating larger developments and the easier 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 to the increased infill development opportunities, reduction in minimum site areas, site coverage, setbacks and increased number of street crossovers.

Burnside and surrounding areas are beautiful and renowned for the leafy greenery and beautiful parks. If the planning and design code changes, it will downgrade the area and it will lose the very thing that keeps it unique from other suburbs that are slowly being ravaged by urban density. It will look no better than Churchill Road and Prospect. Prospect was once a very nice suburb but it is ruined by two/three story apartments blocking the views and the sun from the bungalows that are still there. These developments are only money grabbing opportunities by developers and builders who move onto another site, ravage it and reap more profit again without consequence. We have enough land in this country that we don’t need urban density. Part of the attraction to Adelaide for overseas families to live here is the housing and land available. Leave at least one part of Adelaide untouched and allow it to keep its beauty and dignity.

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.

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

Yours sincerely

Amanda and Christian Zimmermann

Glen Osmond
Q1 Which part of the Planning and Design Code would you like to make a submission about? (Please click the circle to select which part of the Code you wish to comment on. You can also see which council areas are included in the rural and urban code via the links below.)

My submission relates to Urban code. (click here for council areas)

Q2 Please provide your contact details below (Name, Postcode & Email are mandatory) Please be advised that your submission will be made publicly available on the SA Planning Portal.

Name
Amanda Zimmermann

Address
Burnside

Your Council Area
Glen Osmond

Suburbs/Town
SA

State
5064

Postcode
Australia

Country
Email Address

Q3 Which sector do you associate yourself with?
General Public

Q4 Would you like to make comment on
General comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for Rules of Interpretation</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for Referrals</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for Mapping</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for Table of Amendments</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for overlays</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Please enter your feedback for zones and subzones</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Please enter your feedback for general policy</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Please enter your feedback for Land use Definition</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Please enter your feedback for Admin Definitions</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 Please enter your general feedback here

I would like the draft planning & design code to remain as it is in Burnside because I don't want my areas to look like all the others that are being destroyed by high density housing. Our infrastructure which is mostly built for hills would not cope with the influx of extra traffic and would require significant changes to design to satisfactorily allow for it. I strongly object to the draft planning & design code and request that Burnside and surrounding eastern suburbs be left alone.