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AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 131 BELAIR ROAD, TORRENS PARK ON TUESDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2019 AT 7.00PM.

MEMBERSHIP: Mayor H Holmes-Ross
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PRESENT:

APOLOGIES: Cr Sanderson

LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

ABSENT:

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

WELCOME

BUSINESS

1. MEMBERS’ DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The Presiding Member will ask if any Committee Member wishes to disclose an interest in relation to any item being considered at the meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

2.1 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING - 4 SEPTEMBER 2018

RECOMMENDED that the Minutes of the Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee Meeting held on 4 September 2018 be confirmed.
3. INFORMATION ONLY REPORTS

3.1 DRAFT GROWTH PRECINCTS DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT (DPA) - PUBLIC HEARING

Report Author/Manager: Alexa Carr
General Manager: Craig Harrison
(Meeting Date: 3 December 2019)
(Location: Council Wide)
(Consultant Used: $118,400 (whole of project))

PROPOSAL

To convene a meeting, pursuant to Section 25(11) of the Development Act, where members of the public may make verbal representations in relation to the draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment (DPA).

BACKGROUND

Planning Reform

The State Government is undertaking significant change to the South Australian Planning System. These changes will impact Council and our community in a range of ways, including how development applications are processed and assessed; how the community participates in the planning system; and the replacement of Council’s Development Plan with the new Planning and Design Code on 1 July 2020.

The Planning and Design Code, which will replace all Development Plans, is being introduced in phases, with the Adelaide Metropolitan Area being the final phase. Consultation on the Planning and Design Code for metropolitan Adelaide has commenced and will conclude at the end of February 2020. The Planning & Design Code will replace all Development Plans.

Spatial Vision for the City of Mitcham & Structure Plans

Council has been working with the State Government and our community to understand and address the impacts of the new planning system on the City of Mitcham. This work has culminated in the Spatial Vision for the City and Precinct Structure Plans, which have been Council’s focus for the past two years.

The Spatial Vision and Precinct Structure Plans help Council articulate its aspiration for the future look and feel of the City. They provide guidance for the City’s future development – carefully balancing the need for investment, development and progress, with the lifestyle and character of the City that our community values.

The Spatial Vision for the City was developed using existing research and the knowledge and experience of Elected Members and Council staff. It identifies:

- five key precincts which have opportunity for significant investment, growth and change, being:
- Flinders & St Marys Key Growth Precinct;
- Goodwood & Daws Roads Key Growth Precinct;
- Blackwood Centre Key Growth Precinct;
- Belair Road Centre Key Growth Precinct; and
- Goodwood & Cross Roads Key Growth Precinct;
- a set of outcomes to support and guide the development of each key precinct;
- key connections to, from and within the City;
- areas for small-scale and gradual change within the City;
- areas of the City that should be “off-limits” for further development; and
- residential areas with identified special character.

Following the development of the Spatial Vision for the City, key precinct structure plans were developed through a collaborative process between the community and Council. The structure plans provide a high-level overview of how the key precincts might change over the long term, including:

- which areas might support different land uses than currently exist;
- where further growth or intensification of existing land uses might be appropriate;
- where improvements to public spaces and places might be best located;
- where change is required to better manage transport, traffic and parking; and
- where cycling and pedestrian networks could be improved or established.

The precinct structure plans were developed at a highly conceptual level and do not specify zones or form boundaries, rather they indicate anticipated land uses for different areas. A critical role of the structure plans is that they form the basis for proposed zoning changes within the key growth precincts (ie, the subject DPA).

In February 2019, Council endorsed the Spatial Vision for the City and structure plans for the five key growth precincts. Copies of these are available to view and download on Council’s website at https://www.mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au/build-and-develop/shape-your-place/spatial-vision-for-the-city.

Amending Council’s Development Plan

Council has a limited window of opportunity to make changes to its existing Development Plan before the transition to the Planning and Design Code on 1 July 2020.

The process to achieve this is a Development Plan Amendment (DPA), with the first step in this process being agreement between Council and the Minister for Planning on a Statement of Intent (SOI).

At its meeting of 26 February 2019, Council endorsed a SOI for the Growth Precincts DPA. In mid-May 2019, the Minister for Planning approved the SOI
and agreed to the DPA proceeding to the detailed investigations stage, with the exclusion of two of the nominated areas, being the Flinders and St Marys Precinct and the South Road Corridor.

This leaves the following four key growth precincts affected by this Growth Precincts DPA:-

- Goodwood & Daws Roads Growth Precinct;
- Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct;
- Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct;
- Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct.

Subsequent to the agreement between Council and the Minister for Planning, the Administration engaged consultants Urban and Regional Planning Solutions (URPS) to commence investigations and prepare a draft Growth Precincts DPA.

The draft DPA has been provided to Council previously and can be found on Council’s project webpage at [https://www.mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/254423/Draft-Growth-Precincts-DPA.pdf](https://www.mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/254423/Draft-Growth-Precincts-DPA.pdf).

Concurrent agency and community engagement on the draft Growth Precincts DPA commenced on 3 October and concluded on 28 November 2019.

**Purpose of Change**

The proposed changes to planning zones within the draft Growth Precincts DPA are intended to reflect the conversation that Council has had with the community over the past two years, which resulted in the Spatial Vision for the City and Key Growth Precinct Structure Plans.

Broadly, the proposed zoning changes aim to reinforce the key growth precincts as the focus for investment, growth and change within the City.

The changes within the key growth precincts will support:-

- stimulation of change, investment and growth within existing centres;
- a greater mix of land uses;
- increased residential densities;
- opportunity for increased building heights; and
- greater intensity of development around activity centres.

Enabling and concentrating significant growth and change within these precincts will reduce pressure on other residential areas and, as a result, will assist to protect the City’s much valued residential character.

**Investigations**
A range of investigations and analysis have been undertaken to ascertain whether proposed planning zones are appropriate and feasible, the results of which will help to shape the zoning. Indicatively, these investigations and analysis include:-

- Demographics – existing demographics and population projections;
- Built form – current and future built form/densities and opportunities;
- Economic – existing influences and projected future trends/demands;
- Environment/Hazards – bushfire, emergency services, site contamination;
- Infrastructure – Stormwater, Transport, Services, Social – current and future infrastructure capacities/requirements;
- Heritage & Character – impact analysis on heritage/sensitive areas;
- Identification of appropriate SA Planning Policy Library modules (zones and policies) and spatial application.

The draft DPA includes commentary on the investigations and analysis.

The investigation reports, together with the commentary within the DPA document itself, have previously been provided to Council and can be found on Council’s project webpage at https://www.mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au/council/connect/latest-news/draft-growth-precincts-development-plan-amendment-community-consultation.

Proposed Planning Zones

Council is limited to selecting from existing contemporary planning zone modules within the South Australian Planning Policy Library (SAPPL) (Version 6), with minimal local content, in order to effect change.

The exceptions to this is the policy area for Community (Education) Zone, which is currently not held in the SAPPL.

Although this may seem restrictive, it will assist to achieve a smooth transition to the Planning & Design Code when the time comes.

Community & Agency Engagement

The Local Area Planning project has sought to ensure that Council has actively engaged with the community on the draft Spatial Vision, Structure Plans and Special Character areas.

The community engagement on the Draft Growth Precincts DPA has continued this dialogue with the community during October and November 2019.

The engagement undertaken for the Growth Precincts DPA exceeded the legislative requirements and achieved the undertakings made in the Statement of Intent. Broadly speaking, the engagement has included:-

Consultation Period
eight (8) weeks from 3 October to 28 November 2019.

Public Notification
- Government Gazette notice
- Adelaide Advertiser public notice
- Messenger Press public notice
- Federal & State MPs
- State Government Agencies
- Adjoining Councils
- Written notice to owners and occupiers affected by the change
- Direct email to previous workshop/engagement participants, community groups, schools, sporting clubs

Promotion
- Mitcham Community News Article (October Edition)
- Mitcham Community News Column – Messenger Press
- Social media (facebook, Twitter, MyLocalApp)
- Website (front page with link to project page)
- Street banners
- Electronic community noticeboard

Information Provision
- Information displays at Civic Centre, Mitcham Library and Blackwood Library for duration of consultation
- Draft DPA available for viewing at displays and information sessions, for purchase ($20 for printed copy) or download from website
- Project webpage – draft DPA, information sheets and project background
- Six staffed Community Drop-in Sessions during October at the Civic Centre, Blackwood Community Centre and St Marys Football Club and prior to each of the Community Ward Forums

Feedback
- Written – email or to PO Box
- Feedback form – online and hard copy
- Public meeting post consultation to hear verbal submissions from interested persons

Special Residential Character Areas DPA
Separate to the Growth Precincts DPA project, a Statement of Intent has been submitted to the Minister for Planning to progress a Special Residential Character Area Development Plan Amendment. This work seeks to amend planning policy to recognise areas of special residential character with a view to these areas being included in the Planning and Design Code as part of a ‘Character Area Overlay’. The Minister for Planning has agreed to the progression of this DPA.
A project plan is currently being developed and will be the subject of a report to Council in the coming months. The Minister for Planning has indicated that this DPA should be completed by the end of September 2020.

Attachments:

A. Register of Speakers
B. Written submissions of registered speakers

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Goal 1 Accessible & Connected Community

Objective 1.6 Our community is actively encouraged and supported to have a voice and to participate in a meaningful way in shaping our City.

DISCUSSION

Council’s Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee is the appropriate Committee to hear, consider and provide advice to Council in relation to both written and verbal submissions for the draft Growth Precincts DPA.

At the time of preparing this report, a total of 23 requests to speak at the public hearing had been received. It should be noted that the public consultation will conclude after the distribution of this report and so there may be further requests to be heard at the public hearing received.

Several speakers have indicated a desire to be heard, but had not yet provided their written submissions at the time of report preparation. These will be provided to Elected Members under separate cover, as will any additional speakers and their corresponding written submissions.

A register of speakers for the public hearing is contained in Attachment A, with copies of the corresponding written submissions prepared by the speakers contained in Attachment B.

Copies of all written submissions on the draft Growth Precincts DPA will be provided in full to the Elected Members in due course.

Operating Procedure – Public Hearing

It is recommended that the presiding member seek leave of the Committee to suspend proceedings to provide members of the public the opportunity to make a verbal representation to the draft Growth Precincts DPA.

