

SUBMISSION to PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE

DPF = Designated Performance Feature

DTS = Deemed to Satisfy TNV = Technical Numerical Variation

Low rise = up to 2-storeys: medium rise = up to 6 storeys

There are many flaws, gaps, errors and omissions in the Code which the Planning Commission is proposing to 'free up' the planning system. This will allow developers to do what they like, where they like and destroy resident rights.

This Planning Reform was trumpeted as delivering a fairer, more open, transparent and better planning system. Instead we have 3,000 on-line pages which few have been able to navigate. The Code is still riddled with errors and omissions despite the publication of a hefty tome of Corrections two days before Christmas!

This planning system is less fair, less certain, more opaque and more open to corruption. Many of the provisions in the Code are vague generalized statements. These are replacing our DP's comprehensive detailed provisions which set out guidelines for planners and developers alike on how to deliver good quality development outcomes.

The policy vacuum created by the Code's vague language will result in more disputes and potentially more appeals as planners and Panels disagree with developers and there is no detailed policy to guide either party. Sub-standard development will be built, down-grading our suburbs.

The Commission has not worked collaboratively with Councils, despite earlier promises to do so. No evidence, research or modelling has been provided to justify the radical shifts in planning policy.

There are massive deficiencies in the protection of State Heritage Places, Local Heritage Places and Contributory Items in the Code. PO1.7 says "Development of a State Heritage Place retains elements contributing to its heritage value" Does this mean that if some elements are retained, others can be sacrificed? (A164) . An architecture student could write a better provision than this.

You could drive a truck through many of the Code's provisions: - e.g. (A146) for group dwellings, residential flat buildings and battle axe development "The orientation and siting of buildings minimises impacts on the amenity, outlook and privacy of occupants and neighbours". This is pie in the sky. No quantitative requirements. The lawyers will love this.

Major pitfalls to maintaining any consistency or heritage in our suburbs and removing council input are:-

- Only one sub-zone allowed to the Council
- 6-storey flats can be built anywhere in Adelaide with no planning restrictions as to style etc. provided the developer is the SA Housing Trust or an accredited provider of social housing.

- Loss of strategic policy requiring infill housing to be near public transport, public open space etc. will allow more ad hoc poorly serviced infill (A21)
- Loss of control of noise e.g. from air-conditioners
- Dismantling the hierarchy of commercial activities (Centres hierarchy) so that shops and business can be located anywhere, undermining our main shopping strips
- More mixed zones with no policy strength to manage land use conflicts
- Loss of sub-division controls from our Residential Character Zone allowing more infill to occur in Evandale, Maylands, St. Peters, Joslin, Trinity Gardens and character pockets in Norwood (A30)
- Transitioning Hackney, Stepney and part of Maylands in the RHCZ to the Housing Diversity Zone which aims for 70 dwellings per hectare or 143 square metre per dwelling with no maximum site cover – very tiny allotments buried in concrete
- Increased overlooking (sill heights reduced to 1.5 m instead of our 1.7 m) and balcony and terrace size not controlled
- Allowing Private Open Space to go in front of dwellings with resultant high front fencing along streets reducing passive surveillance and social interaction
- Allowing double garages to dominate streetscapes (A24)
- Trashing our Mixed Use HCZ (A16) with an opening up of height and building scale
- 45 degree building envelopes allowing higher buildings than our current 30 degree one
- Increased building heights on main roads, corridors and commercial centres (6 storeys on the Stephen Terrace fish shop site and the St. Peters Bakery)- all to the detriment of local residents
- Loss of residents' appeal rights
- Allowing denser building forms (group dwellings, residential flat buildings) to be built in current Residential Historic Conservation Zones like College Park where such dwelling types don't exist
- Potentially allowing dwellings to be built facing lanes where residents will lack adequate infrastructure such as street trees, postal deliveries. Loss of back-gardens;
- No setbacks of garages facing laneways so cars wont be able to get in and out of garages (our PDC 218, no Code equivalent)
- No side setbacks in General Neighbourhood Zone (our current Residential Zone) resulting in wall-to-wall housing
- Opening up all our residential areas to hammerhead and battle-axe backyard development (contrary to our present DP which limits this type of development to certain areas) (A22, A141 and our PDC188) The Code will allow these types of housing to be built in St. Peters, Joslin, Royston Park and Trinity Gardens!
- Community has no idea what public notification of new development applications will occur - this is not open and transparent contrary to the **Community Engagement Charter**
- "Significant development sites" are allowed to be 30 per cent above the maximum height limit (A134). No certainty for neighbours here which is "Ad hoc" and "unpredictable".
- Many types of development now restricted by our DP will not be restricted by the Code e.g. petrol stations, car wash places, motor repair shops will be permitted in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone (A113)(which our Character Zones will transition to)
- The Suburban Activity Centre zone, with no sub-zones to differentiate scale, replaces 5 of our zones. In this new zone, the same rules apply to the St. Peters Bakery as they do to the Firlie Shopping Centre, which is laughable if it were not so frightening.
- ONLY 4 weeks to assess an application to demolish a LHP (and if the planner hasn't dealt with it by then, it is automatically approved) (A42)

- Less private Open Space – down to 8 per cent of a site and minimal provision for open space around dwellings resulting in less space for trees and vegetation and urban wildlife with more heat island effect and a lower quality of life
- And a reduction in the protection and growing space of significant, backyard and Street trees, when we have a heating planet and need to do all that is possible to cool our suburbs

This Code will destroy the beauty, amenity and style of our suburbs.