

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION OF RESIDENTS & RATEPAYERS
ASSOCIATIONS INC
P.O. BOX 520**

TORRENSVILLE PLAZA SA 5031

Contact Kevin Kaeding President 0429 696 324

31st March 2011

Attention Christine Underwood
Business Regulation Bench Marking
Productivity Commission
GPO Box 1428
Canberra City ACT 2601

Dear Christine

**The South Australian Federation of Residents & Ratepayers Associations Inc Submission
Productivity Commission 2011, Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business
Regulation: Planning Zoning and Development Assessment, Draft Research Report Canberra.**

On behalf of SAFRRA Inc., and the committee who have worked extremely hard on this submission we would like to thank the Productivity Commission for the opportunity to present our submission and the extension enabling our group to email this submission to you which is appreciated.

SAFFRA's SUBMISSION:

Ref: XX11: Cover the ¼ acre block and we cover innate perfect examples of built-in biodiversity. It isn't compensated for by making children think it is about them planting trees on some distant parkland. A ¼ acre block represented biodiversity, sane living and saves an enormous and social cost...small, intimate, uncrowded and safe.

XXIII: '**Reduce socio-economic disparities**': There needs to be a happier medium and less of a stretch for both sides in regard to concentrating and thereby isolating enclaves.

XXV: Our housing is over-priced (Australia is more than the UK; Australia is 'off the richter scale'). If we have to build the least carbon neutral abodes, this is at odds with affordability.

We'd like to leave Adelaide alone but our leaders won't let us.

As long as there is not on-site parking, the house on house wall doesn't work. Traffic congestion is out of control. People don't want the increased population, dense housing, and traffic congestion.

Why is S.A. suffering the ruthfulness or ruination of our state!

Adelaide, SA, driest state- why are we setting the highest target for the amount of infill?

Why grow, grow—at what cost? Yet report shows no real housing shortfall. Didn't we learn from the global crisis!

Artificial influence by govt means families can't afford to buy a home with garden. They have to drive to a big park, and pay to play football, visit national park etc.

What we buy today is not going to exist or be our life investment tomorrow.

Every block is being turned into a people factory.

Build a new city OR revamp Elizabeth. Determine and build what a city needs to function...on non-agricultural land.

Leave the historical origins and identity of our existing cities and towns intact including public buildings and parks. Go further north, south east or west to more arid land.

People aren't happy so why are we steaming ahead with cramming changes.

Keep local government local and representative locally by being closely in touch and using otherwise, lobbying for locals. Escalating decisions away from it and transparency is an escalation away from community.

Take a preventative approach to infrastructure maintenance not reactive. Look after our existing and hardworking people who pioneered and paid the way. If infrastructure is to be a shared cost SAFRRA objects to existing residents/ratepayers footing the bill, power cut-outs, flooding, for urban infill. There is no account taken of existing people. Infill is parasitic upon the existing. As a member of the community we own the land and through government, flog it off cheaply to developers and then **we pay** yet again for the infrastructure. It's unfair and unacceptable. P35: Where infrastructure charges are not set appropriately these can reduce the supply of new housing. Infill can also reduce existing home values and also impede owners' replacement value and change the shape of Australian cities in ways that many existing residents do not desire.

'Rack's, stack's pack's'!

What endears SA? Not the above! There's opposition to infill. There are letters, article after article in the papers verifying this. Why do 40 to 60% of the population change homes per annum?

Therefore build a new city.

XXXIX: We appreciate or would appreciate point 2: Engaging the community fully & early.

XLII: The public servant can speak out but that is not about where 'we' live.

We have no input into the state Planning rule book yet are having to put up with it. Policy/Strategy statements are plucked linked at random and are not those in Dev Plans reflecting existing neighbour's rights.

'No time limits for processes'!-Yet they keep telling us there are. Plans for assessment should be displayed on land.

Electronic DA systems. Scary! Let's not reduce spirit within communities – which we all actually want to improve

Table 4.2 Little examples of building on crown land buffers all too readily become a precedent.

Table 4.2 No developer should start work on land before the community knows that land is rezoned. Proper notification, third party Appeal Rights: Plainer communication regarding those rights, timing and how to submit and be heard are in great need of improvement by Councils and State and Fed governments.

Is the process of immigration cost-effective?

Where do we want our collective money to go? Endless growth? Certain Advertiser articles suggest it costs Government/taxpayers in terms of infrastructure, First Home Owner's Grant etc., \$85,000 for every new greenfield home and three times that, \$255,000, to urban infill. As well Government Land Organisations are charged generating affordable housing, urban renewal and making a profit and to 'de-risk' the site i.e. take away the 'stumbling blocks' to developers e.g. by consolidating land for infill development, land with significant regional impact (in S.A.: Glenside, closed school lands, Cheltenham), engaging in projects considered too risky or unprofitable by the private sector.