Once proceedings have been suspended, the procedure for hearing verbal representations shall be as follows:-

- the presiding member is to provide the opportunity to hear any person who previously indicated that they wish to appear personally or through a representative;
• the presiding member may, depending on time available, provide the opportunity to hear from representations from any other person;

• each verbal representation should be limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes;

• Elected Member’s questioning of the representor should be limited to clarification only; and

• verbal representations will not be transcribed. Written transcripts or speaking notes may be provided by the speaker before or at the meeting.

Next Steps

The administration is now working to summarise all submissions received. As indicated previously in the report, Elected Members will be provided with a copy of all written submissions under separate cover.

It is intended that a workshop will be held with Elected Members on the draft Growth Precincts DPA early in 2020. While the format of the workshop is yet to be determined, the intention of the workshop is to provide Elected Members the opportunity to further engage in the refinement of the DPA.

Subsequent to the workshop, a discussion report will be brought to Council, reflecting the outcomes of the workshop and providing discussion on options to progress the DPA.

A decision report will then follow for Council to determine the final form of the DPA for lodgement with the Minister for Planning for approval. This will include a Summary of Consultation and Proposed Amendments (SCPA) Report which forms part of the package for lodgement with the Minister.

The Minister for Planning must approve the draft DPA before changes to the Development Plan are applied.

Community Implications

The community has traditionally been engaged by Council (or the Minister) on policy matters such as DPAs. The consultation undertaken on the Growth Precincts DPA is reflective of the community being engaged at the policy formulation stage which, it is noted, is the intent of the new planning system being introduced.

Environmental / Heritage Implications

Council is separately progressing strategic policy work surrounding the protection of existing heritage areas and undertaking a body of work to identify character areas within the City of Mitcham by way of the Special Character Areas DPA.

Cost Shifting Implications / Legislative Cost Imposts
There will be short- and long-term cost implications associated with the planning reform, however these implications are still relatively unknown at this stage.

**Impact on Budget including Lifecycle Costing**

The Spatial Vision and Local Area Planning project is one that Council has approached with utmost importance to adequately invest in procuring the best possible outcome for the City of Mitcham.

The existing 1.6 FTE strategy and policy staff members have been focussed on the delivery of this project for the past 24 months. Therefore, this project has taken priority over projects which would ordinarily have been undertaken by Policy staff.

In the report to Council of 26 February 2019, the preparation of the Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment was estimated to be in the order of $120,000.

This amount includes investigations, analysis, policy development and application, mapping, workshops with Elected Members, community engagement, preparation of the draft DPA, preparation of the Summary of Consultation and Proposed Amendments (SCPA) report and various project-related administrative tasks.

**Risk Management / WHS Assessment**

If the Growth Precincts DPA is not lodged for approval with the Minister for Planning within the required timeframe (ie March 2020), there is a risk to Council at the point of transition from the Development Plan to the Planning & Design Code.

The current planning zones and policies within the Growth Precincts do not reflect the aspirations and expectations of the community or Council which are expressed in the Structure Plans.

In addition, we are aware that many zones and policy areas within the Mitcham Development Plan simply will not exist within the Planning & Design Code.

Where there is not a straightforward “like-for-like” transition between the Development Plan and the Planning & Design Code, it will fall to the current land use of the site to determine future zoning. There are a number of instances where this would result in an undesirable outcome for the City of Mitcham, including within the Growth Precincts.

**Legal / Policy Implications**

Nil.

**CONCLUSION**
The Growth Precincts DPA is a continuation of the narrative that Council has developed with the community over the past two years, resulting in the preparation of a Spatial Vision for the City and Key Growth Precinct Structure Plans. The DPA reflects this narrative and Council’s and the community’s aspirations and expectations for the City.

The Growth Precincts DPA presents an opportunity to shape the planning policy framework and the long-term future of the City of Mitcham. The application of contemporary policy will help to unlock significant investment potential and facilitate growth and change within the City of Mitcham.

This public hearing is an opportunity for the community to share their views with Elected Members and to engage with the DPA process.

**RECOMMENDATION – ITEM 3.1**

That the report be received for information only.
Attachment A

Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Public Hearing – Tuesday, 3 December 2019

Register of Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jesse Vandyk</td>
<td>Albert Place, Blackwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lisa Carau</td>
<td>Bracken Avenue, Blackwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Glenys Perri</td>
<td>Gorse Avenue, Hawthornedene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michelle Divine</td>
<td>Gartrell Boulevard, Craigburn Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Heidi Brown</td>
<td>Blackwood Park Boulevard, Craigburn Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ben Martin (on behalf of Bec Fittes)</td>
<td>Main Road, Blackwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Joseph Romeo</td>
<td>Horsell Road, Belair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rosie Broderick</td>
<td>William Street, Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Claire Bowmer</td>
<td>Springbank Road, Clapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jane Rowat</td>
<td>Main Road, Blackwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Timothy Mudge</td>
<td>Grove Street, Eden Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Brenton Stead</td>
<td>Kauri Road, Hawthornedene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Alan Rumsby (on behalf of Grete Rumsby &amp; Daniel Leopardi)</td>
<td>Daniels Road, Panorama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jane Silbereisen *</td>
<td>Blackwood Business Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. James Bosley</td>
<td>Brighton Parade, Blackwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Victoria Stavrou</td>
<td>William Street, Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Tom Morrison</td>
<td>Greenwood Crescent, Glenalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Andrew Cronin, AcroPlan (SA)</td>
<td>Daw Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Andrew Tidswell</td>
<td>Sherbourne Road, Blackwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Janice Arnold</td>
<td>Pekina Street, Eden Hills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no written submission received at time of report distribution
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#9

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 03, 2019 9:03:39 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 03, 2019 9:03:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:37
IP Address: 1.125.105.52

Page 1: Feedback Form

Q1 About You...
Name: Jesse Vandyk
Address:
Address 2:
City/Town: Blackwood
State/Province: SA
ZIP/Postal Code: 5051
Email Address:

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.
Yes,
If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Goodwood & Daws Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct
Strongly opposed to smaller block sizes and higher population density. This will ruin the character of the area, contribute to more vegetation loss, cause traffic issues, and create a significantly higher bushfire risk.

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.
Yes

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.
No

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.
No

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.
Yes
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

#13

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)

**Started:** Friday, October 04, 2019 7:11:07 PM

**Last Modified:** Friday, October 04, 2019 7:21:33 PM

**Time Spent:** 00:10:20

**IP Address:** 42.241.41.122

---

**Q1 About You...**

Name: Lisa Careu

Address: Blackwood

City/Town: Sa

State/Province: 5051

**Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.**

Response: Yes,

If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

---

**Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

**Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

**Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

**Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct**

Appalling idea. Blackwood the Blackwood area will lose more native vegetation supporting native Flora and Fauna. Already overdeveloped area with infrastructure that cannot keep Pace with the rampant development in Blackwood Park. I am very opposed to this idea!

**Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.**

Response: No,

Comment: I found this information only by accident on FB feed

**Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.**

Response: No,

Comment: I had no notice

**Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.**

Response: No

**Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.**

Response: No
#14

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)
**Started:** Sunday, October 06, 2019 1:43:29 AM
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 06, 2019 1:48:05 AM
**Time Spent:** 00:04:30
**IP Address:** 213.172.230.8

## Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

### Q1 About You...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Glenys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Hawthornedene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>5051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.

**Yes,**
*If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:*

| Glenys Peni | hawthornedene Sa 5051 |

**Respondent skipped this question**

### Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct

**Respondent skipped this question**

### Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct

**Respondent skipped this question**

### Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct

**Respondent skipped this question**

### Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct

*I am concerned regarding the amendment to housing block sizes to 250 square metres. What about the trees?*

**Yes,**
*Comment:*

| 20 more trees |

**No,**
*Comment:*

| I was not aware until I read their post |

### Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.

**No,**
*Comment:*

| I was not aware until I read their post |

### Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.

**No**

### Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.

**No**
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Q1 About You...
Name: Michelle Devine
Address: Craigburn Farm
City/Town: Se
State/Province: SA
ZIP/Postal Code: 5051
Email Address:

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.
Yes, If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct
Inadequately sized blocks for development will ruin the character of the area

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.
No

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.
Yes

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.
Yes

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.
No
#32

**Collectors:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)

**Started:** Monday, October 07, 2019 1:07:40 PM

**Last Modified:** Monday, October 07, 2019 1:20:40 PM

**Time Spent:** 00:12:59

**IP Address:** 48.178.9.185

---

**Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment**

---

**Q1 About You...**

Name: Heidi Brown

Address: Craigburn Farm, Adelaide, South Australia, 5051

---

**Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.**

Yes, if yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

---

**Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct**

This Area is a Community and proposing such small blocks is not only not in keeping with Blackwood but also a huge risk on lives as getting in and out of Blackwood at peak hours is already congested. Can I ask you to imagine what would happen in a Bush Fire? I would like to think our safety would be priority over money, which is what this boils down to, squeezing as many homes in as possible not fully thinking about the consequences. What happened you Australia being known for open spaces

---

**Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.**

Yes

---

**Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.**

Yes

---

**Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.**

Yes

---

**Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.**

Yes

---
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Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Q1 About You...
- Name: [Redacted]
- Address: [Redacted]
- City/Town: Adelaide
- State/Province: SA
- ZIP/Postal Code: 5051
- Email Address: [Redacted]

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.
- No,
  - If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address: [Redacted]

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
- Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
- Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct
- Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct
- My property is right on the border of the mixed use area where it starts and stops again along Rea St. We are at a large corner block 162 main road on corner of Miller Terrace and would like to have future options to use our house as business in the future and subdivide the land. I don't understand why there are two houses left on the block that the mixed area misses. My request is that the mixed area border travels right up until Miller terrace. Thank you for your consideration.

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.
- Yes,
  - Comment:
    - Great thank you!

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.
- Yes,
  - Comment:
    - Enough notice I just someone takes notice and responds :)

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.
- Yes

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.
- Yes
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Q1 About You...

Name: Joseph Romeo
Address: Adelaide
City/Town: SA
State/Province: 5052
ZIP/Postal Code: 
Email Address: 

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.

