

**From:** [David Burton](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** COMMENTS ON PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE - PHASE 3 CITY OF PROSPECT  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 8:27:23 AM

---

I wish to register my comments for the following matters as a resident of the City of Prospect:

What is wrong with SA Gov't? Don't they understand that we don't want our suburb ruined by inconsiderate rule changes. Why not make these changes in your own suburb – Oh! Now you see the sense in the following comments!

I totally support the arguments submitted by Kristina Barnett and other comments offered by many residents of Prospect.

While we support a number of key performance outcomes that will be used to assess relevant development applications from the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone it is of great concern that Prospect Council's detailed Historic Area and Character Area Statements provided to the Department are not included in the Code

Despite being named a Planning and 'Design' Code, the draft Code has minimal focus on design based policy or outcomes. This is an issue that City of Prospect and its residents in consultation have previously expressed on a number of occasions and is apparently being ignored in the current draft.

The existing Prospect Council Residential and Historic Conservation Zones need be incorporated into the proposed Suburban Neighbourhood Zone (Policy Areas 560, 450 & 350) and the Housing Diversity Neighbourhood Zone (Policy Area 200).

If you want to redevelop areas to higher density accommodation (I would question why you want that anyway) what about redeveloping the existing Housing Trust areas of Blair Athol and Kilburn many of which are currently in a state of disrepair?

Who compensates existing residents who are affected by the intrusion of these new developments – shading solar panels, reducing natural light to their rooms, intrusion of privacy by no overlooking restrictions, overcrowding streets with additional vehicles parked all over the place and the considerable financial loss due to the market devaluation of their home of, possibly, 50 years or more?

I don't support the allowance of private certifiers who are employed by the developer, and who will stretch the rules to suit their purposes.

Our community should expect existing character to be maintained with sensitive infill acceptable where suitable design and streetscape integration are demonstrated, and this must be recognized in the Planning and Development Code. The Code policy does not address the retention of local residential character balanced with sensitive and appropriate infill development to a sufficient level of detail. The simplistic nature of the Character Area Statements do not contain sufficient contextual information to support the basic, numerical

based planning policy in the zone and overlays. This is where private certifiers will have a ball.

Further consultation is required and date for the current consultation needs to be extended.

I/we would like further community consultation once the Code's errors have been corrected and the draft updated.

Yours Sincerely

Name: David Burton [REDACTED] Prospect 5082