Page 61 Table 37: In the first place government land is sold without the public's permission, sold under-valued, shoved to the Dev. Assessment Commission (DAC) by-passing Councils and the Community re transparency regarding costs, values, ethics, desires, Proclamations, etc; obtaining 'approvals' before passing the site to private developers. Land Management Organisations do all the ground, infrastructure prep work then turn over to a developer with those preliminary costs done and dusted by government. In Adelaide/S.A. it is the Land Management Corporation which is the independent run government land development organisation.

'Supply of Land': Precedence by government into greenfield is a real worry.

Table 60-38: S.A.'s LMC don't build and promote affordability; don't cover environmental conservation; don't cover infrastructure; don't cover innovation. Table 3-860 They do cover commercial development.

The Report has not talked about Air Quality and only vaguely talked about increases in government charges, utility charges, giving no figures but plundering the public purse for housing costs.

There is now a much worse liveability quotient. The considerations in the Productivity Commission draft research report with seemingly inadequate and self-confessed data collection shortfalls are biased solely towards money matters in terms of costs & productivity: an attempt to rationalise past & current policies!? We have this week heard Scott Morrison's address to the National Press Club in Canberra informing reputable journalists & us that there is no independent of government agency charged with tempering population investigations i.e. studying recent impacts on the sustainability of our ever increasing population or carrying capacity- basic necessities, essential services, food, water, health & wellbeing of human life in the Australian context and relative to finite resources. Wasn't it done in the past & a maximum of 23 million people was the recommendation? (Aust. Academy of Science late 1990's).

In South Australia we do not need unsustainable population growth which it seems really our government believes we must have. The planet is today overpopulated. Why accelerate this greatest conflict of all time? Governments are destroying the farming communities' ability to produce food to feed Australians.

We need more support for primary production making food affordable to all Australians instead of the increasing purchases from overseas of our food produce and with the spreading urbanization on arable farming land. In particular at Mount Barker and in the wine industry areas of the Barossa Valley, the South Australian residents, ratepayers, local councils have opposed these massive housing developments but these housing developments have been supported by our State Govt.

The ageing population is a natural process. Our governments are making older Australians uncomfortable and even making them feel unwanted; they believe a burden on society by our own government. These Australians have paid taxes all their lives to support all Australians whether young, old or disabled.

We must have a more, faster, reliable, public transport system, better traffic flows especially at peak times – more underpasses, one-way traffic and tunnels for buses, trams or trains.

In South Australia we must be guaranteed of an adequate water supply, affordable water prices in the city and country, more recycling of water and the re-use of storm water, wetlands and storm water storage areas.

We need to adapt to climate change, higher temperatures, flooding and increasing high tides. In South Australia future higher temperatures, high cost of energy and the loss of trees and natural environment mean urban infill needs to be more climate and people friendly. This is why we must stop Adelaide's out of control urban infill, with no space for trees or shrubs, a lifeless natural environment, unnecessary high rises, new apartments. Apartments and new multi-level units are very high energy consumption dwellings and with no or little green open space made available to residents and ratepayers. No green space in their dwelling area, an unliveable, unhappy lifestyle!

In South Australia heritage homes and buildings are being lost at the speed of light to feed urban infill which is supported by developers, local /state governments. We must have adequate Local Heritage Protection for the listing of Local Heritage properties in the same way we list our State Heritage Listing, on merit, individually - a halt to demolition while the property is being assessed.

Please change our current 10-15 year process which we have had to deal with currently. This is why most of our heritage buildings will be demolished in Adelaide, the suburbs and rural areas. Councils oppose our every five years development plans review submissions regarding local heritage due to the lack of funding for local heritage assessments reviews. How convenient!

We believe most of the graphs relating to South Australia in the Productivity Commission document 1, shows our government's obsession with population growth which is highlighted as shaded areas of importance on these graphs. We are not Sydney or Melbourne. These views of unrealistic population growth are not the views of the wider community in South Australia – we believe the government seem only interested in serving more the developers and the business community.

Who after the event do not have any responsibility nor will fund the costs of sustainable water supply, affordable energy costs, affordable housing, open space, unemployment, social problems and mental health problems or peoples' wellbeing associated with high population growth and poor high rise developments.

Residents and ratepayers wish that the government sector in South Australia retain Adelaide's character and heritage buildings which are the views of the wider community in South Australia but only a selected voice of faceless individuals have a say. Why can't we have a true and better democracy in South Australia?

Housing affordability in South Australia is no longer. Developers are dictating housing types not the residents. We believe all our residents and ratepayers have rights to affordable housing, housing type, open green space and trees.

It's hard to do justice to our group's response to this document with a time frame of less than 1 month.

Paramount:-

398/9: The report calls for Ecological protection of communities.

Yes we should be provided considerable ecological community protection -therefore to the ¼ acre block.

Ecology=healthy living organisation for animal, flora, fauna, humans; the branch of Biology dealing with relations of living organisms to their surroundings, habits, modes of life, pop.s; the Physiology (normal functions/behaviour of living life) and Distribution. **We should be protected, by the EPBC Act, from deterioration.**

Yours sincerely

Kevin Kaeding

President

South Australian Federation of Residents & Ratepayers Associations Inc