Yes, if yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct

Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct

I believe this growth precinct should come with a condition that any property within a certain distance to the district centre (maybe 3km?) should also come under the conditions of the new suburban zone. Many other councils also take this approach to encourage higher density housing close to community amenities. Especially along Belair Rd to the South as it is in close proximity to Torrens Park train station and should allow for higher density housing. It is a big jump from 250m2 house blocks in the proposed new suburban zone to 450m2 in the current central plains policy zone. Belair Rd also services public buses in and out of the city. It would look strange for high density housing to stop at Fifth Ave and then go back to low density on the other side of the road.

Q5 Goodwood & Daws Roads Growth Precinct

Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct

Respondent skipped this question

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.

Yes

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.

Yes

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.

Yes

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.

Yes
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Q1 About You...

Name: Rosie Broderick
Company: 
Address:
Address 2: Hawthorn
City/Town: Adelaide
State/Province: SA
ZIP/Postal Code: 5062
Email Address: 

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.

Yes, if yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct

Hawthorn offers a premium residential experience that respects the history of our city and its unique architectural design and lifestyle offerings. Allowing for developments that scale to a height of 6 stories will significantly impact and negate the character of this premium suburb. High-density residential impacts on the demographics of an area as well as impacting the physical nature of buildings that would encroach on the area as developments gain approval. It seems an anomoly that in a City Council area that covets and protects the heritage and architectural style of one of its suburbs, Colonel Light Gardens, that it seems so willing to forgo the character of other areas under its jurisdiction. I am supportive of an upgrade to the street scape in this area but will not offer my support to develop above 2 stories. We live in a street that is currently zoned as residential A1 and the encroachment from adjacent commercial, that has occurred in recent years has already impacted on the quality of living experience. Despite this we are still paying premium rates for this zoning classification. I suspect developments of this nature will impact on the value of individual residential homes. My question to any member of the Council is how would they vote if their own home fell in the zone that they are seeking to recklessly. Perhaps the North Adelaide model that puts residents at the forefront of the decision-making process should be investigated by the Mitcham Council.

Q5 Goodwood & Daws Roads Growth Precinct

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.

Yes

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.

Respondent skipped this question

Respondent skipped this question

Respondent skipped this question

Respondent skipped this question

Respondent skipped this question

Respondent skipped this question
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Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct

This is a fantastic area to live and development around public transport is a great idea. We need to be strategic about maintaining and increasing tree canopy.

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct

My comments are the same for Belair Road Precinct and Blackwood: we need to preserve tree canopy for climate change, avoid localised heat of houses and for wildlife habitat. Trees will disappear if we do not put a value on them and plan for their inclusion in our cities. For land owners excited by this financial windfall, they can look at the property values of treeless suburbs and see it as much less. I am also concerned about increasing the population in a fire risk zone. Especially if that will be an aging population. I see merit in the purpose of allowing retirees to stay in the area they know but live in smaller houses. I would be interested to know if this has been achieved elsewhere? Are blocks not going to be bought by developers? Are the new houses going to be accessible? If we are serious about providing for an aging population we would be specifying land for independent units. If we are allowing this for urban infill, we need parameters to ensure this is significant.

Q6 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct

I will add that it should be considered that there are currently bus stops but no busses on Dawes Rd, otherwise. My comments are the same for Belair Road Precinct and Blackwood: we need to preserve tree canopy for climate change, avoid localised heat of houses and for wildlife habitat. Trees will disappear if we do not put a value on them and plan for their inclusion in our cities. For land owners excited by this financial windfall, they can look at the property values of treeless suburbs and see it as much less. I am also concerned about increasing the population in a fire risk zone. Especially if that will be an aging population. I see merit in the purpose of allowing retirees to stay in the area they know but live in smaller houses. I would be interested to know if this has been achieved elsewhere? Are blocks not going to be bought by developers? Are the new houses going to be accessible? If we are serious about providing for an aging population we would be specifying land for independent units. If we are allowing this for urban infill, we need parameters to ensure this is significant.

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.

Yes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.</td>
<td>No,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That will be determined by how our feedback is acted upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.

Yes, if yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct

Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct

Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Goodwood & Daws Roads Growth Precinct

Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct

Urban infill is out of place in the hills. People live here for the hills environment and character. It is important to preserve this. Multi storey housing and small block sizes will lead to loss of vegetation that provides for a whole ecosystem. There will be problems with run off and storm water loss of views. Loss of trees results in a heating affect on the environment as evidenced by heat map imaging. Multi storey development and greatly increased population will exacerbate the already congested traffic strip. This could be disastrous during a bushfire. Fires are becoming a more prevalent and ferocious with global warming. Traffic gridlock, lack of escape routes or fire truck access and mayhem.

We have around 2500 signatures from concerned customers on the Karraka petition which supports keeping urban infill out of the hills and shopping precinct and retaining the local nursery which falls within this proposed zone, not to mention as many signatures again on our online petition and another 1000 on our wrongly addressed petition. Karraka is the only garden centre in the Mitcham area. Karraka is the only nursery in SA that offers a pot recycle service and uses sustainable containers. We are one of a handful that don’t use harmful and carcinogenic growth regulators. Karraka supports local growers. This is all very important to residents in an area where gardening and green space are an important part of life.

Mitcham council has been seen to be leading the way in declaring a climate emergency and I urge you to take all of this into account and decide that Blackwood is an inappropriate choice for urban infill.

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.

No,

Comment:
The DPA plan is flawed in countless ways. We urge the state government to delay its implementation until these issues are addressed.

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.

No,

Comment:
We have tried to inform customers a large proportion probably two thirds of whom live in blackwood and hadn’t heard about it. Very difficult for older residents in particular to do feedback on line.
Draft Growth Precinct Development Plan Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q0 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Comment: We haven't had time to adequately research and inform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comment: Urge you to take this seriously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q1 About You...
Name: Timothy Mudge
City/Town: EDEN HILLS
State/Province: SA
ZIP/Postal Code: 5050
Email Address:

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.
Yes,
If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
up cash grab by council

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
up cash grab by council and dangerous given limited trade sport infrastructure and fire zones

Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Road Growth Precinct
up cash grab by council and dangerous given limited trade sport infrastructure and fire zones

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct
up cash grab by council and dangerous given limited trade sport infrastructure and fire zones

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.
No,
Comment:
No transparency, adequate notification or public consultation. Uber council lining their pockets at the potential cost of lives

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.
No

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.
No

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.
No
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**Complete**
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**Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment**

**Item 3.1 - ATTACHMENT B**

---

**Page 1: Feedback Form**

**Q1 About You...**

Name: 

Address: 

City/Town: 

State/Province: 

ZIP/Postal Code: 

Email Address: 

---

**Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.**

**Yes,**

If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

---

**Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct**

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct**

I would like to comment on this particular area given my history of nearly 40 years as a resident in various homes in the area.

1. Gradually the Blackwood area has become significantly busier in all areas. There can be no argument with this point.

2. Traffic has become almost unbearable at times, especially peak periods. Again no possible argument as shown by traffic surveys.

3. Population growth in the region has increased through multiple methods mainly by multiple dwellings constructed on large blocks by developers. Additionally, new houses built with urban spread in areas like Blackwood Park. Directionally the high density housing proposals on small blocks absolutely exacerbates these issues.

4. History in other councils show massive discontent. huge inconvenience, infrastructure constraints, transport congestion, no parking availability, legal fights and generally loss of council credibility. An example of all these has and continues to occur with dumb decisions made

I want to make three key points:

1. High density housing on or near main road Blackwood cannot possibly be done without seriously further affecting traffic congestion and associated safety issues.

2. The whole community is acutely aware of bushfire issues, risks and safety. High density housing is going to risk the local population from leaving in a fire event.

3. Campbeltown and Paradise areas have been a disaster for resident and council. Nobody wants their disasters here.

---

**Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.**

**Yes**

---

**Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.**

**Yes**

---

**Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.**

**Yes**

---

**Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.**

**Yes**

---
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Mr Matthew Pears  
Chief Executive Officer, City of Mitcham  
PO Box 21, Mitcham Shopping Centre  
Torrens Park SA 5062  
By email: Mitcham@mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au

Re: Public Submission – Draft Mitcham (City) Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Dear Mr Pears,

I have prepared this submission on behalf of my daughter, Greta Rumsby, and her husband, Dino Leopardi, owner/occupiers of land at Panorama.

Ms Rumsby and Mr Leopardi object to the proposed rezoning of their property, and all residential allotments west of Daniels Road from Residential (Central Plains) Zone to a Mixed Use Zone.

I note that, unlike the rezoning of the Repatriation Hospital site, the above draft DPA has been prepared prior to the preparation of a detailed master plan. The draft policies and proposed zone boundaries appear to have adopted the areas broadly defined by a ‘Structure Plan’ – which broadly proposes how the four quadrants of the Goodwood Road/Daws Road/Springbank Road intersection might be developed. The Structure Plan identifies principles for matters including desired access and business focal points, walking and cycling routes, building heights, as well as public plazas etc. Tellingly, the Structure Plan on which the draft DPA is founded, confirms that the form of future development of the former TAFE and Bedford Industries sites is to be “… further refined with separate master plan”.

On my appreciation of the Structure Plan it appears that the concept for a ‘main street’ on the Bedford site is the ‘driver’ for the planned expansion of the proposed Mixed Use Zone beyond Bedford and into the current Residential Zone – the consequences of which on the interface in residential Panorama do not appear to have been fully appreciated. In particular, it is unclear from the Structure Plan, and the policy regime under the draft DPA:

- whether Daniels Road (a narrow no-through residential street of less than 6m in width) will be relied upon to provide vehicle access from Springbank Road into the Mixed Use Zone;
- what building form and land use is expected to be developed to the west of Daniels Road and how this relates to the balance of the Mixed Use Zone; and
- how the interface between residential and non-residential uses on either side of Daniels Road will be reconciled and what kind of living conditions and character
can be expected at the interface. In particular, what will be the consequences in terms of traffic, building height and form, and the foreseeable amenity of residential properties sharing a public road at the interface of the zone divide.

In my view, the use of public roads as the ‘divide’ between residential and non-residential land uses (which interestingly is to be remedied under the DPA for nearby Ontario Avenue), is a poor planning decision. A far better outcome can be achieved at the rear of properties as indeed occurs at the moment where an articulated and moderate building height wall separates the rear of the Daniels Road residences from the unloading and dispatch of manufactured goods at Bedford Industries, with its associated process and traffic noise.

