


Q1 I feel that the engagement on the State Planning Policies, regulations and heritage policy position papers genuinely sought my input to help shape planning policy.

Answered: 52 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	0.00% 0
Somewhat agree	17.31% 9
Neither agree nor disagree	7.69% 4
Somewhat disagree	21.15% 11
Strongly disagree	53.85% 28
TOTAL	52


#	COMMENT:	DATE
1	No input from the public whatsoever. I was appalled, and am tired of policy planning and strategic staff at local Councils not taking more affirmative action on this overall issue, when their salaries are paid for by local residents and ratepayers of an area.	6/19/2019 3:08 PM
2	There were opportunities to comment, but I do not feel assured that the comments I made will result in changes to State Planning policies.	6/19/2019 12:12 PM

3	despite numerous public meetings and discussions over the past 3 years and a comprehensive booklet released by the National Trust summarising the concerns regarding a hostile discussion paper released by DPTI towards heritage protection in 2016, there has been evasion and stony silence from DPTI until just recently. This is unacceptable because heritage policies need to be factored in with related developments to provide an indication of how the state now will accommodate a fairer and more proactive set of policies that acknowledge the social and cultural value of heritage to the community, provide for incentives and funding, and to address the past 3 years of inaction on this crucial aspect of our planning system. People are sad and angry at the dismissive attitude towards heritage by the state government by both Labor and Liberal parties. It is insulting that the values expressed by people over heritage have been dismissed as 'emotional'. Most people get emotional when there is a flagrant priority given to developers (unless the developers also are dismissed, they probably get emotional too)	6/19/2019 11:27 AM
4	My input was not sought.	6/18/2019 11:11 PM
5	Presentations from DPTI and SCAP seemed to have an agenda and unlikely to change through consultation.	6/18/2019 10:23 PM
6	Made many constructive submissions. No feedback. Get to the stage where I wonder if I was wasting my time.	6/18/2019 9:32 PM
7	Summary was very general.	6/18/2019 9:23 PM
8	Consultation appears to be intended to tick the box that it has happened but little notice is taken of community concerns and input. DPTI only seems to take notice of positive supportive input. It is a sham. Why has DPTI totally ignored the many submissions in support of strong heritage controls, in response to the so called Heritage Discussion Paper of 2016?	6/18/2019 9:07 PM
9	It would have been better to have had a number of consultations with the communities spread over a period of time. I have written our concerns below.	6/18/2019 8:13 PM
10	I feel the community engagement is disingenuous. The department is going through the motions to make it appear residents are being consulted, but in reality it is the interests of the development industry that are being given priority.	6/18/2019 7:26 PM
11	One senses the community is a temporary irritant. They are confident of their supremacy. End story.	6/18/2019 7:00 PM
12	1. Lack of concern for contributory items on Heritage matters 2. takeover of decision making via Commissioner at a very low level \$3 million now \$3.3 takes away local knowledge 3 No community consultation when changing Stirling DC Dev Plan, despite initial DPA requiring community consultation. there are major local issues impacted adversely by changes.. retirement accommodation, water 4 No ability for representors to comment on changes to a DA post initial proposal hearing	6/18/2019 6:37 PM
13	I went to 2 meetings, we were given small post it's to write on. Then told to place where we thought it mattered, non of which made sense, plus how much can you write on a small post it!! When speaking to staff I asked why the hurry to reform, she said the Act is written that way! Change the Act. A lot of words said, very little actual content	6/18/2019 6:34 PM
14	Contributory heritage not protected from demolition which on makes up less than 2% pf dwellings.	6/18/2019 5:14 PM
15	At a recent meeting I attended state planning representatives sidestepped and avoided engagement on the concerns raised by the community. It was a frustrating experience . It felt like manipulation in that I had attended in good faith to hear how the department was taking community concerns into account. There was an avoidance of any engagement on any of the issues just a restatement of the departmental intentions.It seemed like a cynical modus operandi within the department to fulfill its stakeholder consultation obligations . This meeting was probably ticked off as part of community consultation when it was a complete sham there was no consultation no listening and responding at all.	6/17/2019 12:29 AM

