

**From:** [Peter Hubbard](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed zoning /planning changes objection  
**Date:** Sunday, 16 February 2020 1:49:17 PM  
**Attachments:** [Resident Submission Letter Beaumont1.docx](#)

---

Please find herein my strong objection to the existing proposed planning / zoning changes. Please ensure my objection is read and responded to so I can consider the reply.

We all need to stand for what we believe because this is our life.

Thank you in advance of your consideration

State Planning Commission

By email: [DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au](mailto:DPTI.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au)

To Whom it May Concern

### **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 objection. My entire family and all those we know together with the quickly growing number of people as they become aware of the concerns with the proposed changes I / we are not at all happy with the proposed changes as they are now.

I have strong objections because this will impact our lives directly and adversely change forever our living environment for us and future generations. As it is now, current planning rules have seen very significant shrinking of suburban properties with a large and growing footprint of building at the expense of useable land space for trees canopy and usable open area for home gardens, birds, bees and nature in general.

We accept sensible development but oppose inner suburb cramming and the mushrooming multi-level McMansions that leave no space for trees destroy existing street character and history. The downsizing should continue in harmony with the whole environment and be sustainable and preserved for the future. We strongly object to having to look in the face of seeing a growing “hot box” area in which we live, crammed houses overlooking each other, more and more cars parking in the streets (this is certain even with electric cars), massively less green thereby adding more to climate change. This is about our lives and our future, please respect it and have a heart for the future of Adelaide. Yes, we are Linden Park residents and we feel very, very threatened. Beauty, and sustainable size properties are what sets Adelaide apart from the growing problems of large cities.

Objections in Summary:

#### 1. General Neighbourhood Zone

The draft Code places RPA21 of my Beaumont Ward, in the General Neighbourhood Zone. The policy in this new zone is entirely at odds with current zone policy and allows for a far greater intensity of development than existing. The current zone focuses on preserving character rather than accommodating change and infill and does not envisage a greater range and intensity of development. 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.

#### 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 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.

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

Yours sincerely,

Peter Hubbard



Linden Park

**From:** [Peter Hubbard](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#) Don't  
**Subject:** destroy LINDEN PARK - Submission  
**Date:** Monday, 3 February 2020 1:48:47 PM

---

I am representing myself my family and others that have communicated with me and demand as a resident of LINDEN PARK to retain a general Neighbourhood Zone.

Working with businesses in the planning space and building space, I am pro-quality development in the appropriate areas, including multi-level housing. I have been around long enough to see what happens within suburbs areas where the proposed minimum allotment sizes are in place. It is a disaster and I am disgusted that this is now intended to be imposed on our family and all our neighbours throughout LINDEN PARK. We all invested in and moved to LINDEN PARK Burnside, for quality of area, living space for the green and beautiful tall trees within the suburbs and housing blocks. We wanted and paid for quality for the long term future with peace, health and serenity.

The premise that infill will allow more people to catch public transport is a false. The fact is the with small allotments there may be one only car space (if any) on the premise. There will be more than one driver per household and more than one car whether it be petrol, electric, or hydrogen and the cars will park on the streets . There are already too many cars parking in street and you are invited to come with me to show your ministers and heads of department. It will be a complete disaster affecting OUR lives.

We urge that a longer term view should be about quality of life, and living environment, not dictated by an end means of population growth where we chase more jobs and via versa.

As a resident I have seen considerable in-fill already in LINDEN PARK under existing allotment sizes and even that has seen the felling of too many trees, including significant trees. At current allotment size in LINDEN PARK, there is continuing in-fill and whilst there are already issues of street parking and depletion of tree canopy, it is at least can be sustainable for lifestyle. Developers only interest is to maximise profit and push the envelope of development where ever they can, even now, few new developments retain space enough to grow any tree canopy offering shade. This is a major problem for the future and has already started affecting us in LINDEN PARK.

In-fill of such a drastic measure will lead to a HEAT BOX suburb with too many hard surfaces and rooves shimmer more heat to add to the problems of climate change, and more rainfall run-off where it should be soaking into gardens and sustaining our local flora and fauna. We want future generations to have backyards, play and climb trees at home among the birds, insects, vegetable plot, where the pets, birds and bees have a future in LINDEN PARK too.

There are those from beyond LINDEN PARK that may live in such small allotments and they now choose LINDEN PARK for the quality and Green environment, why on earth should we allow Linden Park to become similar to where many have come from.

This proposal must not be allowed, it is retrograde and will destroy the heart of Burnside and we can never undo the damage once the floodgates are open.

We strongly object to this proposal that will negatively and rapidly degenerate our Green LINDEN PARK

There is already an acceptance that a green suburb is a cooler suburb. This decision will see a massive depletion of greenery, tall canopy trees from within and affectively erase the all the living beauty it now holds.

It is well recognised that many changes are being pushed ahead and there is a reluctance to stop, delay and re-think it. We are pushing back.

The only people wanting to push this change is for vested interests, whether it be political, or just for the money they can benefit from. We are custodians and have a duty to protect our suburb for our children and their children. We reject this proposal and seek a halt of it, this is about our lives and homes and we need to preserve quality for the long term.

Please ensure this objection is received read and replied to by the person/s responsible for accepting and acting on this objection.

I am open and available for a conversation and / or meeting.

Kind regards,

**Peter Hubbard**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]