I consider that the rezoning in its current form will likely produce a poor residential/non-residential interface. In the absence of a detailed master plan for Bedford and the active participation of a public authority to assemble and co-ordinate redevelopment, I expect that this part of Panorama will be blighted by degraded residential properties which suffer the haphazard development, or threat of industrial, commercial and mixed business uses.

If, on the other hand, the Council only ever intends to have residential development on properties fronting Daniels Road, then there is simply no justification for extending the proposed Mixed Use Zone to the Daniels Road centreline as proposed.

The Council should, in my view, pause the DPA and undertake the necessary investigations and resolve the above issues before advancing it further. If, politically, the Council is required to advance the DPA and have it approved ahead of certain legislative and policy changes to be introduced on 1 July 2020 for Greater Metropolitan Adelaide, then the boundary should revert, with a proper and detailed interface scheme, to the current Light Industry Zone on the eastern boundary of the Bedford site.

Alternatively, upon completion of the master plan if Council is of the view that an easterly expansion of the Mixed Use Zone is required in order to realise its development goals, the rezoning should only take place after proper consultation with affected residents and only once the foreseen interface issues at the residential/non-residential divide are resolved. Under no circumstances however, should the Mixed Use Zone/Residential Zone boundary be aligned along a public road.

I confirm that the writer seeks the opportunity to address the Council in support of this submission at the 3 December 2019 public hearing. Please confirm the time and place at which those submissions will be heard.

Alan Rumsby FPIA
cc: Councillors Dave Munro and Yvonne Todd
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Q1 About You...
Name: James Bosley
Address: Blackwood
City/Town: Blackwood
State/Province: SA
ZIP/Postal Code: 5051
Email Address:

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.
Yes,
If yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct
The divide between 'Residential Hills' and now 'Suburban Neighborhood' down Brighton Parade from Sheppard Hills Rd and Briaglow Ave brings a detrimental effect on my property value. The divide disadvantages one side of the street to the other. Could the divide be changed to run between the back of houses and not separate street-scapes? whether thats between Brighton Parade and Gladstone Rd o the east or Brighton Parade and Woodleigh Rd to the west...

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.
Yes,
Comment:
All information was sourced independently through the web site which was well informed, but I attended the forum at Blackwood Community Hall on 16/1/19 and felt the expertise was overwhelming... was told by councillor Colin just to fill in the form and send back, nobody really knew or cared what was going on.

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.
Yes

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.
No,
Comment:
Refer to above comment, see how we go...

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.
Yes
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Q1 About You...

Name: Victoria Stavrou
Address: Hawthorn
City/Town: SA
ZIP/Postal Code: 5062
Email Address:

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.

Yes, if yes, please provide your telephone number and email address.
Mobile:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
My family and I strongly oppose the proposed changes. I submitted a written letter to the council which outlines my concerns. I moved to this suburb for the serenity and lifestyle that comes with living in Hawthorn and the price I paid for my house reflects this.

Q5 Goodwood & Dawes Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.

No,
Comment: It was very hard to understand. It was not clear in what you were actually proposing. The images (maps) were unclear and to a layman it was hard to understand. It's only because a number of my neighbours alerted me to the proposal that I understood what it actually meant. I feel council has misled many of the residents being affected by not being clearer in its language.

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.

No,
Comment:
See above

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.

Yes

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.

No
Mitcham Council
PO Box 21
Mitcham Shopping Centre
Torrens Park, SA, 5062

26 November 2019

Subject: Ratepayers Objections to Precincts Development Plan Amendment (DPA)

Dear Council Members

I am writing in response to your proposal to approve the Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment. I live on William Street in Hawthorn and am a ratepayer. The DPA, if approved, will affect my family and neighbours greatly.

I have four major concerns, described below in numbered sections:

1. Likely House Values Devalued in DPA Areas

   The very reason my family (and in speaking with residents and neighbours who live nearby, most have the same concerns) chose to live here in Hawthorn were the leafy, quiet streets with large "grand" old houses situated on sizeable blocks of land. The Mitcham Council has always had the reputation of being significant and influential protectors of the environment, wild life and heritage housing. The old houses in leafy streets have given Hawthorn its reputation as being a "premium suburb", with its consequent premium property prices.

   Changing the ambiance of Hawthorn through the proposed DPA, to a busier and "developed" urban area (which is associated more with living in the Adelaide CBD, or in the outer fringe suburbs) will adversely affect this suburb and negate the very reason people such as ourselves look to move here.
As a direct result, the properties which adjoin this DPA-re-zoned area will decline in value.

As a consequence, trying to sell our current property in the future would mean monetary losses. Consequently:

a. Will the Council revalue the properties and reduce the annual council rates?

b. And as well, provide compensation to home owners bordering this re-zoned area if such losses will occur?

2. Parking Issues

Parking on Hampton St. and William St. is already difficult. Customers and employees of the surrounding businesses (on Belair Rd) consistently breach the signed Parking Rules and exceed parking time limits. We have contacted the Council on numerous occasions asking to send Parking Rangers/Inspectors and issue tickets to parked cars which have exceeded the 15-minute limit (which happens daily), as well as for tow-trucks parked in the 15-minute zone illegally (it being a residential zone and not a commercial zone). Very little has been done in “response”, with little evidence that parking tickets have been issued.

We have also requested that a “No Standing Zone” signs be placed over the speed humps on Hampton Street up to William Street, to overcome the dangerous nature facing us, when exiting out of our own driveway. (No one from the Council has even attempted or experienced this manoeuvre from our driveway to realise the danger to a young child sitting in the back seat being “rear-ended” by a car that could not be seen (and generally, cars driving on Hampton St are speeding).

Again it seems the Council has shown little concern about the basic safety of Ratepayers who pay Council rates in excess of $4,000 per year.

If Council is unable to cope with and satisfactorily address the current parking issues and enforce its own signed restrictions, how is Council going to cope when DPA-
approved building actually begins? Where will contractors, construction workers, building inspectors, managers etc all park, let alone, 4-level residents, employees, clients etc. after construction? And where will this leave current residents, their family and friends?

3. Safety Issues and Increased Traffic Density

Hampton Street is zoned as 40kph. Again, something breached on a daily basis by drivers using it as a shortcut between Hilda Terrace and Unley road or to cut through to turn onto Cross Roads. The speed bumps do not work.

With increased traffic running through these streets as a direct result of not only the actual construction, but the increase in number of residents, how is the safety of residents going to not be affected?

4. Residential Privacy Issues

Most home owner in the likely DPA-impacted areas have properties protected by high fences to ensure safety and privacy. With the DPA approved, allowing four levels office and residential blocks backing onto existing private properties, occupants residing in such offices and apartments will be able to see over into our hitherto private back yards and observe any activities. We will have no control over who will live in, or be visitors to, the apartments or offices. Many of the houses and families in private residences have young children, who play, and in many case splash and swim in private swimming pools This is of huge concern to us as we have no guarantee of privacy or even, basic physical safety, for example, if objects are thrown from the high-floors onto our hitherto private gardens and back yards.

Council has provided no information on how this will be addressed.

For us ratepayers, Council sets the annual rates, which we dutifully pay. Annual Council rates are justified if there is a "quid pro quo": namely Council provides general services for ratepayers
and residents (roads, clean footpaths, rubbish and waste collection etc) and addresses their specific concerns. We have above listed – and justified – some concerns for you to address and redress.

In addition: Why has this issue of rezoning under the DPA proposal not been foreshadowed during the last Council elections, and only recently, and then with such little fanfare and limiting the distribution of Council material to a few only residents. When going around our neighbourhood “Trick-or-treating” recently, the number of local residents unaware of Council’s DPA proposal was staggering!

In conclusion, we intend to continue to fight this as we feel that these are important issues.

Yours sincerely

Victoria Stavrou

Ph:

Hawthorn SA 5062
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

Q1 About You...
Name: Tom Morrison
Address: Glenalla, SA 5052

Q2 Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public hearing? Scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park. If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public hearing will not be held.

Yes, if yes, please provide your telephone number and email address:

Q3 Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Goodwood & Dawas Roads Growth Precinct
Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct

General Zoning Comments
Overall, I agree with the re-zonings proposals from the Council. I understand that the Council is unsure at this stage which zones in the new Planning and Design Code would be most applicable for the ‘Mixed Use’ and ‘District Centre’ zones. Currently, DPTI’s proposal has changed ‘Mixed Use Zone’ into ‘Suburban Business and Innovation’ and ‘District Centre’ into ‘Urban Activity Centre’. With this in mind, I would suggest that making the ‘District Centre’ zoning smaller and increasing the size of the ‘Mixed Use’ zone could deliver better outcomes for the area that align with the goals set out for this DPA. It would appear that the ‘Suburban Business and Innovation’ zone (Mixed Use) is much more open to allowing for residential development above shops and therefore better suited to encouraging developers to offer different housing types. Making the ‘Urban Activity Centre’ (District Centre) smaller, would hopefully force larger developments such as the new Aldi to be situated closer to the existing main shopping precinct, therefore encouraging people to walk rather than drive.

Recommendation: Areas I think that could be changed from ‘District Centre’ to ‘Mixed Use’ include the North East of the roundabout and West of Gladstone Road on the South side of Shepherds Hill Road.

I am concerned that increasing development in Blackwood will exacerbate issues with traffic during peak times, car parking issues for the shopping centre and bus stop egress. The transport review from Tonkin, as part of the DPA, seems to suggest that traffic on Main Road north of Chapman Street could increase by nearly 20%. This would undermine the attempts to increase pedestrian activity on Main Road. I understand that a primary driver behind this plan is to stop the decline of the Blackwood Shopping district. Blackwood and the surrounding areas have never had a larger population, yet the shops continue to struggle. This would seem to suggest that a larger population will not fix this issue and could make the situation worse. While I understand many of the solutions to these problems are outside the scope of the council, making the situation worse is not a good idea. Bus stop egress is touched on very lightly in the DPA and does not seem to consider the impact on residents from surrounding suburbs such as Hawthorndene and Glenalla in trying to leave the area. I have no doubt that the CFS will stick to their ‘leave early’ mantra but this is simply not practical for many. As an aside note, demographic and behavioural changes are continuing to put bricks and mortar stores under pressure, and I do not believe that it is the council’s role to try and reverse this by attempting to increase the population.