16	They sought our input but did not seem very interested in our answers or implementing - based on their actions. For the parking consult - I suggested more frequent and cheaper public transport - govt has cut back and made it more expensive. For the assessment pathways - I suggested accountability and transparency - no sign of that either. I fear for our heritage areas. We should not have to depend on the neighbours to development to know the planning rules and codes and put in objections. Example - one of my neighbours has recently built a non complying shed on the boundary - so we were consulted but my other neighbour advised not to put in any response because he's a very nasty piece of work and we have to live with him. There were two very simple changes he could have made to have the thing be appropriate in our State Heritage area ie 1. be set back from the laneway, and 2. be of corrugated profile not square profile (Never mind all the other sheds in our lane are square profile - we should be moving away from that.	6/10/2019 8:26 PM
17	Any engagement of the Norwood Residents Association (on behalf of residents) in this whole State Planning Commission (SPC) process, has been per favour of our Norwood Payneham and St Peters Council. There was no direct approach made by the SPC about proposed changes, which indicates they do not share the same level of concern/commitment to the needs of local people in our area.	6/9/2019 4:50 PM
18	DPTI appears to have its own Agenda & consultation appears to be token e.g.preservation of the contributory items in the new planning legislation is not occurring. Those who are aware of the importance of history and historical buildings in our community note DPTI has not changed its position on keeping this classification in the new code.	6/6/2019 1:34 PM
19	Not sure about the wider population who are not part of a Residents organization. I have not seen wide spread ads.	6/4/2019 4:32 PM
20	Just a box ticking effort by State Planning	5/29/2019 2:34 PM
21	I was able to submit my discussion points for the first part of the planning proposals but the conclusions drawn from all submissions were not made available for public discussion as proposed. The People and Neighbourhoods Paper has not been released for public discussion and people in widely differing areas will be provided with a fait accompli.	5/29/2019 12:59 PM
22	No acknowledgement of submission - could have disappeared into the ether. The National Trust was left to summarise and comment on submissions.	5/23/2019 3:58 PM

Q2 I feel confident that my views have been heard as a result of the engagement

Answered: 52 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	1.92% 1
Somewhat agree	5.77% 3
Neither agree nor disagree	11.54% 6
Somewhat disagree	15.38% 8
Strongly disagree	50.00% 26
Comment:	15.38% 8
TOTAL	52

#	COMMENT:	DATE
1	I didn't feel like putting in submissions, at any stage, as I knew my views would be ignored. No confidence in the system.	6/19/2019 3:08 PM
2	Again I believe that views I have expressed orally and in writing were not understood. In a meeting with a senior person from State Planning, I felt that the concerns I expressed about inappropriate development in suburban areas were dismissed as 'naive, old-fashioned and obstructing development' - whereas my concern (and that of hundreds of supportive residents in my resident group,) is for development that enhances existing streetscapes and lifestyles rather than detracts from them, by ensuring that there are appropriate rules for developers, and ensuring developers are held accountable if they don't follow those rules in building their development.	6/19/2019 12:12 PM
3	Wait and see if the current Ministers have heard public concerns and suggestions!	6/19/2019 11:27 AM
4	They "heard" but did not listen.	6/18/2019 7:00 PM

5	Being heard but not considered is false engagement	6/18/2019 5:14 PM
6	I have significant concerns about private certifiers & the Opal tower & the Victorian cladding fiascos have brought to the fore these concerns but DPTI refuses to acknowledge this issue.	6/6/2019 1:34 PM
7	Heard does not translate into action. It could just all be a token not taken seriously enough. That's what happened before under Rau.	6/4/2019 4:32 PM
8	Since the discussion paper 'People and Neighbourhoods' has not been released for public discussion , have the contributions that were supposed to make it up actually been part of its format are is it a complete dilution of public service policy with no input from the requested individual persons, peak bodies and community groups who all have an interest in the future development of areas where they live and work.	5/29/2019 12:59 PM

Q3 I believe I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard on these planning policies.

Answered: 50 Skipped: 2




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	0.00% 0
Somewhat agree	14.00% 7
Neither agree nor disagree	18.00% 9
Somewhat disagree	20.00% 10
Strongly disagree	48.00% 24
TOTAL	50

#	COMMENT:	DATE
1	some what heard but not listened to .	6/19/2019 10:21 PM
2	I'm never given a good opportunity to engage or be heard on a lot of issues, involving any level of government.	6/19/2019 3:08 PM
3	There is no use in ticking the 'consultation' Box if there is not a genuine attempt to understand what residents are saying.	6/19/2019 12:12 PM
4	see above. The test is in the Code and evidence of state defence of listed heritage and financial cost sharing/incentives.	6/19/2019 11:27 AM
5	I was not given an opportunity. I am not a member of Community Alliance.	6/18/2019 11:11 PM
6	Being given the opportunity is not the same as being heard.	6/18/2019 7:26 PM
7	Actually, despite my raised hand, I was unable to be heard at all. I wanted to speak about Category 1 developments.	6/18/2019 7:00 PM
8	Too much couched in jargon that requires constant back referral to work out what it actually means Inadequate access to low cost representation such as ERD Court 60 m rule provides inadequate opportunity for seriously impacted parties to make valid representations	6/18/2019 6:37 PM