Recommendation: Potentially explore the possibility of setting up a carparking fund for the precinct that developers would be required to contribute money towards if their developments do not meet the carparking requirements. Support ways for elderly residents to leave the area in case of a bushfire. Initiate a bus stop egress review for the Mitcham Hills to identify issues and propose solutions.

Mixed Use Zone and District Centre Comments
For the ‘Mixed Use Zone’, I believe that a 3-storey development limit would be better for Blackwood. This closely aligns with the ‘Suburban Business and Innovation’ zone proposed by DPTI for the area in the new planning code. Critically, I think that this will allow for a gradual increase in the height of the buildings around Blackwood. The larger developments in this zone will most likely be approved by SCARP. I believe it is important that the Mitcham Council tries to avoid the
Draft Growth Precinct Development Plan Amendment

outcomes that have been occurring on Unley Road recently where in a 5-storey zone, SCAP has approved a 7-storey tall block of apartments which backs directly onto single storey detached dwellings. This would limit the potential of 6-storey developments in Blackwood which would be completely out of character with the local area. Furthermore, developers who retain large trees, increased setbacks from the main road or the ‘Suburban Neighbourhood zone could be incentivised by allowing for the addition of another storey.

The intention to encourage buildings in the ‘Mixed Use’ zone to maintain a ‘pedestrian scale at street level’ is important. I believe however, that a setback of 4-5 meters including multiple deep soil zones should be considered. For the main road of Blackwood, adding additional trees has been difficult due to the numerous services on both sides of the road and the powerlines. There is substantial potential with this re-zoning to encourage the planting of more trees on private land to vastly improve the public realm appearance of Blackwood. I do not believe that the current proposals in the DPA do this well enough as it appears to only advocate for one deep root zone per development and minimal setbacks.

Recommendation: Height limit in the ‘Mixed Use Zone’ should be 3-storeys. Mandate a large set-back from the main road for the purpose of including multiple (multiple being the key word) deep root zones to allow for the greening of the public realm space through a ‘Technical and Numerical Variation’.

Suburban Neighbourhood Comments

I am not at all happy with the idea of 250sqm blocks for detached houses in the ‘Suburban Neighbourhood Area’. This will completely ruin the character of Blackwood, resulting in a substantial loss of trees and amenities as well as an increase in the urban heat island effect. This aspect of the DPA seems to completely contradict what the council has been trying to do in other areas such as the Character Areas DPA. Furthermore, I believe that blocks of this size will encourage the development of two storey homes or single storey homes that are not at all appropriate for the elderly. Block sizes in this area for detached homes should be a minimum of 450sqm or even potentially 600sqm considering the tendency for there to be a 10% variation in the ‘minimum’ block size. This will encourage developments such as what can be found around Café 1823 where the block sizes are still large enough to have a garden.

Most importantly, retaining the block size of 450sqm will allow the zone to be ‘Suburban Neighbourhood Zone’ rather than a ‘General Neighbourhood Zone’ in the new planning code. The deemed-to-suitably outcomes for a ‘Suburban Neighbourhood Zone’ are much better suited for Blackwood and the surrounding areas. This also follows with what the Adelaide Hills Council has done around the Stirling area to allow for different housing choices. They are very happy with the ‘Suburban Neighbourhood’ zoning for this area.

At the end of the day, allowing for detached homes on 250sqm blocks is not an efficient way of doing urban infill that is environmentally friendly. With such small blocks, the potential for any large-scale development in the future will be nearly impossible, as like in the Blackwood Shopping area where the multiple lands make it difficult to generate change. A minimum block size of 250sqm does not fit with the council’s recent decision to declare a climate emergency or fit well with the draft Mitcham 2030 vision. I believe that it contradicts the following points:

+ T1.2 – 250sqm blocks will result in more fences than ever and a substantial increase in urban heat which will impact our elderly and younger residents the most. The City of Mitcham currently has tree canopy cover of over 40% in areas of 5A where 250sqm block sizes exist, the canopy cover is below 20%. It is becoming widely recognised that canopy coverage of 30% is critical in maintaining public health and wellbeing
+ T2.1 and T2.2 – 250sqm blocks will completely trash the biodiversity of our natural landscapes with a massive increase in hard surfaces and stormwater run off
+ T3.1 and T3.2 – 250sqm blocks are not attractive and do not encourage vibrant precincts as there is no creation of shared public green spaces or facilities

If the council believes that there is a requirement to significantly increase the population in Blackwood, then following the development principles found in areas like Europe and Singapore is the only way to do it. In general, they have allowed for multi-storey developments that maximize height, minimise building footprint and maximise shared public green space. If done correctly, this increase in population does not result in a decrease of tree canopy coverage, supports vibrant, engaged communities and makes it more economical to provide services such as public transport.

Recommendation: Maintain the existing 450sqm block size minimum and the zoning for ‘Suburban Neighbourhood Zone’. With the expansion of the zoning where block sizes like this will be possible, it should unlock ample opportunity for different housing options.

Q7 I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand.

Yes,

Comment:
Thank you for making the full DPA PDF a non-scanned copy. Potentially some development scenarios would have been useful, similar to what DPTI has provided with the Draft Planning and Design Code.

Q8 I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation.

Yes

Q9 I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA.

Yes

Q10 I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA.

Yes
28 November 2019

Mr Craig Harrison  
General Manager, Development Services & Community Safety  
City of Mitcham  
PO Box 21 Mitcham Shopping Centre  
TORRENS PARK SA  5062

Dear Ms Carr,

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT – TARGETED GROWTH AREAS FOR CITY OF MITCHAM (DAWS RD/ GOODWOOD RD)

Firstly, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Development Plan Amendment prepared. The area to which this submission speaks is generally limited to that within and surrounding the Goodwood Road / Daws Road precinct.

In the consultation period for the 2018 "Shape Your Place" campaign, in which Council put to consultation ideas and concept plans for future growth in certain areas to inform a future Development Plan Amendment (DPA) I lodged a submission, which I have attached for reference as much of the material submitted is also relevant for the western part of Precinct 2 (Goodwood Road and Daws Road).

The land contained in my "Study Area" identified within the aforementioned submission, comprises land bordered by the Repatriation Hospital site (east), Daws Road (south), Winston Avenue (west) and the northern side of Day Avenue and Grantley Avenue (north), which was identified within an area shown in the Precinct 2 – West part of the Structure Plan on consultation.

This area, the main focus of this submission, is principally proposed to be rezoned to Suburban Neighbourhood Zoning, with the Repatriation General Hospital site being provided with a separate Policy Area tailored specifically to the site, within the Mixed Use Zone, which is to be made consistent with the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) State Planning Policy Library (SPPL).

In principle, I am supportive of the proposed amendments to the Development Plan above, however think there are areas where it could be improved or perhaps policies designed to better achieve truly ‘diverse’ built form and housing tenure.

HOUSING DIVERSITY – PURSUING THE ELUSIVE PLANNING UTOPIA

In my years working at City of Campbelltown as a planner there was a Residential Development Plan Amendment (2014) that included substantially reduced site areas (150m² for dwellings in residential flat buildings and row dwellings in certain areas, but not confined to along transport corridors), which significantly altered the built form
character of many established suburbs and resulted in some very poor planning and
design outcomes including, loss of street trees, loss of canopy cover generally, very
undesirable built form outcomes with limited articulation, extensive overshadowing,
loss of on-street parking, poor internal amenity, very low amounts of landscaping and
the list goes on. There was some good development among all this, but that was in
the minority.

The problems did not necessarily stem from the site area minima alone. The main issue
in my opinion, was that the development industry has a desire to push for a certain
type of housing product that can still fall within the definition of a residential flat
building, but with each dwelling very much having its own private setting, private car
parking, garaging linked to each dwelling rather than being in a common facility, and
so forth. In lay persons terms, what the development industry constantly sought were
‘townhouses’ as opposed to apartment buildings. That is where the site area became
a real problem as very little area was left for quality landscaping. The Development
Plan policy was either too weak to command better outcomes or perhaps the horse
had been allowed to bolt out the blocks too early and staff lost control of the situation
to a degree.

In an apartment building, areas of communal open space or circulation, common
parking areas and if two storeys, having dwellings located entirely above ground
means that greater curtilage can be provided and more modulation of facades
generally results, with balconies being required for private open space.

With less area being allocated to access and parking requirements and a single
vehicle access point being able to be provided to such development, this makes a
lot of difference to the built form and landscaping outcomes. Many good examples
of this can be seen within Melbourne’s inner rim suburbs, where these sit in many
instances much more harmoniously alongside established detached housing, than
the jammed together townhouses that are seen through Hectorville, Campbelltown
and nearby areas here.

The point I am trying to make is unfortunately the definitions within the Development
Regulations 2008 fail us as planners in so many ways, and it does not appear that the
draft Planning and Design Code will fix this, and perhaps this is a discussion for another
forum, but I would encourage site area minima to be reviewed in the context of what
the nature of built form actually is, with respect to residential flat buildings, rather than
necessarily being constrained by outdated and inadequate definitions.

I consider that ‘proper’ residential flat buildings, comprising buildings with meaningful
common areas, common parking and/or at least some dwellings that are located
entirely above ground should be afforded a lower site area minimum to encourage
this form of more orderly infill development, while providing true housing diversity
instead of more of the same ‘three bedroom, two bathroom’ townhouses squashed
together, seen in areas where targeted infill policy has failed to deliver true housing
diversity.

There would be a way to address this and support truly greater housing diversity by
adjusting Principle of Development Control 16 of the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone
as follows:

---

City of Mitcham – Targeted Growth Areas DPA Submission
PDC 16: A dwelling should have a minimum site area (and in the case of residential flat buildings or group dwellings, an average site area per dwelling (including the area of the common driveway)) and a frontage to a public road not less than that shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Minimum area (square metres)</th>
<th>Desired Minimum Net Residential Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached (except where constructed boundary to boundary)</td>
<td>250 minimum allotment area</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>250 minimum allotment area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row dwelling and detached dwelling constructed boundary to boundary</td>
<td>250 minimum allotment area</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group dwellings and residential flat building</td>
<td>250 average site area per dwelling</td>
<td>16 (total development site frontage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential flat buildings comprising two or more storeys and including common parking facilities for residents and visitors and/or above ground dwellings</td>
<td>200 average site area per dwelling OR 150 average site area per dwelling where at least 50% of dwellings have 2 bedrooms or less and/or comprise an aged care facility, retirement village or independent living units</td>
<td>16 (total development site frontage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusion of a reduced site area for the circumstance where there are dwellings with two bedrooms or less addresses a problem with the current system that fails to deliver affordable housing that allows for entry into the housing market for first home buyers, while specific considerations for aged accommodation should be given consideration due to the ageing demographic of the area.

In my experience 15m is not a sufficient frontage width for orderly car parking and manoeuvring on site for residential flat buildings where access to garaging is perpendicular to the site frontage and generally this does not allow sufficient space for a tandem visitor space in front for those more ‘private’ dwelling arrangements in residential flat buildings. Hence it is considered that 16m should be a minimum frontage for this type of development, if not more.
PDC 17: The minimum site area requirements and front setback requirements where located on an arterial road can be reduced where the division is accompanied by a building envelope plan detailing building footprints and wall heights that demonstrates that the development contributes to the desired character of the zone and the internal occupant amenity of residents is protected from traffic noise and where one of the following applies:

(a) The allotment(s) is located within 200 metres of the Urban Corridor, Mixed Use or Centre Zones
(b) The development includes 15 percent affordable housing
(c) The allotment(s) is directly adjacent public open space greater than 2000 square metres

I note that an 8m front setback is stipulated for the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone for arterial roads, while in the Mixed Use Zone there is specific setback requirements to encourage development to a zero setback line in part, or otherwise three metres, to activate frontages.

As indicated in my submission in 2018 for “Shape your place” Daws Road is a relatively low volume arterial road and is also a very wide road, with generous verge space on the northern side, a central vegetated, raised median and generally good spatial separation from the front of properties to traffic. This is close to the Mixed Use Zone and therefore PDC 17 above would apply to the area along Daws Rd within the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone.

For typical “one into two” residential developments, an 8m setback is probably adequate to cater for the vehicle movements required for ingress and egress in a forward direction. However, with apartment buildings for example, there might be opportunity to have a consolidated access point and with suitable vertical separation from the road, e.g. with a basement car park, dwellings could potentially be located closer without there being undue acoustic impact. This would need to be tied to a proper design that addresses all potential planning issues and therefore, I consider that alteration of PDC 17 as above or similarly could deliver appropriate solutions in this respect.

THE MISSING LINK – CONNECTING HARVEY HAYES RESERVE TO NEARBY AREAS

Regrettably there has been two properties that have sold in the last 12 months on the eastern side of Day Avenue, backing onto the Repatriation Hospital (the ‘Repat’) site that would have presented a missed opportunity for Council to purchase and create a pedestrian link between the Repat site and the Harvey Hayes Reserve, as envisaged in the Mixed Use Zone (Repatriation General Hospital) Policy Area Structure Plan.

The linkages being established between reserve areas and activity areas are important to make the most of the relatively limited public open space currently in the area and this point is reinforced by the Structure Plan for the proposed Mixed Use, which shows a link being created between the Repat and Harvey Hayes Reserve. I would encourage Council to actively pursue ways to establish this link, together with a possible link between Lancelot Drive and Day Avenue.
I note that the Structure Plan by Jensen Plus detailed in the Precinct 2 Spatial Vision does not quite correlate with the Development Plan’s Structure Plan, which fails to reflect the desired link to be established between Harvey Hayes Reserve and the Repat Site. I would encourage this be included.

CONCLUSION

Overall, I am generally supportive of changes envisaged for the part of Daw Park within Precinct 2-West, however would like to highlight that this area is 7km south of the Adelaide CBD and well located for higher density forms of residential development and mixed use developments in appropriate locations.

If the comments within this submission can be taken on board for future refinements of the Development Plan Amendment, and in particular for Precinct 2, that would be greatly appreciated.

If there are any items that need clarification please contact the undersigned on or via email.

Yours sincerely,

ANDREW CRONIN  MPlA
Director, AcroPLAN[SA]
Urban Planner & Designer
MURP, B.DesSA.

Enc [1]
- “Shape Your Place” 2018 submission
29 August 2018

Mr Craig Harrison
General Manager, Development Services & Community Safety
City of Mitcham
PO Box 21 Mitcham Shopping Centre
TORRENS PARK SA  5062

Dear Mr Harrison,

SHAPE YOUR PLACE – STRUCTURE PLANS FOR FUTURE ZONING IN THE CITY OF MITCHAM

Firstly, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Structure Plans prepared by Jensen Plus on behalf of the City of Mitcham, to inform State Government in the planning reform process for future Zoning.

In the consultation period for the Development Plan Amendment (DPA) undertaken by State Government in relation to the Repatriation Hospital and surrounding land (October 2017) hereafter referred to as the “Mixed Use Zone” DPA, I lodged a submission in relation to the DPA to the State Commission Assessment Panel (SCAP), which I have attached for reference as much of the material submitted is also relevant for the western part of Precinct 2 (Goodwood Road and Daws Road).

The land contained in my “Study Area” identified within the aforementioned submission, comprises land bordered by the Repatriation Hospital site (east), Daws Road (south), Winston Avenue (west) and the northern side of Day Avenue and Grantley Avenue (north), which is identified within an area shown in the Precinct 2 – West part of the Structure Plan on consultation. This area is the main focus of my submission.

The principal difference between the bounds of my “Study Area” and the pink area highlighted for change within Precinct 2 – West shown in the draft Structure Plan is the Jensen Plus Plan also includes a part of Morgan Avenue on the southern side between Rockville Avenue and up to Jose Street, on the opposite side of Winston Avenue, and also includes small dead-end streets on the western side of Winston Avenue and around 16 allotments between Winston Avenue and Jose Street, including those along Morgan Avenue west of Winston Avenue and Winston Court.

While I do not necessarily object to the boundaries of “Precinct 2 – West” I find it somewhat odd that the area denoted for change in the Precinct includes a part of Morgan Avenue but not on the northern side and that it includes Morgan Avenue at all. In my view, being very familiar with the area, Morgan Avenue displays more consistent character to that of other east-west streets to the north, such as Crozier and Kingston Avenues, and perhaps should be removed from the Precinct, save for allotments very close to Winston Avenue on both the northern and southern side to
encourage higher density housing in close proximity to established transport network, and close to the small group of shops at the Winston Avenue/Morgan Avenue intersection. Having part of the northern side of the street included would allow more future development lots to have north to their rear for optimal orientation, and allows for more consistency in terms of future urban form on both sides of the street.

While it is acknowledged that the purposes of a Structure Plan is not necessarily to flesh out too much detail at this stage, and especially given the level of uncertainty with the planning reforms process. I would like to offer comments in relation to the Structure Plans for Precinct 2: West and East. I will begin with an assessment of how I consider the built form and land use character within the “pink” area identified in the Structure Plan for Precinct 2: West.

**LAND USE CHARACTER**

Precinct 2-West contains principally low-density residential development, mostly single storey detached dwellings, with some incursions of new brick veneer detached and semi-detached dwellings on the original allotments, or smaller subdivided allotments. The whole of the “pink” area identified for change in Precinct 2-West is contained in the Central Plains Policy Area at present, which does not encourage development at medium to higher residential density, and generally precludes non-residential forms of development.

Nevertheless at the northern end of the “pink” area in the Structure Plan, there is a group of small shops at the junction of Morgan and Winston Avenue on the northeastern side. Allotments otherwise along Winston Avenue contain residential development, other than two at the very southern end, where Winston Avenue meets Daws Road. A small group of shops is contained on the western side of this junction, which includes a Vietnamese convenience shop and take-away, and a pizza shop/restaurant. Further west there is a consulting room used by Physiotherapists and Chiropractors. There is also an office containing Disability SA on the opposite side of the Winston Avenue, at the corner of Winston Avenue and Daws Road. A detached dwelling exists to the east of Disability SA on an undivided allotment and then there is another substantial non-residential use, comprising the Telstra St Mary’s telecommunications exchange sited at the corner of Perry Avenue, which is around 4 storeys in height.

Overall, within the pink area identified in Precinct 2 – West, there are a number of existing ‘out of zone’ uses, particularly on Daws Road. Of note there is also a large aged care facility (Estia Health DAW Park Aged Care facility) that has extended well beyond its original bounds (when it was Miroma Nursing Home) to the point it now has frontage to Daws Road. This now encompasses most land on the western quadrant of Lancelot Drive, extending to three former detached dwelling allotments on Daws Road between the corner of Lancelot Drive and the Telstra exchange, and now includes an allotment that faces Perry Avenue. It occupies an area of over 9800m², as can be seen on the marked up aerial image from nearmap.com on the following page.
While an aged care facility is kind of residential in nature, it is in the form of institutional care, which has a significantly different impact on the built form character and traffic conditions in the locality than normal residential uses. Having noted the aforementioned uses, they do not present significant externalities in terms of smell, noise, dust, vibration or otherwise. Other than car parking overspill in the adjacent streets, they generally do not detrimentally impact on existing residential uses nearby.

Within the pink area identified in the Structure Plan of the Precinct, the character is predominantly residential but for isolated non-residential examples stated. The fact that the non-residential uses as well as a significant institutional use are concentrated within a very small part of the Precinct on Daws Road is significant. This makes the remaining dwellings (being 182 and 190 through to 200 Daws Road) the only dwellings that face Daws Road between Winston Avenue and the eastern end of the Repatriation Hospital site.

**BUILT FORM CHARACTER**

The housing stock within the locality for consideration is generally comprised of ex-service housing, constructed in the era immediately following the Second World War until approximately 1960 for returned servicemen. Most dwellings in the defined area are single storey detached dwellings on substantial land holdings, generally in the order of 700m² or more. Housing is ageing and some of this is in relatively poor condition. There are isolated examples of new builds replacing existing housing stock, in Perry Avenue, Day Avenue and on Winston Avenue, as well as a mid 2000s brick veneer dwelling at the south-eastern corner of the Precinct, directly abutting the Repatriation Hospital site, and a new dwelling under construction on the corner of Daws Road and Lancelot, two allotments west of the Repatriation Hospital. Some of the dwellings in the area can be seen in the following images:
OUT OF ZONE USES

There are two sites that have substantial commercial buildings contained upon them, including the multi-storey Telstra exchange at the corner of Perry Avenue and Daws Road and the Disability SA regional offices at the corner of Winston Avenue and Daws Road. They are seen as follows:
OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

All streets in the Precinct 2-West area are provided with mature trees lining their verges. Day Avenue and Perry Avenue are lined with mature Jacaranda Mimosifolia trees, while native Eucalyptus and Corymbia species trees are contained to the Harvey Hayes Reserve and comprise street trees in Willett and Grantley Avenue, as well as part of Day Avenue surrounding the reserve and a local vegetated part of road reserve in part of Day Avenue near the northern end of Perry Avenue.