9	they heard us but what is the point if they ignore us.	6/10/2019 8:26 PM
10	The steamroller approach to drastic reform has suited the SPC agenda, no-one else's. Short time frames and lack of specific detail also make it almost impossible to fully evaluate proposals, such that our input is often limited to concerns about what COULD happen if loopholes or less stringent approval avenues are available for developers to exploit.	6/9/2019 4:50 PM
11	as above	6/6/2019 1:34 PM
12	No opportunity to be heard. By who anyway?	6/4/2019 4:32 PM
13	Heard but obviously not listened to .	6/1/2019 4:09 PM
14	A far greater influence by developers and building companies in the development of this policy.	5/29/2019 2:34 PM
15	I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard in the original draft of policy but when the Planning Commissioner attended the CASA meeting it was obvious that there were certain questions which required an answer which were not being answered adequately.	5/29/2019 12:59 PM

Q4 I was given sufficient information to take an informed view of the planning policies.

Answered: 52 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	3.85% 2
Somewhat agree	21.15% 11
Neither agree nor disagree	7.69% 4
Somewhat disagree	28.85% 15
Strongly disagree	38.46% 20
TOTAL	52

#	COMMENT:	DATE
1	Too much to absorb at any one time . we are not CEOs or Developers who have the time to study all the changes in the documents . The time lines are unrealistic and deliberate.	6/19/2019 10:21 PM
2	I don't know the impacts of these planning changes, so putting out a few leaflets or brochures doesn't help me at all.	6/19/2019 3:08 PM
3	It is only because of my recent experience with an oversized development that I developed an understanding of planning. State Planning should realize that there is a case for understanding the 'common sense approach' and 'person on the street' approach. Residents don't have to understand all the planning rules to agree (often in great numbers), that a consistent height for buildings, privacy, overshadowing, setbacks are all important to them and are the reasons they bought into their suburb in the first place. Even if we understand every single planning policy, will our concerns even be addressed.	6/19/2019 12:12 PM
4	No there is no rigorous research into the advantages of heritage protection, financially, socially or environmentally by DPTI	6/19/2019 11:27 AM
5	I have never seen any material from Planning.	6/18/2019 11:11 PM

6	As Chair of the Prospect Tram Barn Alliance the Committee found that no information was available when asked of Councillors and Government Officials. Deputations and submissions were made to Council but no notice was taken of original request of suggested involvement by the community. We have been continuously told that Councillors and MPs cannot discuss "Saving the Prospect Tram Barn" as all discussions are in confidence/ contracts have been signed and the whole Prospect Depot is sold to a developer. We have continuously asked Prospect Council for plans / information which we were able to view but not given copies of detailed plans to share in the community. We asked a number of very pertinent questions about the future use of this heritage facility(as Prospect Council indicated from the beginning they wanted Community use of the facility. We are now told it is to be made into a Child Care Centre. A complete loss to the Prospect Community and the wider metropolitan area. A heritage building will be lost as Government has not valued the heritage and economic tourism that it could bring to SA particularly being on a major corridor of SA. We have over a considerable number of months been refused information on the grounds (again) all is being handled in confidence(where such information is unavailable to the general community). The future details of the heritage listed Tram Barn are all held in secrecy - a complete lack of transparency by all Government officials both at the Local and Government level, which is a "disgrace to all" supposedly living in a democracy. Freedom of information certainly has caused a deep distrust	6/18/2019 8:13 PM
7	The copious information was presented in a confusing manner.	6/18/2019 7:26 PM
8	Contributory heritage protection is one big grey area and no simple and clear resolution presented by the current planning commission or gov minister DIPTi	6/18/2019 5:14 PM
9	were asked to comment on codes that were not yet available. but the infor on polices was detailed. No info on accountability processes. We should not need millions of dollars for judicial reviews to make sure developers and council comply with the codes.	6/10/2019 8:26 PM
10	Delivery of much of the content used terminology best understood by urban planners/developers etc, not the average citizen. Also, as mentioned earlier, when not all the details of proposed changes are known, how can anyone reasonably expect to have a substantially 'informed' view?	6/9/2019 4:50 PM
11	Too rushed with multiple papers to digest	6/6/2019 1:34 PM
12	Too much information on different issues of the planning process with strict deadlines that make it unfeasible for private citizens to make a submission	6/4/2019 4:32 PM
13	A policy which just over rides previously paid assessment of heritage worth by councils (and paid for by ratepayers). Who knows their local areas values better? - the council or a bunch of people in State Planning whose performance is based on new building activity and nothing else.	5/29/2019 2:34 PM
14	We do have a lot of information. We do understand it. Our local planning officers have been extremely good in explaining various things to us. However bureaucrats on the whole will very often retreat to 'we know better than you' - even if it is an architect speaking. The proposed plan for Adelaide with all its infilling, has not been given bouquets by the Institute of Architects in relation to town planning and I believe the bureaucrats of DPTI are totally ignoring some of these voices.	5/29/2019 12:59 PM
15	Only received information via a local resident group. What happens when people do not belong to such groups?	5/23/2019 3:58 PM