Harvey Hayes Reserve is a local park of around 5500m² and has been the subject of a recent Council initiated refurbishment, with the introduction of a stormwater detention basin and substantially more vegetation, providing a scenic outlook and improved environmental conditions. Open space represents quite a small percentage of the overall study area, being around 4.5% of the overall area, and there is not abundant areas of open space outside of this, with the relatively recent loss of around half of the former Daws Road High School oval to a retirement village. Road reserve comprises approximately 22,500m² within my defined study area, not including the actual road reserve of Winston Avenue or Daws Road, but all streets in between.

The lack of open space within the area is recognised in Page 15 of the DPA documentation on public consultation October 2017, where it is stated

“…the Development Plan recognises that areas located north of the RGH site and Springbank Road in the Residential [Central Plains] Zone are relatively poorly serviced by the provision of public open space and recreation. The size and scale of the RGH site therefore provides an important opportunity to..."
enhance the provision of open space and recreation areas for the benefit of both residents living on the site and the wider residential area."

DRAFT STRUCTURE PLAN COMMENTS:

Noting the land use and built form character along Daws Road and to a lesser extent Winston Avenue, it is my opinion that the recognition of existing uses should better inform the Structure Plan in its form post-consulation.

The fact that Precinct 2-East includes a narrow strip of housing lots that back onto Pasadena High School, being earmarked for future ‘mixed use’ to ‘feed off’ the future Repatriation Hospital development, apparently due to their close proximity, appears to be somewhat of a strange choice of location for such development.

Firstly, the residential catchment for foot traffic is substantially poorer (as are the environs for walking) in that location than say, between Winston Avenue and the Repatriation Hospital on Daws Road, or further north along Winston Avenue. There are large, undeveloped land holdings, a major cemetery, a public high school with an uncertain future, and commercial, storage and industrial uses to the east. While there are likely to be mixed uses emanate in the former TAFE site in future, it is considered that having these spill over to the other side of Goodwood Road is potentially a recipe for further congesting an already very busy part of Goodwood Road / Five Ash Drive.

Secondly, the area of Daws Road between the hospital and Winston Avenue would be better suited to ‘feed off’ the Repatriation Hospital Development, given it is closer to the hospital and on the same side of Daws Road. I would strongly encourage that mixed use and apartment type developments be contemplated in the “yellow” area highlighted on the aerial image on Page 3.

I note that within the documents on consultation, Precinct 2-West is specifically proposed as having "limited opportunities for infill development sensitively designed to respect established character". I strongly believe that this does not acknowledge the existing out of zone uses on Daws Road in particular, nor recognise the potential of land holdings along Daws Road between Winston Avenue and the Repatriation Hospital to accommodate complementary uses befitting of the close proximity to the revitalised Repatriation Hospital precinct.

I would encourage a bolder approach to development in the Precinct, with development particularly in the areas abutting Winston Avenue, Daws Road and overlooking Harvey Hayes Reserve being in medium and higher density forms, if consolidated sites are provided to ensure this is undertaken in a more orderly manner and with an appropriate allocation of landscaping. Along the two major roads, opportunities for mixed-use development that activates street frontages would seem logical and also assist in framing Daws Road, which is a very wide road.

Adopting a more intense infill approach in these areas could assist in protection of areas where there are more consistent, desirable character elements.

In terms of dealing with the identified lack of open space in the area, it is expected that this will be a significant focus of future development of the Repatriation Hospital site, together with linkages to connect to Mortock Park, the oval adjacent Pasadena High School and Harvey Hayes Reserve. Nevertheless, it is important that these
linkages are reinforced in the Structure Plans proposed, and I fully support the approach in principle.

Another opportunity that may arise in future is that housing lots on the southern side of Day Avenue facing Harvey Hayes Reserve, and on the northern side of Lancelot Drive abutting these, potentially become available for purchase. I would encourage that Council investigate this option and approach these land holders to potentially open up a pedestrian link via Lancelot Drive to Harvey Hayes Reserve, and enhance the network of linkages between nearby reserves, which also includes another smaller reserve in Naomi Terrace, Pasadena. In my opinion this potential linkage should be represented in the Structure Plan post-consultation, with policy that supports it being created in future.

Overall, I am generally supportive of change envisaged for the part of Daw Park within Precinct 2-West, however would like to highlight that this area is 7km south of the Adelaide CBD and well located for higher density forms of residential development and mixed use developments in appropriate locations.

If the comments within this submission can be taken on board for future refinements of the draft Structure Plans, and in particular for Precinct 2, that would be greatly appreciated.

If there are any items that need clarification please contact the undersigned on or via email.

Yours sincerely,

ANDREW CRONIN  MPIA
Director, ActoPLAN[S.A]
Urban Planner & Designer
MUPP, B.Des(SI).

Enc [1]
- Repatriation Hospital and surrounding areas DPA submission
Written submission on behalf of Daphne Moshos & Michael Kyratzoulis of Hawthorn dated 28 November 2019

We strongly oppose the Development Plan Amendment (DPA) proposed by the City of Mitcham (the City) for the reasons set out below.

There are fundamental issues with the DPA and the City’s failure to adequately identify the need for such developments on Belair Road particularly in circumstances where:

1. The current population growth in Adelaide does not support such a substantial and pressing need for high density developments in suburban areas particularly Belair Road, Hawthorn; and

2. There is already existing affordable housing in Hawthorn and surrounding suburbs such as the Bonython apartments on Egmont Terrace which require significant work and repair and have been neglected for many years and which should be prioritised before the development of any further affordable housing.

We are not opposed to change and the need for growth and development in Adelaide as a whole although it is our submission that the City have rushed this decision without giving proper consideration to a number of issues. We also query why significant time, money and effort has been put into this process by the City in circumstances where the City Development Plan will be superseded by a new planning and design code in mid 2020. At the very least, shouldn’t the City be waiting until the new code is implemented?

Some of our submissions and concerns in relation to the proposed Urban Corridor Zone include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>A mixed use zone accommodating a range of compatible non-residential and medium and high density residential land uses orientated towards a high frequency public transport corridor</td>
<td>No compelling evidence provided in relation to the need for high density residential land uses in Belair Road, Hawthorn. The high frequency public transport corridor is already easily accessible to all residents in the area. In the event the DPA proceeds there is likely to be significant impact on traffic on Belair Road and surrounding streets. Limited steps have been taken to address this issue in the DPA. Where is the need for the types of developments proposed? Given the existing recreational and heritage listed properties the Urban Corridor Zone has the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>Integrated, mixed use, medium rise buildings with ground floor uses that create active and vibrant streets with residential development above.</td>
<td>Where is the need for more active and vibrant streets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>A mix of land uses that enable people to work, shop and access a range of services close to home.</td>
<td>This objective is already being met with the current zone and existing commercial properties on Belair Road. There are ample work places, shops and services available to locals. See further below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>Adaptable and flexible building designs that can accommodate changes in land use and respond to changing economic and social conditions.</td>
<td>In what way are the proposed developments adaptable and flexible? What are the changing economic and social conditions particularly in Hawthorn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>Amalgamation of adjacent sites within this zone, that may or may not have a main road frontage, is encouraged to provide better design outcomes in relation to increased design flexibility, diverse building types, increased landscaped open space and consolidation of vehicle access points.</td>
<td>Residential properties are adjacent sites within this zone which limits the size and ability to achieve the DPA’s objectives. Given the size of the lands that have the ability to become developments, there is also limited scope for the desired increased landscaped open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>A built form that provides a transition down in scale and intensity at the zone boundary to maintain the amenity of residential properties located within adjoining zones.</td>
<td>Regardless of the form of any development, it will severely impact upon the amenity of the residential properties located within adjoining zones. When looking at the locality, there’s an impression of an open and spacious relationship between private and public/commercial land. To break this conformity would see the established character of the locality compromised such that the proposal will not enhance this character and will actually detract from that character and the amenity of the locality. Any development will interrupt line of sight despite the steps taken to address this in the DPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>A safe, comfortable and appealing street environment for pedestrians that is sheltered from weather extremes, is of a pedestrian scale and optimises views or any outlook onto spaces of interest</td>
<td>This objective is not achievable with the existing infrastructure surrounding William Street and Belair Road, Hawthorn. The existing infrastructure is not compatible with proposed developments. This objective cannot be met due to several reasons including: 1. George Street being a no through road 2. Already limited parking with many vehicles being parked on William Street during the day in order to catch the bus on Belair Road and attend work or shops on Belair Road 3. The safety of any residential and commercial occupants would be compromised as they would entering and exiting onto a main road being Belair Road. Belair Road is also only a two-lane road with no allocated bus lane and heavy traffic especially in peak hours. It is far from pedestrian friendly. 4. There is no appealing street environment for pedestrians. Any development would be on the main road. 5. Any development would be less sheltered by weather extremes by being on a main road. 6. Any benefit of views or any outlook onto spaces of interest is non existent as the 126 Belair Road (the property adjacent to our property at 43 William Street) looks out onto a main road, a group of commercial shops and auto service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 8</td>
<td>Noise and air quality impacts</td>
<td>The ability to reduce noise and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 9</td>
<td>Development that contributes to the desired character of the zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The desired character of the zone is not compatible with the amenity of the locality in Hawthorn particularly the height of 4 storeys buildings.

The City have failed to adequately identify a need for increasing the density and diversity of housing, businesses and other services offered to residents and the wider community in circumstances where:

1. The population growth is disproportionate to the level of developments proposed
2. Hawthorn has a well-established suburban character and reputable feel which would be severely impacted if the DPA proceeds. The DPA negatively impacts the character of the suburb Hawthorn.
3. There is already sufficient businesses and services offered to residents and the wider community such as access to ample supermarkets, medical and specialist practices, parks, ovals, Mitcham library, entertainment and pubs, cinemas, takeaway food stores, gyms, gift stores and beauty services.

The City have not adequately addressed the issue of preserving adjacent privacy/amenity. How can this be avoided if a 4 storey building is erected and visible from the backyards of William Street?