Q5 I understood why I was asked for my view and they way it would be considered.

Answered: 52 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	1.92% 1
Somewhat agree	15.38% 8
Neither agree nor disagree	23.08% 12
Somewhat disagree	28.85% 15
Strongly disagree	30.77% 16
TOTAL	52

#	COMMENT:	DATE
1	Yes just for the Government to say it has consultedquasi consultation	6/19/2019 10:21 PM
2	Consultation is now generally a farce, and a lot of decisions are pre-determined and decided before any engagement process. The current planning minister is a farce! He will be known as the planning minister who pays no attention to the people of South Australia.	6/19/2019 3:08 PM
3	Consultation needs to be on the agenda, but there needs to be an independent, appropriate means of ensuring the feedback is considered, where appropriate. I believe a member of that current entity didn't know what a contributory item was, and yet is going to assess the suitability on protection for them being removed.	6/19/2019 12:12 PM
4	Consultations that censor a strong messages by participants seems to have been the result of processes provided, including the random group of people consulted about the planning system. What is the point of consulting if there is no intent to respond properly to clear concerns?	6/19/2019 11:27 AM
5	I wasn't asked for my view.	6/18/2019 11:11 PM
6	I am not convinced that my view would be considered.	6/18/2019 7:26 PM
7	It was to make us feel better.	6/18/2019 7:00 PM
8	Not confident that views will be taken on board	6/18/2019 6:37 PM

9	There was no Planning Department interest in canvassing community views completely the opposite . The technique seemed to be to shut down any community concern by not answering the questions from the floor or those raised by panelists there was no debate or joining of the issues . It left me feeling as if "a job " had been done on the meeting and it's ostensible purpose subverted.	6/17/2019 12:29 AM
10	Overall the process has not given enough details on the alternative model to make an informed decision about how the new strategy will improve development outcomes.	6/16/2019 9:02 PM
11	I think if I had known they would ignore us I would not have wasted my time.	6/10/2019 8:26 PM
12	When only very minor adjustments are made to policy proposals and the SPC blatantly ignores its own Expert Panel Report on Heritage, it begs the question, 'Why bother?' In hindsight, this whole process smacks more of a token PR exercise than any genuine effort to consult with or engage people in important decisions which will affect their financial investments and quality of life.	6/9/2019 4:50 PM
13	Again consultation has been tokenistic	6/6/2019 1:34 PM
14	Never even told that my view WOULD be considered in any way.	6/4/2019 4:32 PM
15	It was a process that they had to conduct to look like they were consulting . The outcome shows once again that they took no notice of the community views.	6/1/2019 4:09 PM
16	I lodge my view because I live in what is now classed as a local Heritage Conservation Zone. Zones such as these, wherever they may be, have their own charm and identity. Once they are lost, they will be gone forever. Our bluestone cottages our Basket Range Tudor homes are unique to Adelaide and they should not be allowed to disappear because of failings in our planning laws. The planning laws need to be strong enough so that local councils have the power to act. Emasculation will destroy these character parts of the city which people have taken time and love, which cannot have a price, to restore. The Department need to look to the future and ask 'What sort of cities and towns do we want in this state? Do we want others to come and see them?' If so - preserve our heritage.	5/29/2019 12:59 PM
17	A 2 part question here: I understood why I was asked, but the consideration given to it, for all intents and purposes, was/is not known.	5/23/2019 3:58 PM