Increased density as a result of...
| Figure 1 on page 42 | The diagram is misleading as the majority of adjacent dwellings are not 2 storey |

We confirm we wish to be heard at the public hearing on Tuesday 3 December 2019. Please note we have engaged Garth Heynen from Heynen Planning Consultants to speak on our behalf at the hearing.

Regards,

Daphne Moshos & Michael Kyratzoulis of
27 November 2019

To: The City of Mitcham

Re: Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment

The following feedback is provided on the Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct plan and zone proposals specifically, although the principles will apply to all draft growth precincts.

The words used in describing the zones do not provide much clarity as to how these will be interpreted in reality – eg ‘protect amenity’, ‘good character’ and ‘high quality’; and this will be elaborated on in more detail later. They raise many more questions about how planning documents will be able to achieve these goals than they provide answers.

It is noted that the State Government is committed to increasing residential density in existing suburban areas and the new Planning Code is designed to facilitate this. The City of Mitcham is to be commended on proposing growth precincts in key areas to provide some order around how this can be achieved. There are however some serious concerns regarding the implications of the Council DPA and how these could be interpreted.

Mixed Use Zone

Generally the proposed mix of uses is supported and in fact reflects what exists already in these areas.

It is noted that the mixed use zone on the west of Coromandel Parade contains several historic residential buildings. It will be important that these dwellings and the precinct have some type of protection from ad hoc demolition and development.

The encouragement of development that contains ground floor commercial uses with residential on upper floors is supported. There will need to be some measures in place that ensure that this type of development occurs, otherwise what will be built will be what delivers the most financial return for a developer.

The new Bowden precinct is an example of creative mixed use development.

Suburban Neighbourhood Zone

The principle of being able to provide greater choice of housing types and densities is supported but it will need more than these words to make this happen in reality.

There may in fact be some areas in the currently identified Residential Zone that may be suitable for inclusion in this zone, such as immediately east of the railway line. This would be consistent with the desire for housing in this area to be easily accessible to public transport (the train).

The topography (land slope) of area to the east of Main Road lends itself to opportunities to develop 3-storey buildings that do not become intrusive or overlooking of neighbours. It is important that buildings over 2-storey do not adversely affect neighbours (shading of solar panels and gardens, and reducing daylight access).
While this zone can provide an increase in density it does not necessarily provide a greater choice of housing types as it will be up to the development industry to determine what is built and it could easily be all the same. More particular regulations and incentives will be needed to do this.

The zone is be ‘predominantly residential with limited small-scale non-residential’ and this is supported in principle. Clarity will need to be given as to what is meant by ‘small-scale’ and what defines ‘non-residential’.

Dwellings of one or two storeys is supported. Three storey development is to be considered, but it will need to be careful located and designed to ensure that overshadowing of neighbours is avoided. It is not clear what ‘locational and design’ criteria will be applied to ensure that local amenity is maintained.

It is also not clear what policies can be applied to ensure ‘good character and amenity’ and ‘high quality design’ can be achieved.

It is not clear how ‘design criteria will manage building setback distances’. Currently regulations that prescribe setbacks invariably result in a monotonous streetscape appearance. There needs to be more flexibility in allowing variation in setbacks and frontages.

Similarly ‘limiting the visual dominance of garages’ can only be achieved by prescriptive block widths, which may not provide the most desirable planning solution. The frontage requirements proposed of 7-9 metres will not achieve this objective as a double garage takes up some 6 metres of this width. Consideration needs to be given to more creative regulations to encourage development that doesn’t result in a streetscape of garage doors.

A minimum allotment size of 250m² is proposed. While this can be acceptable if done with sensitive planning in a large parcel of land, providing semi-detached, row and group dwellings; it is not acceptable for detached dwellings. There are currently examples in Station Avenue and on Shepherd’s Hill Road where houses are effectively on small allotments but clustered in a way that reduces negative streetscape impact whilst allowing landscape and large trees to co-exist.

If this is allowed as a blanket requirement it will result in rows of big houses on small blocks, and all large trees being removed.

Consideration could be given to allocating other pockets as Suburban Neighbourhood zone where there already exists increased density of unit development. It doesn’t have to be always in between the Mixed Use and Residential zones. This will give developers more creative opportunities to develop other parcels of land in places where increased density currently exists, providing better protection for the rest of the Residential area.

**District Centre Zone**

The proposal to retain the existing zone is supported.

The intent is to accommodate commercial with residential, and there will need to be some measure in place to encourage development that incorporates both, as in the Mixed Use Zone. This will be important in ensuring that the precinct is a safe and vibrant place, especially outside normal business hours.

**Issues**

The following issues are a distillation of those referred to in the above comments.

- Currently development occurs in an ad hoc way with developers purchasing properties at random for demolition and construction of new dwellings. The practice of providing zoning with boundaries and separate regulations governing what can and cannot be built is not ideal planning and does not lead to desirable neighbourhoods for living in. There is no consideration given to context or neighbourhood amenity. Good planning requires that these are considered.
It is important that buildings over 2-storey do not adversely affect neighbours (shading of solar panels and gardens, and reducing daylight access).

Increase in housing options is essential in the Blackwood district to provide for a variety of family configurations, the young and elderly; options which currently don’t exist. Neither the Council proposal nor the State Government’s proposed Planning Code will ensure that these options are provided. This can be achieved by infill and higher density developments but separate measures will be necessary to make this objective happen in reality.

The proposed new planning system is claimed to provide certainty and consistent regulations for developers which in itself is desirable. It does not however give the general public confidence nor comfort that their desires for amenity, privacy and access to open space will be respected.

Good planning and quality of design are referenced but are not achievable unless there are criteria developed that describe what these are, and regulations that ensure they are delivered, otherwise it becomes personal opinion at best or ignored at worst.

Climate change effects which including increasing temperatures in cities plus the heat island effect of more hard surfaces and reduced trees will be exacerbated by increased housing density. Any increase in density must be balanced by good planning to ensure that new trees and green spaces are incorporated into the built environment, as well as preserving existing trees and landscape.

Any increase in density (which means more people) will require improvement to the public transport services to ensure that local roads are not adversely affected by increased car traffic.

It is important that places of special character and historic conservation are protected to ensure that their heritage and environmental importance can be maintained for the future. It is not clear how the policy requirement to “Recognise the value that communities place on heritage and ensure that new development is implemented sensitively and respectfully” will be achieved.

Large trees play an essential role in our urban environments, providing shade, habitat, cooling and humidifying the air, and reducing the heat island effects, as well as providing a pleasant environment. As our climate warms, the existence of large trees will become even more important. The protection of existing trees in public and private spaces is essential and regulations must ensure their retention. Allowing block sizes of 250m² will condemn large trees to being removed, unless creative planning rules are provided and enforced to ensure their protection.

Similarly access to open public space is essential wherever any increased housing density is developed reducing private open space.

If we were planning Blackwood from scratch we would do it differently from what currently exists. While we are generally stuck with the legacy of what exists we can improve things over time. Building are regularly being upgraded, demolished and new buildings constructed. We can make improvements over time if we have a vision, a creative plan and the willingness to make it happen.

Creative planning is about creating the built environment that enables people to live the lifestyles they desire. Current planning is merely trying to avoid the worst problems that result from ad hoc development.

The DPA goals of containing our urban footprint, building new housing close to transport routes, creating walkable neighbourhoods and providing more housing choices are supported, however there needs to be much more detail provided about how this can be achieved without sacrificing desirable urban amenity, including existing landscape and trees. The regulatory environment to date has not been able to prevent inappropriate development and I remain to be convinced that the new proposals will be able to do any better.

Andrew Tidswell
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment (DPA)

The City of Mitcham is updating its Development Plan to create opportunities for investment, growth and change within four key areas of the council area.

We want to hear your views on the proposed changes.

Feedback Form

Share your views with us by 5pm on Thursday, 28 November 2019

About You
Name: MRS. JANICE C. ARNOLD
Organisation (if relevant):
Address: 
Suburb: EDEN MILLS
Postcode:
Email: ...
Telephone: ...

Do you wish to make a verbal submission to Council at a public meeting?
(scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at City of Mitcham Civic Centre, 131 Belair Road, Torrens Park)
Yes [x] No [ ]
If no requests to make a verbal submission are received, the public meeting will not be held.

Please Note:-

• Written submissions close at 5pm on Thursday, 28 November 2019.
• Submissions will be published and available to view by interested persons from 29 November until the close of the public hearing.
• Your feedback will be considered by the Council when the DPA is being finalised.
• Submissions can be made:-
  • On line: www.mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au
  • By email: mitcham@mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au
  • By post: PO Box 21, Mitcham Shopping Centre, Torrens Park, 5062
• Please refer to our webpage for further information, or call 8372 8888.
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment (DPA)

Please provide your comments on the proposed Development Plan zone changes for any or all of the Growth Precincts.

1. Goodwood & Cross Roads Growth Precinct

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Goodwood & Daws Roads Growth Precinct

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
3. Belair Road Centre Growth Precinct

______________________________

4. Blackwood Centre Growth Precinct

This is a unique area, a community within a city. It has a valued and sufficiently large shopping centre business area with limited access from the city which maintains its individuality. An increase in density, industry and certainly two, three or four story mixed-use buildings will simply destroy its character, destroy its "ambience", including the wildlife, the beauty and open it up to development of commercial & residential buildings that are already being built viz the ugly, intrusive Aldi store, a monotonous grey white "chain residence being built on aged blocks particularly in Ellen Hills, which have no room for trees and gardens. I note that though evidence is mentioned — what a joke! We hear & read nothing of investment, development, growth, change — no one has asked me — everyone in my street is over 70 years change. It seems only business developers rule.
Draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment (DPA)

Please tell us how you have found this consultation process – your feedback helps us to improve how we do things

I found the information on the DPA clear and easy to understand  
Comment:  

I had sufficient notice to get involved with the DPA consultation  
Comment:  

I have had genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the draft DPA  
Comment:  

I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final DPA  
Comment:  

Thank you for providing your feedback on the draft Growth Precincts Development Plan Amendment (DPA).

Your feedback is highly valued and will help Council to make decisions about the final form of the DPA to be lodged with the Minister for Planning.

A report on the submissions received will be prepared and will be circulated to all participants in the consultation in due course.
4. **NEXT MEETING**

To be advised.

CLOSE: