

INTERIM ENGAGEMENT REPORT

APPENDIX 2. SUMMARY OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

NAME	OPPOSE / SUPPORT / NEUTRAL / BLANK	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	<p style="text-align: center; font-size: small; margin: 0;"> Supportive of proposal / layout and orientation of dwellings / improvement to current / increase housing options / environmental benefits Impacts from affordable housing / perceptions of crime ("ghetto") / devalue community Amenity / impacts - noise, appearance ("eyesore"), overlooking, overshadowing Loss of existing uses / jobs / child care centre / Westpac Mortgage Centre Traffic / traffic congestion / carparking / pedestrian safety / not main road / other traffic Height / density - building height should be limited Impacts on River Torrens / Linear Park / Environment - wildlife, biodiversity, appearance, loss of trees, value of area, stormwater disposal / Karrawirra Park is sacred ground and needs to be respected Impacts/devaluation of property value Strain on existing amenities / inadequate facilities/services/infrastructure to support increased density (e.g. public transport) / not within close proximity to Activity Centre (shops) Do not understand / need more information / information inconsistent Impacts on mental health Not consistent with existing surrounding built form Support redevelopment but at two to three levels in height and lower density / make it similar to Metcash etc Green / open space should be included in the development Community consultation inadequate / not in accordance with Community Engagement Charter Will set a precedent for other land holdings/development in the area Not in accordance with the State Planning Policies / 30 Year Plan / Desired Outcomes and Performance Outcomes of the Urban Neighbourhood Zone Prefer Affected Area to be rezoned to Suburban Neighbourhood Do not like it / inappropriate / do not support / will spoil area Hazard to the Adelaide airport routes SUMMARY </p>																			RESPONSE			
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19				
Adrianna Milne	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																1	Love the suburb and River Torrens. Six to eight storey buildings will destroy the suburb. Support new housing development but in keeping with what's existing. No apartments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Alan Johnson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																	1	Object to Code Amendment. Current public transport in area not a major transport node. Area not a significant place of interest. Public amenity should be respected for those residents living in the area. Buildings up to seven levels are not suitable for the location. Rezoning would quash any future possibility of the River Torrens being included on the UNESCO World Heritage list. This would be a loss for tourism promotion in SA. Will deliver ugliness to the Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Alana Robinson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																	1	Opposed to multi storey buildings in Lockleys. It will destroy our beautiful suburb and section of the River Torrens.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Alanna Monteleone (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					1	Not supportive of rezoning. Increased height unreasonable. Not in accordance with the Desired Outcomes of the Urban Neighbourhood Zone. Linear Park/River Torrens adjacent site is steep and heavily vegetated. Tree removal not supported. High scale development would impact on aesthetic of the area and views to/from the Linear Park. Affected Area not near high frequency transport. Not in close proximity to supermarkets/shops. Reliance on car travel. Roads in area already congested.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Alex Bennett	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																		1	Six storey development is inappropriate on the site. Will set a precedence. Increase pressure on existing infrastructure and traffic flow. No other development of this scale adjacent the Linear Park. Development of the scale disproportionate to natural landscape. Stormwater should not be allowed to flow into the River Torrens. Increase density will add to traffic flows and reduce local safety, particularly at adjacent school site.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Alex Rajkovich	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					1	Unsuitable development for the location. Will affect local ecology. Create traffic and parking issues. Would be ok with two storey housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Alex Ward, Department for Environment and Water (DEW)	SUPPORT	State Government Agency	1																					Supports the proposed Code Amendment as it should result in future development that reduces impervious area, increases tree canopy and public open (green space) as well as provide water sensitive urban design techniques to capture and reuse water. DEW supports the application of the Zone, Urban Tree Canopy Overlay and Stormwater Management Overlay to the Affected Area. Provision for open space would increase urban tree canopy and WSUD and should reduce heat island effect. DEW would welcome the opportunity to work with developers to improve understanding of biodiversity sensitive urban design.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Alexandra Gouge	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																		1	Object to Code Amendment. The suburb has none of the infrastructure or amenity necessary to support the rezoning. Traffic volumes will increase significantly. Will destroy the peaceful and quiet neighbourhood. Will have a negative impact on housing prices. Will create unsafe, crowded and unsightly suburb out of keeping with the wider Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Alisha Williams	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1											Does not agree with proposed amendment. The Torrens is not an appropriate place for high density housing/six storey buildings. The amendment will change the fabric of the area and open the flood gates for similar development. Ability to drop value of homes in the area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Anastasia Economou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1														Against submission. The submission is flawed. No major roads and minimal public transport. Not in keeping with character of suburb. Completely unfair to people who have stretched their budgets to enter the market in a desirable neighbourhood, only to have it taken away.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Anastasia Skouroumounis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1													Elderly mother lives in area and says there is already plenty of traffic going through. Very upset with proposal. Traffic will be a hazard to pedestrians and safety of neighbourhood. Six storey buildings will be an eyesore and affect privacy. Fear of loss of beautification and increase noise pollution.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Andrew Chugg	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1			1									Objects to redevelopment of the site. Serious concerns regarding mid to high level density housing of this nature. Inappropriate and out of character with the suburb. Would impact delicate natural ecosystem and amenity of River Torrens Linear Park. Density would impact local infrastructure. The site is not served by a main road and are opposite a school and kindergarten that suffer traffic congestion at peak hours. There is no local shopping or other amenities of any kind. Would welcome smaller scale residential redevelopment of the site, no higher than two levels. The Linear Park is a precious natural resource and should be treasured and preserved not marred by unsightly concrete constructions.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Andrew Koch	OPPOSE	Other																	1	Oppose the changes to the Code Amendment. Would support change to Suburban Neighbourhood.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Andrew Sbroiavacca	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1			1								1	Opposed to Code Amendment. Six level development won't suit area. Traffic is already busy. Not opposed to redevelopment of the site, but object to anything over two levels. Suburban Neighbourhood Zone should be considered as an alternative option, similar to Metcash. Code Amendment will bring increase traffic, pedestrian hazards, parking congestion, noise pollution, impacts on wildlife along River Torrens and affect local family amenities.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Angela and Lee Triantafillou (two submissions, second submission from Angela Triantafillou)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1												Opposed to the Code Amendment. Purchased property in Grant Avenue, chose this property as it had no rear neighbours (adjoins Westpac). Do not oppose residential development on the site, but have great concern with multi storey buildings, increase traffic, parking congestion and noise pollution. Privacy concerns. Parking and street congestion of great concern. Proposal will not suit environment and disturb the wildlife of the linear park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Angela Craig	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																	1	Do not want this as not in keeping with the environment and will ruin the area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Anita Rositano	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1													Oppose change to allow multi level apartments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ann Hofen	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1			1									Not in keeping with character of existing housing. Extremely dense and will put pressure on existing roads, services and other infrastructure. Carparking shortfalls. No objection to development of one to two storey dwellings. Proposal looks and sounds like a ghetto not dissimilar to housing commission developments. No local shopping centres and not a major route or destination. Will become towers instead of gums, open space and wildlife. Do not want proposal to go ahead. Not a good idea for Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Anna Markou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1												Oppose the Code Amendment in particular the Affordable Housing Overlay and building height. Not opposed to development of the site but with a maximum building height of two levels. This would fit the amenity of the surrounding area. Concerned code amendment will have following negative impacts: 1. increased traffic flow 2. parking congestion. 3. noise pollution. 4. access to Linear Park and impact on wildlife. 5. impact on the River Torrens. 6. Impact on amenity of area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
AnnaLena Clark	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1												1	Do not agree with this. AN eyesore and not in keeping with the area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Annalisa Stabile	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1													1	Have lived in Lockleys since 1979 and raised family in the area. Proposal should not go ahead. A rezoning should apply the same zone that exists to surrounding area ("Suburban Neighbourhood Zone") with maximum building height of two storeys. Would feel sorry for current residents who would be overshadowed by the development and impacts on amenity. The area does not have good public transport infrastructure or access to main roads. Redevelopment would impact traffic flows and increase pedestrian hazards. Parking congestion would be an issue. Utilities would be impacted by denser development. Noise pollution created by the development would be detrimental with wildlife and impact on the beauty and serenity of the Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Anthonius Franciscus Vandijk	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1			1		1														Limit to two storeys. Concerned about crime increasing with higher density and lower cost housing. Parking should allow for four off street car parks per household. Environmental concerns for River Torrens. Safety walking around river after dark.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Anthony Lebessis, on behalf of Telstra	NEUTRAL	Utility Provider																					Telstra records indicate that there are Telstra assets location within the area of the proposal. Future development should have regard to existing assets and, once located, it can be arranged for the asset to be relocated or development amended to avoid assets.	Noted. Any future development of the Affected Area would have regard to existing assets and undertakes to work with Telstra to appropriately relocate assets or ensure they are not damaged.	
Anthony Mussared	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1														Six storey apartment building will have a significant impact on the aesthetics of the Linear Park. High density will have a significant impact on the distribution and amount of traffic. Changes have not be considered in the Traffic Report. Six storey apartment building will change the aesthetic of Lockleys, which is currently low density. Incorporation of affordable housing may lead to higher turnover of residents. Site may not be suitable for affordable housing as existing facilities in area not accessible by walking/public transport. City access via Linear Park only useful for highly fit people. Only one city bus service adjacent the site. Impact on environment. Increase noise, heat, shading/reflection from large buildings and interruption in sky space. Not opposed to redevelopment of the site but this should be no more than two storeys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Antonio Favaro	NEUTRAL	Member of the Public			1		1	1														1	Would welcome new development on the site, but with the same standards as the existing residential development in the area. The rezoning will result in over population of the area. Appreciate the existing community and levels of security. The traffic is busy at the school and increase traffic is not wanted.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Arja Korhonen	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					1	Object to the rezoning. Assigning the Urban Neighbourhood Zone to the area is incompatible with zonings within a several kilometre radius, allows for a style of residence incongruous with surrounding residences and erodes the amenity and workability of adjacent zoning. Hard to see it as anything but inappropriate, illogical and wrong. Does not meet Desired Outcome for the Zone as not in close proximity to a high frequency public transport corridor, adjacent primary road corridor and is not close to community focal points. Conflict with pedestrians and cyclists leaving the Linear Park with increased traffic resulting from the rezoning. Adverse traffic outcomes. The proposal should be rejected.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Arno Kugel	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1														1	Suburb to be devalued by changing the goal posts for residential planning. Unfair that quiet street will become a thoroughfare with traffic. Eyesore up to eight storeys in height. Hundreds of apartments at high density. Ignore community concerns and not in community best interest	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Arwen Nikolf	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																						No comments provided with submissions	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ashkay Chawla	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1															If development goes ahead the ecosystem of the River Torrens would be destroyed. Will reduce the character of the area. Don't believe the redevelopment is appropriate and should not go ahead.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ashleigh Scidone	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																						No comments provided with submissions	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Ashleigh Weston	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1					1											Recommend that the site be used for residential dwellings no higher than three storeys. This is to avoid traffic congestion. There is already not enough parking, extra apartments will cause shortfalls with on street parking. Maintain privacy for current house owners.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Bailey Nilsson (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1		1											The skyrise buildings will be an eyesore to local residents and invade our privacy. Will cause excessive traffic that will cause pollution and traffic hazards. Wildlife will be impacted. The development will ruin the quiet, peaceful and family oriented lifestyle.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Barbara Biggins	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													The height will destroy the amenity of the area and the liner park. An increase in population will add significantly to the existing traffic congestion issues.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Barbara Cummins	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1		1											Fully against any changes to allow multi storey high-rise buildings. Money making venture and not the long term effect on residents, Leneer Park or wildlife. Increased noise, traffic, pollution and crime. Overshadowing of existing homes. Destroy peacefulness of nature.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Barbara Hill	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1		1											Lockleys is a suburban setting and does not let itself to mid/high density living. Buildings would overshadow Linear Park, impacting on wildlife and residents. Impact of traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, parking congestion for visitors and noise pollution. Lack of consultation. Not opposed to redevelopment but must retain suburban nature and be no more than two storeys that provides open space and carparking.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Barry Chugg	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													Opposed to proposed high-rise housing. Height of development is too dominant for the surrounding area and housing, Pierson Street is only a two lane street with a bus route, but is not a main road and does not have a domenic hub. Traffic is already congestion and the redevelopment would exacerbate traffic and parking problems. Redevelopment would be visible from a considerable distance from both sides of the river and detract from Linear Park/River Torrens. Concerned about potential environmental impacts redevelopment would have on the ecosystem.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Belinda Wilcocks	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													Subject to the proposed Code Amendment. Anything larger than two storeys is not something want to see along Linear Park. Traffic congestion on Pierson Street is already at peak level, prefer to see changes to the bus route and reduction in traffic. Concerned about privacy of students. Lower cost housing has the potential to decrease value of surrounding area. Not impressed with proposal.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ben Kugel	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1														The proposal is a disgrace. Density does not suit the area. Traffic on Tracy Court and Azalea Drive will anger neighbours. The streets can barely cope as is. This is a money making scheme and will devalue other houses in the area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Benjamin Carr	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Proposal is not inline with the amnity, capacity, look, feel, history, community values, property values and heritage of the Council area. Malurus Avenue is already at full car capacity during morning and evening peak times. The traffic assessment should factor in Metcash site. Not against residential development on the site but size, height and potential population over acceptable levels.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Berni Woods	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1													Appalled you would allow such a monstrosity in the area. Greedy and ignorant.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Betty Bouras	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1		1											No high rise development. Don't want to ruin our beautiful nature reserve and lifestyle.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Blaine Lind	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1		1											Streets blocked by parked cars. Visual pollution. Impact to traffic. Cheap housing allow modern day ghetos.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Brad Harper	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														Against the changes to the code to allow construction of six level density living. Not inline with the current look of the suburb and surrounding areas. Will impact traffic congestion, which is already set to increase with plans for Metcash site. Protect Linear Park and do not impact on flora and fauna as a result of development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Bradley Eagle	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			No benefit to the local community. All it will do is fill narrow streets with cars and pollution and create traffic jams around Lockleys/Underdale area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Brenda McDonough (two submissions received, both with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1												Against six storey buildings. No transport hub or shopping facilities for this amount of people. Compare this to Metcash. Not in keeping with the area. Traffic will be ridiculous, especially on Rowells Road. Impact on River Torrens and wildlife. Would like site to be rezoned for two storey buildings only.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Brian Clifford	OPPOSE	Community Group		1		1													1	Lockleys is not the suburb for a development of this capacity. Suburb known for high quality of living. This kind of development takes away the feel of the area. Many residents are against.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Brian Hayes	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1												Opposed to the Lockleys development. It is not in keeping with the local community - large blocks, open spaces and natural environment. Once this is gone it can never be replaced. Please do not allow development to go ahead.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Brian Lawrie	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																	1	Traffic in area is already busy with situation compounded by street parking. With more people using the area there will be more cars and the roads will be less safe. Site is adjacent Linear Park. This is a community asset used by many people who enjoy the peacefulness and ambience of the park. This would be detracted from by buildings greater than two storeys. Any change to zone should be to Suburban Neighbourhood Zone to retain the residential status of suburb.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Brianna Anderson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1	1	1										:(Noted.	
Brigitta Ragg (three submissions received, two with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1	1	1										Purchased land on a street that was effectively a dead end. Concerned about increased traffic. Will impact property value. Not opposed to Affordable Housing Overlay or residential rezoning of the site, but opposed to the proposed building height. Would support buildings up to two storeys. Bus that services Pierson Street infrequent. No shops in walking distance. Concerned about impacts on flora and fauna on Linear Park. Do not believe consultation was broad enough, included all residents who may be impacted by the Code Amendment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Brook Crismani	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1														Work at Lockley's Early Learning Centre. The ELC is a community that can't be taken away from the area. It would be a loss to the community to get rid of it. Not to mention all of the jobs that would be lost.	Noted. At this time there is no plan to remove the ELC, only to rezone the Affected Area. If the rezoning goes ahead redevelopment of the Affected Area is a medium to long term prospect. Redevelopment would also include opportunities to investigate other uses of the site that could include child care centres and the like.	
Bruce Amos (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1			1	1												No way rezoning of site can be sanctioned to allow for development of up to six storeys. This would be a total infringement on the Linear Park and green space, but also create huge potential for traffic pressure and on road parking. Proposal creates buildings of a magnitude unmatched along entire Linear Park. Proposal is unacceptable.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Bruce Turner	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1												Highrise should not be allowed around Linear Park. Not in keeping with either the residential area of the river precinct. To approve a project such as this will only set a precedent for similar buildings and ruin what is unique here in Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Bruce Williams, City of Charles Sturt	OPPOSE	Local Government						1	1											Stand of established trees are located along the northern boundary of the site. Noted that the Significant and Regulated Tree Overlay would apply to the site. The Overlay desires the conservation of regulated and significant trees to provide aesthetic and environmental benefits and mitigate tree loss. Recommend further investigations be undertaken to identify significant vegetation. Massing investigations do not appear to have considered the location of established trees. Location and protection of trees could impact future development. Concerned with four to six storey building height along Linear Park, which is considered inconsistent with the amenity of the Linear Park. Prevailing character for single and two storey height limit. Requested that height limit be refused.	Noted. The massing investigations are indicative only to demonstrate overall height and mass of structures applying the proposed Zone, Overlays and TNV. It is not representative of a final development outcome for the site, which would need to have regard to existing vegetation and where appropriate design around these features. The Code Amendment has been amended to address concerns raised in respect to proximity of built form to the River Torrens and Linear Park. With the developer undertaking to setback any future buildings from the northern boundary of the Affected Area to soften the interface and provide opportunities to improve the Linear Park adjacent the Affected Area. This setback would also enable existing vegetation adjacent to the northern boundary of the Affected Area to be retained.	
Bruno Andre	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1													Against high density development in Lockleys	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Bruno Denichilo	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	No multi storey housing in Lockleys	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Brydie Sims (two submissions received, both of which were blank)	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submissions		
Cameron Hromin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1													No need to further encroach on beautiful public space and environment. What will be left for generations to come. How can we encourage people to look after their physical and mental health if beautiful surrounds are taken up by new dwellings. Angry.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Carlie Mathers	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Do not support this development. Increased traffic through this area will pose a threat to children in neighbouring schools. Does not fit with current landscape. Please do not build highrise here.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Carlo & Josephine Giannotti	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	We are opposed to this redevelopment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Carolyn Koch (two submissions received, one of which was blank and one that was received after the consultation period had ended)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	1	Opposed to the Code Amendment. Site should be changed from employment to suburban.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Carolyn Matchett	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			1	Do not approve of this development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Carolyn Shakeshaft	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1													Concerned about visual impact of four and six storey apartments interrupting the surrounding area. There are no other multiple storey buildings of this magnitude. Likely to stand out and be an eyesore in contrast to Linear Park. Concerned about increased traffic flow.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Casey Ryan	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1				1													Do not want this. Will ruin the local area and beauty of the river.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Caterina Cirillo	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1				1											Built up areas will ruin suburb. The proposed amendment will not be a good fit for this site. Already impacted by traffic in the area and increase dwellings will create a nightmare on local streets. The area is special. Other parts of Adelaide should be considered.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Cathy Hoffmann	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1													Too much traffic. Will lower value of home. Will take away beauty of Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Cathy Janders	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1														Concerned about proposed development. Have lived in the area for 45 years and have seen much change. Including demolition of existing housing replaced with two or three. This has caused traffic and parking issues. Adding high density housing will exacerbate an existing problem. If this development goes ahead how will traffic be managed. Privacy will be affected. Do not want Linear Park marred by six storey buildings. It will set a precedent for further similar developments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Charlie Johnston	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																				Does not fit with local area. Will fundamentally change the areas land use.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Charlotte Baker	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																				No comments provided with submission	
Chelsea Brincat	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																				No comments provided with submission	
Cheryl Moxey	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1													Against the development. Ludicrous to put so many people in small area. River bank will be destroyed by six to eight storey buildings and low income earners. Why not build then in North Adelaide, Elizabeth or Salisbury.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Chris Balog	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																				Proposed development appears to be out of character with established housing in neighbouring areas.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Chris Grove	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1													Don't spoil the ambience of the Linear Park. Surely someone more appropriate can be found.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Chris Hughes	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1													Please don't build highrise buildings it will destroy peaceful surroundings.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Chris Jeisman	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1				1													Opposed to high rise development along the River Torrens Linear Park. If allowed to proceed will be a disaster for the community and other future generations to come.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Christina Constantinides	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1													Traffic is a hazard now, let alone building this. Linear Park is unique and high rise apartments are not suited to this peaceful and family oriented area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Christina Nerris	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1				1	1										Concerns with the proposed development: 1. Congested traffic and parking 2. Effects on health from lead emissions 3. Potential blackouts 4. devaluing of homes 5. Added delays to existing driveways 6. Noise pollution	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Constantine Paxinos	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1												Resides within 100 metres of site. This is not an appropriate location for multi level apartments and affordable housing. Please stop destroying our natural environment and Australian family life. Should not destroy a neighbourhood for one project.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.				
Corrine Duggin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1													Object to proposal. Don't agree to 6-8 storey residents in suburb. Preference would be for one to two storey housing. Concerned about extra cars coming down narrow streets.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.				
Craig Jensen	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												1	Moved from the Mornington Peninsula in 2012. Western suburbs always appealed to due to bushlike feel thanks to the Linear Park. Other things like schools, airport, city, beach and transport were all contributing factors to our decision. Dissapointing to hear of the unfit proposed development directly behind us. Concerned about its impact on our way of life. Concerns being increased noise, increased traffic, medium rise development and environmental impact on Linear Park and River Torrens. Density proposed can only have a negative impact on surrounding area. Not opposed to redevelopment like what has been Metcash. Proposed rezoning is opposed and instead make it consist of housing in line with the existing area of Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.			
Craig Potter (two submissions received, both with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			1	No to the new development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.			
Cramer Fiona	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1													1	Current use of land has minimal impact on traffic or noise to surrounding residents. Does not block light or overlook homes. Would support changing the zone to Suburban Neighbourhood in keeping with adjacent housing. A chance to Urban Neighbourhood with medium density buildings up to six storeys high is not appropriate in this location. Roads in this proposal are single lane, quiet streets which will not cope with increased traffic. Linear Park along the Torrens is a beautiful place to exercise due to most housing being obscured by trees. Impossible to hide a large multi storey building.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Crystal Johns	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1															Local residents to not want this to occur. Increased traffic and population will lead to overcrowding in streets.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Cynthia Aartsen (three submissions received, all of which were blank)	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																					No comments provided with submission			
Cynthia Goldworthy	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1																1	Stop overdevelopment. Six storeys is too high in residential streets. Won't be enough car parks for all the cars. Rowells Road won't handle increase in traffic. Residents don't want high-rise development. Not in keeping with the suburban streets and single storey dwellings. Stop destroying the backstreets. If you have to build highrise then build them on main roads. Stop overdevelopment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Damien Kennedy	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					1	Will result in change to the character of suburb. Create unsustainable burden on local infrastructure and local roads.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Damien McCarthy (two submissions received, both with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					1	Petition against the development of multi storey housing or high rise development along the Linear Park	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Dana Newton	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					1	Oppose the plan to build anything over two storeys along the Torrens. Will not benefit the suburb or greater area and does not suit area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Daniel Shepherd	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																						No comments provided with submission		
Daniel Huggett	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																						1	Development does not suit character of Lockleys. Thought of having six storeys along Torrens ludicrous. If approved this development application will ruin one of the great suburbs in the west.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Danielle Battifuoco	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																						1	Opposed to planned development and negative impact the height and density would make to the aesthetic of the Linear Park as well as negative impact on community and potential impacts from future similar developments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Danielle De Nadai	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																						1	No to this kind of development. Maximum level two storeys. No multi level apartments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Danny Jarratt	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																						1	Oppose development this close to Linear Park. Linear Park provides a peaceful place in a loud urban corridor and provides incredible benefits to the community.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Darren Panozzo	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																		No comments provided with submission	
Dave Hector	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1			1	1	1												Have resided in Lockleys for 20 years. Traffic congestion is at an all time high at Rowells Road. The proposed location will only add to congestion. The proposed development would lower the value of property and bring residents that are not particularly welcome. We have enough socially dysfunctional families in the area without the new development. Crime will spike and the community will suffer. Do not support the affordable housing at all.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
David & Andrea Gordon	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1			1	1												Do not want a multi storied building on the site or in the area. The area is not suitable for such a proposal. Would not improve the lives of the community nor help the environment in any way. Linear Park needs yo be taken into consideration.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
David Blight	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1			1			1		1		1		1				As a long term Lockleys resident concerned about the Code Amendment. Out of character with the areaand not appropriate. Site is surrounded by single/two storey houses in the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. Site should be zoned the same. Site not on a main road, urban corridor or transport hub. Visual impact will be significant. Privacy and overshadowing issues. No private yards and insufficient open/community space. Affordable housing coupled with social/safety issues. No environmental impact statement. Infrastructure issues regarding water supply. Will not improve the lives of residents. Will set a precedent. Future development should respect existing setting. Balance between conservation and development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
David Newman	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1												Really concerned about effect this development will have on Lockleys. Will be too high density and negatively impact enjoyment of Linear Park	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
David Potts	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1			1		1								The high density and building height is out of character with the local area. Nothing else in area that compares to what is being proposed. No reasonable consideration of increased traffic, parking congestion, access and egress for the development. No close access to amenities one would expect for high density housing. No scope in the proposal for this to be developed. Access to public transport is limited. No university is area. Development will put a strain on existing infrastructure and utilities. This issue exacerbated by River Torrens as a physical obstacle for services.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
David Roberts	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1		1		1								Entirely out of keeping with area. All of the surrounding area is sinlge or two storey. Population density in area would be increased. Six or four storey buildings on Linear Park would detract from ambience and reduce amenity. No trasport hub or shopping complex nearby to cater for extra population. Extra stress in roads. Proposed amendment would negate good planning done in the past.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
David Smith	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																		No comments provided with submission.	
David Turner (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1													Planning for future housing needs is sensational. However, do not require six storey units. Reduce to two or three levels.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Dean Clark	OPPOSE	Member of the Public														1				Not acceptable.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Dean Clarke	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1				1	1							Lockleys is a beautiful suburban setting with attractive family homes. A six level development does not suit surrounds. Proposal would result in increased traffic, pedestrian hazards, parking congestion, noise pollution, impact on wildlife. Not opposed to development on the site but object to anything over two levels. Should look at Metcash and adjust proposal.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Dean Hoffmann	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1			1					1								Proposal must be stopped. Will riun the area and doesn't fit with character. Lockleys should not be a high density area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Denese Martin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1			1		1	1			1				Object to Code Amendment. Do not agree with high density and six to eight storeys. Preferred zoning would be Suburban Neighbourhood with single or two storey buildings. Development does not have a transport hub. Increase to traffic will be unsafe. Not wihin walking distance to shops of CBD. More cars. Not compatible with location.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Elsa Galligani	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1													Object to development due to probably adverse impacts on wildlife and parklands. A less invasive development would be acceptable. I believe six storeys is a huge imposition on existing residents. Will overlook the primary school. Fee that these factors have not been taken into consideration.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Emil Stock	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1													Do not believe this site should be used to build high rise residential buildings. Seems like corporate greed trying to make the most of the prime river front. Happy for site to be subdivided into normal housing not high density housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Emily Gilev	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
Emily Jones	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1												Writing on behalf of young family that live in area. Opposed to Code Amendment. Urban Neighbourhood Zone should not be deemed appropriate for this site as it does not meet the description of the Zone in the Code. The site lacks the characteristics of a Urban Neighbourhood Zone with no shopping centres in walking vicinity, no nearby train service, major transport corridor or significant place of interest. Rezoning will increase traffic congestion, place strain on community facilities and decrease neighbourhood safety through increased traffic. Development will not give anything back to the community. Will create a zoning island not complimentary to surrounding area. The existing business zone is not ideal for the suburb either.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Emma Panzarino	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Oppose any development higher than two storeys, particularly along the River Torrens.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Emma Rasic	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1													Six storey building is ugly and will ruin the neighbourhood.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Erin Peake	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1													No to high-rise along Torrens Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ethelwyn Freda Jones	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1	1											Code Amendment is not in keeping with the area. Impacts from traffic and parking, including access to/from site. Please change to two storey keeping with the character of the locality.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Eugenio Rebellato	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1	1											Citing NSW data the description of the proposed development as medium density is misleading. Medium density (40 dwellings per hectare) would be tolerable, multi storey apartments not in keeping with area and would have detrimental impact on River Torrens/Environment. Multistorey development would also destroy the rural/undeveloped charm of the River. Development may not attract families resulting in underutilisation of schools. Development does not promote walkability. Accessibility of development by fire trucks. Carparking shortfalls based on West Lakes example. Slight improvement to traffic is not a good outcome if possibility exists for greater improvement. While traffic conditions may improve on weekdays, traffic report ignores potential for increased traffic on weekends. Site not located near transport corridor or near a route that provides adequate public transport. Would result in incongruous development, which would impoverish the community standards and conditions. Recommended Code Amendment be allowed with standards and conditions applicable to the new development at former Metcash site.	Noted. The Planning and Design Code provides a definition for net medium and net high density with medium net residential density defined as 35 to 70 dwellings per hectare. Based on the calculation of 70 dwellings per hectare the proposal would result in a medium density development.
Evan Knapp	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1	1											Area inappropriate for zone that allows high density development up to six storeys. Code Amendment misleadingly suggests proposal is 'medium density' . Zone is designed for land along major transport routes with access to public transport (e.g. ANZAC Highway). Suggestion that Pierson Street is a transit corridor is absurd. All surrounding areas are zoned Suburban Neighbourhood with maximum building height of two levels. This would be an appropriate zoning type for the site. Note maximum building heights will be utilised in the north of the site disrupting the amenity of the Torrens Linear Park. Unconvinced by steps taken to prevent overlooking. Visual pollution will be visible throughout the suburb	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Evelyn Joan Richichi	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												Grave concerns about proposal. Will impact on current and future residents, environment and community. Not congenial to the location. Area will not/does not allow for additional traffic flows, parking congestion, noise pollution, amenities, utilities and transport options. Homes will be devalued and overshadowed. History and character of area will be lost. Tranquil and environment of Linear Park will be destroyed. Concerned for safety and health of people. Opposed to six storey development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Fiona Gosling	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												Current schools and child care are at capacity. Loss of the child care centre from the site will further reduce availability. Will be devastated if existing child care centre is demolished. Medium rise buildings will overlook neighbours. Foot traffic on Linear Park will impact flora and fauna. Pierson Street is quiet except for peak hour. Adding 360 residences will increase traffic at off-peak times and on weekends.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Fiona Lorick	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1												Do not support high rise development on Linear Park. Development will be detrimental to wildlife. Will increase traffic and pollution. Detract from peaceful area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Frank Woods	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Should not go ahead.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Fraser Rigby	NEUTRAL	Member of the Public	1		1	1	1	1													General support housing infill in inner suburbs. Development of this site one off opportunity to create new housing in inner city as well as enhancing community space and services. Proposed Urban Neighbourhood Zone appears to create the most flexibility in terms of use. Concerned that development will be heavily weighted to medium density housing with four to six storey apartment blocks. This will remove from the aesthetics of the neighbourhood. Buildings along the Linear Park would be out of character with the rest of the riverfront. Would detract rather than enhance the Linear Park. Question how the current proposal would strengthen linkages to the Linear Park. Unclear how redevelopment could provide sufficient carparking. Area insufficiently serviced by public transport. Concerned about potential for increased traffic on Azalea Drive and Tracey Crescent should these be connected to roads in the development. Query access to site and application of the Traffic Generating Overlay over half of the site. Proposed following changes: 1. TNV for building height limited to two levels. Traffic Generating Development Overlay extended over whole of site. No provisions for the retention of the Early Learning Centre. This is a very popular service. May be outside of Code Amendment process, however opportunity should be taken to retain service as part of a future development on the site.	Noted. The extent of the Traffic Generating Development Overlay shown in the mapping is how the Overlay currently applies to the Affected Area under the Planning and Design Code. The Designated Entity is happy to seek to extend the Overlay to apply to the whole of the Affected Area through the Code Amendment. While the Overlay only applies to half of the Affected Area, any development proposal for the Affected Area is still likely to trigger referral to the Department of Infrastructure and Transport due to the Affected Area being contained on one parcel.
Gary Brown	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
Gaylene Favaro	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1											1	No high or medium housing. No to unprecedented proposal along Linear Park. No to destruction of habitat and visual impact on Linear Park. Yes to proposal that meets the character and low density housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Geoff Cutting	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Against proposal	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
George Constantinides	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												High rise development in area not acceptable or desirable. Local streets will become congested with traffic and parking. Six storey buildings will tower over Linear Park and destroy quiet amenity. Better suited to major road.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
George Economou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1											1	Against the proposal. Will negatively effect housing prices and damage status of area. Will encroach on privacy of residents. Not against development, but against anything over two storeys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
George Gonis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													Proposal will not be suitable for peaceful location. Outraged it has gone this far. Should not be allowed any higher than two storeys. Traffic flow is a concern. Higher number of vehicles will crowd area and cause parking concerns. Small houses cannot accommodate number of cars per dwelling. No carparking facilities in new development. Traffic on surrounding streets. They cannot take any more traffic. Lockkeys must remain low density .	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Helen Lind	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														Out of keeping with character of area. Multi storey does not match other housing in area. Allowing this would be the start of a disaster. Wpould increase the amount of traffic dramatically.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Helen Turbill	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1		1													Doesn't align with existing residential development in area. Would detrimentally affect traffic flow and ass to already congested traffic problem. Torrens Linear Park is a piece of wilderness in the city. Development will impact its beauty and wildlife. If allowed will be the beginning of many more developments of this type.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Henrietta and Daniel Shepherd	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													Supportive of growth and development in Adewlaide. However, the porposed re-zoning is inappropriate for the Lockleys area. Proposal does not meet the Desired Outcomes in the Urban Neighbourhood Zone. There is only one bus service past the site. Streets are already over capacity in peak hours. Not a high frequency public transport corridor. Scale of development compromises public saefty. Low density development similar to surrounding houses is the only appropriate development for site. Maximum height of surrounding properties is two levels. Porposed six levels is inappropriate for suburb. Proposal does not consider urban environment and suburban profile for Lockleys. Would effect lifestyle of people living in Lockleys. Support development in area, however, must be appropriate.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Hilary Creasey	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1	1											Appalled that you would consider allowing a six storey building in Lockleys area. Already experiencing problems with infill development. Code Amendment will exacerbate water drainage issues, parking problems and traffic congestion. Will degrade the character and ambience of Lockleys. Devalue current real estate. Hinder wildlife.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ian Roberts	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1													Opposed to proposal. Structures would be out of character for area and be an eyesore. Overshadowing of existing homes is unacceptable. Will have an effect on the livability and value of homes. No respect fo the beauty of the landscape or local residents.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jacki Mills	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1	1											Object to the proposal. It will not suit the current urban environment. No infrastructure to support development of this size. No capacity to handle increase traffic flows. Cause a pedestrian hazard. Footpaths and streets are narrow. Public tranport is limited. No shooping cnetre in walking distance. Noise, air and rubbish pollution will be increased. Negative impact to the Linear Park. Linear Park is a wonderful natural reserve that is in need of some upgrade. Not against residential development. Would support a change to Suburban Neihgbourhood with two storey with improved infrastrutcre and small commercial development to support.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jacob Hayes	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																Opposed to development. Will change a beautiful quiet area into an overcrowded eyesore. Local community do not want this.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jacqueline Hockley	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1			1										The public open space cited is not accurate as part of it is open land along the linear track. It is not an appropriate use of this area or any suburban street. High density living should be contained to main roads and transit routes. Will cause traffic chaos and pressure on current infrastructure and resources.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
James Cother, Environment Protection Authority	NEUTRAL	State Government Agency	1																		Detailed site investigotions will need to be undertaken as part of a future development application to determine that Affected Area is suitable for intended land uses. EPA supports the application of the Stormwater Management Overlay to the Affected Area to improve quality of stormwater.	Noted. Currently site discharges untreated stormwter into the River Torrens. Application of appropriate development polcies (i.e. Stormwater Management Overlay) provide the opportunity for future development to significantly improve quality of stormwater being discharged into the River Torrens, which in turn will provide environmental benefits to the River and the area generally. It is understood that further investigations would be required to determine whether site contamination exists on the land and any remediation works that may be required to ensure land is suitable for futurre sensitive land uses.
James Polvere	NEUTRAL	Member of the Public																			Please provide more information.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Jamie Tripodi	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														Opposed to six storey building. Maintain area as residential and maximum two storeys. Also concerned about infrastructure.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Janet Boyce	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1															Amendment will shove traffic through small suburban streets. It is dangerous, greedy and corrupt.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Janine Johnson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1		1													Opposed to the Code Amendment. Pierson Street bus route only bus near site and is not a major transport route. The area is not a significant place of interest, it is a suburban housing area. Way of life for residents must be respected. Discussions for Torrens Linear Park to be listed on UNESCO World Heritage list. This would not occur if the development proceeds. Loss for future tourism promotion.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jason Quinn	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1		1													Oppose the development. Eyesore to residents and visitors. Increased traffic volumes. Safety issues for local residents and children due to increased traffic. High rise in otherwise low level suburb. Conservation of Linear Park compromised. Not close to transport and no where near public amenities. Will not increase quality of life for residents.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jeff Pfitzner	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1													Scholls and childcare are at capacity, not to mention traffic congestion. To contemplate multi storey on the site is a social disgrace. Azalea Street and Trueman Reserve and associated wildlife will suffer a sad demise.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jenny Williams	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comment provided with submission.	
Jens Nilsson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1												Protest the development of multi storey buildings in this area. Invades privacy. The impact on the area on residents and wildlife around Linear Park should be considered.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jill Purdy	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1						1												Deep concerns about impact on local environment, infrastructure and increase of road traffic in the area. No need to have such dense public housing that will later become ghetto like.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jilian Wirkus	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1			1															Proposal incompatible with area. To ensure community is not adversely impacted development should consider wellbeing of residents. Limited to two storey dwellings and not targeting low income residents. Potential for crime.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Jo Hugman	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1													Oppose proposed amendment as Pierson Street is not an urban corridor. Not near a transport hub. Buildings height of more than three storeys not appropriate. Development not in line with other developments in the area. Suburban Neighbourhood Zone more appropriate.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Joanna Wells	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1												Inappropriate to situate multi-level housing in area which is predominantly single storey. Not an area suitable for this type of development. Not on transport corridor. Local bus does not constitute a go zone. Increased traffic volumes from increased density. High density should be situated closer to main roads. Understand developer does not want to have open/green space, this is totally unacceptable.	Noted. In relation to open space, any future residential development of the site will be required to provide 12.5% of the land area as open space or financial contribution. Such open space would ultimately be available to anyone in the community to use.
Joanne Wright	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
John Andrewartha	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
John Fisher	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1	1											Pierson Street and surrounding streets are not an urban corridor. Traffic congestion is prevalent during the peak periods and will be further compromised. There is sufficient existing access to the River Torrens Linear Park. Any development higher than two levels is not acceptable, not complementary to the suburban environment, out of character with Lockleys and sets a precedent.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
John Paul Smith	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1	1											Visual impact through the large buildings planned to be built. Car parking and traffic problems including increased hazards/accidents and traffic noise. Damage to local fauna. Environmental impacts from increased deliveries. Views of the River Torrens will not be the same.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
John Smith	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1	1											Oppose multi storey premises. Going to ruin the Linear Park. Impact from rubbish and damage to Rivver and local fauna worrying. Increase traffic resulting in safety concerns and to a level that will impact the local environment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
John Stavrinakis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1	1											Oppose the development. Will diminish the streetscape with towering buildings. Increase traffic flow and create parking congestion. Degrade the natural habitat in the surrounding Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Karen Grove	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																	1	Will totally spoil family oriented area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Karl Martin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1				1	1	1										1	1	Outraged that such a development can be considered. Lack of consistency with existing development policy in area (subdivision on Grant Avenue). Cashed up investors will buy units with no investment in the community making the affordable homes packaga farcical. Will encourage transient poluation and rise in negative elements. Pierson Street is not a transport corridor and already fails to cope with traffic. Appropriate to rezone to Suburban Neighbourhood so that single/two strepy homes can be built. From an environmental perspective I see numerous significant trees will be removed, increased rubbish and damage to the ecosystem of the River.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Karl Shwung (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1	1			1	1	1										1	Against proposal. Turn area into a ghetto. Go build low cost housing elsewhere. Lockleys is a great suburb. Six storey development will not suit area. Not against development, but must be one or two storeys. Will add to noise pollution. Have impact on wildlife along the River. Cause pedestrian hazard and create extra traffic. Pierson Street is not an urban corridor.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Karuna Veerapen	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1										1	Disagree with proposed Code Amendment. Area already heavily congested in the moening and evening, proposed development will massively increase road traffic in neighbourhood side streets with risk to pedestrians. Would be social damage to the community. Do not have good public trasnport, increasing number of buses would have a negative impact on traffic. Does not suit the suburb. Prefer smaller housing estatet rather than apartments. Put too much pressure on surrounding roads and infrastrutcre. Detrimental to the environment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Kasia Fijolek	NEUTRAL	Member of the Public					1													Lockleys Early Learning Centre is used by many people in the community.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Kate Stevens	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																		No comments provided with submission.		
Kate Taylor	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																	1	Reject proposal	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Katherine Martin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1	1			1	1	1										1	Oppose the Code Amendment. In favour of the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. Against the Urban Neighbourhood Zone as only one bus on Pierson Street, no train service and no shopping centres in close vacinity. Not sufficient parking. Six storey hieght not in keeping with character of area. Opposed to condensed living. Will create an urban ghetto as focus to build affordbale housing rather than quality homes. Concerns about the amount of traffic. Impact to Linear Park Karriwirra Pari is a major concern. Loss of historic red gums. Impacts on birdlife from pollution/airconditioners. Not opposed to development but would prefer homes that have adequate parking and reflect the suburb. Oppose the proposal to build 6 storey high buildings. Take this up with Kaurna Nations as well and City of West Torrens. Karriwirra Pari is a sacred ground and needs to be respected. Trees need to be protected.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Katherine Markou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1													Oppose the Code Amendment. Lockleys valuable asset to western suburbs. Apartment buildings unstoppable in CBD, but to have one in Lockleys is greedy. This would be a mistake.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Kathryn Liebezeit	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1		1	1									1	1	Concerned for proposed Code Amendment. City Shaping article referencing 30 Year Plan states that 'we don't want tall buildings everywhere and we want to protect and build on character we value'. Agreeing to six storey and medium/high density proposal along Linear Park would contradict this statement. To develop area in this manner would impact the existing community visually and pratically due to increased residents in the area without appropriate infrastrtcre to support this. Support rezoning to Suburban Neighbourhood to protect the lifestyle of surrounding community.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kathy Koutsouliotis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1		1										1	Having two, four or six storey apartments overlooking backyard is an invasion of privacy. Will feel unsafe in front and back yard. Will turn area into a hooning precinct. Schools are at capacity.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	

Kathy Woods	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													1	Appreciate that development of site is being considered. Agree that Employment Zone no longer appropriate, but disagree to the Urban Neighbourhood Zone. Permit construction of buildings uncharacteristic of the suburb and properties along the Linear Park. Constitution of the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone would be most appropriate for the site. Site not provided with appropriate services (bus, schools etc) required. Parking capacity is concerning. Unlikely that future development would be supported by adequate carparking. Buildings above two storeys are unheard fo in Lockleys. Impossible to develop in cohesion with existing properties. Don't oppose development, just poor development that the proposed zone would allow. Would ruin the character of Lockleys. Metcash site does not exceed low to medium density and two storeys and neither should the site.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Keith Preston (two submissions received, both with the same conentent and one received after the consultation period had ended)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1	1		1	1														1	Seems to go against the spirit of poprosed rezoning changes. Proposal has rasied concern with community. Not against development of the site for residential purposes. But reject proposal as inappropriate and too high density for Lockleys and Linear Park. No precedent for this kind of development anywhere. Number of concerns. Proposal is situated with minimal services, shops and public trasnport. Traffic issues, streets already congested. High density housing is out of character. Impact on wildlife. All buildings need to be setback from the rivr. Six storey buildings are out of character. Will see existing residents leaving the suburb and other problems that come with that.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Kelly Abrahamson (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																				1	Allowing high rise next to Linear Park is not ok. People live here to escape is all and for mental health. Build these on main roads. Have to protect the river.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Kelly Stone	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1														1	1	Not opposed to the site being rezoned for housing, concerned with density proposed. Six level apartments are not in keeping with the amenity of the suburb or Linear Park. Concerned with two level buildings close to homes creating shadow. Increased traffic flow and impact on existing water mains. Would prefer to see amendment more in keeping with local area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kerrie Kartambis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1															1	No to high rise development along the Linear Park. Will be too congested. Regular housing, but not apartments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Kerry Rover	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																						No comments provided with submission.	
Kevin Keading, West Torrens Residents Association Inc. (two submissions received, written content the same, one containing newspaper article and photographs)	OPPOSE	Community Group			1	1		1														1	1	Wishes to reinforce that a majority of ratepayers and residents in Lockleys are opposed to high-rise buildings on the site and along the Torrens Linear Park. Proposal is not in keeping with the natural environment of pre-existing housing. Believe six storey buildings will have an effect on wildlife along the Torrens Linear Park. Concentration of human life, noise and overcrowding will destroy environment forever. Increased population will increase traffic flow creating pedestrian hazards and congestion. Six storey development will cause overshadowing of residents homes. Child care centre on the site promotes a natural environment for children to learn in. Destroy curmet and future generations of learning in natural pollution free environment. Natural noises and environment along Torrens Linear Park will be destroyed. Development would have mental helath impacts for existing and future residents. Would create a covid hot spot. Torrens Linear Park enhanced not destroyed. If allowed would open the flood gates for high rise along the Torrens. Does not fit vision of Colonel William Light. Development would create an urban jungle in the middle of a nature reserve. Opposed to Code Amendment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kevin Nash	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																				1	Do not want this in our suburb.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	

Khaled Dahak	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1																	Area will be ruined if code amended passes. Not located in an urban corridor. Information regarding density misleading as report refers to high density. Not against development with maximum two level height dotted along the river.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kimberley Bartsch	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1							1										Against proposed development. Traffic will increase. Multi storey and volume residences will negatively affect nature, wildlife and general serenity of area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kristina Childs	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					Do not think high rise buildings fits in the community. Not the best choice for wildlife currently living in the area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kristina Shepherd	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1		1		1													Do not support the zoning change. When assessed against the Desired Outcomes the site does not meet the criteria, therefore the Urban Neighbourhood Zone is an inappropriate zone to apply. One bus route services Pierson Street. No room to widen Pierson Street. On street parking restricts current traffic movements. Proximity to Kirrawirra Park and the Linear Park provide access to walking and cycling, however public safety will be compromised given the proximity to the busy school area. Is not a high frequency transit stop. The development is not close to an activity centre. Anything over two levels inappropriate for the site. Code Amendment lacks consideration of urban environment and profile of Lockleys. To inject medium density into the middle of the suburb would effect the lifestyle. For development, growth and change, however inappropriate development A zoning of Suburban Neighbourhood consistent with the rest of Lockleys allows for development of the area without compromising amenity or character.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kyle Heading	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					Do not support the development. Is not the kind of development that should be considered so close to the river.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kylie Roberts	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1																	Opposed to Code Amendment. Area inappropriate to be zoned as Urban Neighbourhood. Pierson Street is not a major transport node, corridor or significant place of interest. Existing infrastructure already struggles to meet current demand and will not cope with high density. Area characterised by low density housing. Sense of community would be lost. Worried about the environmental impact on Karawirra Park. People enjoy the Linear Park which would not be the case if it became pillared or overshadowed by apartment blocks. Not be adequate consultation with local community. Support a rezoning to Suburban Neighbourhood.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kym McKay	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					No no no.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kym Waldeck (two submissions received, both with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					Opposed to the development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Kyra Staak	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					Increased traffic congestion and demand for schools will impact local area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lachlan Baldwin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1																	Housing expansion in Lockleys is fine, but not six storeys. Out of place and will create a lot of traffic. Turn the neighbourhood into a ghetto. Illegal activity will probably also end up in the area. It's not in the city therefore don't turn it into the city.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lambros Kartambis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					Don't agree with high rise development in area so close to school and Torrens Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lana Krav	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1																	Disappointed that a four or six storey high rise could take place in our community. Worried about seeing highrise and amount of traffic flow. In the past development such as Underdale were near the river frontage were done in line with low density living. We would like Lockleys to keep its larger homes and blocks and no higher than two storeys. Traffic, parking and bin collection concerns. Development will bring more cars to the area. Smaller homes cannot accommodate this. There will not be enough parking for new residents. Don't want a huge highrise in the middle of the suburb. High rises have their place on main roads and in the city.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lara Reid	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					Oppose the redevelopment on the river front in Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Laura Palombella	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																					No to high rise along River Torrens and Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Lauren Tarca	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.		
Leanne Fromm (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1			1	1	1													Lockleys is two storey, anything higher will ruin beauty of Lockleys. No affordable housing. Don't ruin beauty of Torrens Linear Park. Eyesore must not occur. Wildlife nature has not been considered. Increased traffic flow and hazards to school kids must not occur. Submission includes a presentation and photographs of area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Lee Triantafillou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1														Lockleys is a peaceful and attractive setting. Having six level development will not suit the surroundings. Oppose the Code Amendment. Will not work with existing housing. Traffic increases will cause delays. Buildings will shadow existing houses and clock sun causing problems for plantations and wildlife around the Torrens. Increase in noise pollution. Privacy of existing residents. Parking congestion. Lockleys school will be affected by high traffic flows and pedestrian hazards. Not opposed to development of the site up to two levels high.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Leigh Hauber (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														I vote no. The building height and population density is out of character with Lockleys. It it goes ahead area will become a slum.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Leisa Moroney	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1														This cannot happen. Has seen the damage these types of developments cause. Lockleys is a beautiful quiet area. Concerned about the impact to local traffic.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Lesley Flora	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1													1	Think zoning should be left 'as is'. Anything over two levels is too high. Churchill Road is a classic example of how ugly anything over two storeys is. Don't destroy our western suburbs. Don't destroy roads with more traffic congestion. Object to the chnage, object to anything over two storeys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Lexi Read	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.		
Lidia Scidone	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.		
Lisa Baldwin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1	1		1	1														Do not want this type of development in our suburb. Does not fit with existing landscape. Properties will town over people's homes. Increase traffic congestion ina area. Affordable housing means creating a ghetto.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Lisa Cummings	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Lisa Draper	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1	1												We utilise the child care centre on the site. It does not deserve to be shut down. Medium to high density housing does not suit the area. Will likley place pressure on roads and Linear Park environment. Safety concerns for children due to high density housing close by. It will also present school zoning issues for families. Destroy the feel and amenity of the Linear Park. There has to be a better solution to develop the land if that's what must be done.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Lisa Pearce	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			1	Disgusting.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lloyd Goudge	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1		1											1	Change to Urban Neighbourhood Zone should not occur. Out of proportion with Lockleys. Change will be detrimental to local residents. Streets more unsafe, overcrowded. Plummeting house prices. State planning requirements for the Urban Neighbourhood Zone to be supported a high level of services, shops and public trasnport to support increased numbers. These services/facilities are not in the vacility of the site the rezoning should not proceed. No developments of this scale anywhere along Linear Park. A change to Suburban Neighbourhood Zone is appaoriate.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lorna Crowley	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1	1	1	1	1			1										1	Not in favour of siz storey housing. The site brings local jobs for local people. Having environmental commercial uses along River Torrens is better for the local community. Building height is a massive hazard to the local airport abd safety concern. Not in keeping with Lockleys. Area not suitable for zone as it does not improve the lives of the community. There will be a strain on carparking, local traffic, public transport, public resources and utilities. Prefer to keep site commercial and improve with environmentally friendly business. This will bring more jobs to the area. Buildings should be a maximum of two storeys.	Noted. The Planning and Design Code sets out building height maximums in proximity to the airport that if exceeded will require referral to the Airport to confirm suitability. This is managed though the Airport Building Height (Regulated) Overlay of the Planning and Design Code. Any building that exceeds 15 metres in height on the site requires referral to the Adelaide Airport. The purpose of the referral is to assess the suitability of building height and impacts on flight paths etc. The Airport Building Height (Regulated) Overlay already applies to the Affected Area under the Code. The Code Amendment does not seek to change the operation of this Overlay as it applies to the Affected Area.

Luigi Filippin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1												Disagree to Code Amendment. Impact on wildlife. Code Amendment infringes on the rights of current property owners including reduction in privacy and overshadowing. Increased traffic flow, carparking, pedestrian hazards and safety. Strain put on existing community resources such as schools, transport, doctors, parks and shopping centres. (Submission includes photographs of area).	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Luke McKenzie (four submissions received, all with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1		1												Housing up to six storeys not in keeping with character of area. Negatively impact wildlife. Increase traffic and parking congestion. Not appropriate for Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Luke Walker	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1												Six storey development on dorrstep of last piece of nature in city is a joke. Completely change the atmosphere and feel of the Torrens and biodiversity of the area. This type of high density urban land fill must stop.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lyndy Cavanagh	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1				1												Code Amendment does not support the local community and would impact on the appeal of the suburb and health of the River Torrens	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Lynton Pearce (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1				1												The developer is claiming the Linear Park as open space for the development. Many of the adjacent properties are single storey and enhance the suburb. If Code Amendment allowed is could dramatically change the ethos and ecology of the River Torrens. Would be unsightly and impact on the Linear Park. Such a high concentration of affordable housing in one location is out of character for the suburb (drug central on the river). Runways for cars and cars parked everywhere. Lockleys school already at capacity. Multiple skyscrapers will stand in the heard of everyone's Torrens Linear Park. Proposal in contravention with the Desired Outcomes of the Urban Neighbourhood Zone. 30 Year Plan needs to be considered. There is a need for infill development and affordable housing, but this is not the appropriate site. Pierson Street is not an urban corridor, 30 Year Plan says this is the ideal place for high density housing. Why is development applying for 100% affordable housing when the Code only requires 15%. The City of West Torrens is clear on wanting the site to be rezoned to Suburban Neighbourhood. Azalea Drive and Tracey Crfescent are no through roads and are one reason purchased in area.	Noted. While connections to the Linear Park may be explored as part of a future development proposal for the site and have been explored as part of this Code Amendment, the Liar Park is not being claimed as open space for a future development. The Linear Park and River Torrens are held in a separate parcel of land and under separate ownership to the Designated Entity. Any future residential development of the site would have to provide 12.5% of open space (within the Affected Area) or otherwise a financial contribution towards open space. Code Amendment does not seek 100% affordable housing. The Code Amendment seeks to apply to Affordable Housing Overlay to the Affected Area, which would enable future development to incorporate affordable housing if it wanted to.
Madison Jones	OPPOSE	Member of the Public								1											Please do not go ahead with proposal. Not suited to the community and likely to devalue surrounding property. Residents happy with the way it is now.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Madeleine Regan	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1	1	1											Six stored development is inappropriate. Currently not permitted in area. Allowing it would create a precedent. Amplify pressure on existing infrastrcture and traffic flow. Linear Park is a nture corridor that retains lower level housing. No development of scale proposed adjacent the Linear Park. Could be replicated in every suburb along the Linear Park. Inconsistent with atural landscape. Will affect environment and animals along the Linear Park. Stormwater should be reused or treated prior to release to the River Torrens. Development does not appear to cater for carparking or increased traffic. Density on the site would impact traffic flows and reducel safety.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mandie Busby, SA Power Networks (SAPN)	NEUTRAL	Utility Provider																			Anhy infill or green field development will necessarily require corresponding upgrade of the electricity distribution network. This may include the setting aside of land for a new sub station. Future development should consider the current network capacity and long lead times to meet increased demand and contributions to extensions/connections of electrical infrastructure. Developers should contact SAPN directly in this regard.	Noted. Any future development of the site would have regard to current capacity and would seek to upgrade electrical infrastrcture, as required, to service the demand of any new development of the Affected Area.

Margret Pearce	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1	1		1	1	1												Disappointing to try and incorporate this sort of development into a prime residential area. Does not match the existing character. Not opposed to development of prestige quality homes. Existing roads cannot take traffic involved with the many residents. Would make Azalea Drive impossible to close to the traffic lights. Existing homes would be overshadowed. Visual appearance of multi level buildings would be unsightly and devalue homes. High concentration of affordable housing will create a ghetto environment and increase crime. Environmental disaster to Linear Park and River Torrens.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Margaret Steenvoorde	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1											1	Objects to Code Amendment. Will not be in keepinh with Suburban Neighbourhood Zone. Will ruin the character of Lockleys and reduce quality of living. Houses will be overshadowed. Reduce greens space. Increase traffic. Add to parking congestion. Increase noise and air pollution. Create more hazards for pedestrians. Impact wildlife and natural surroundings of River Torrens and Linear Park. Traffic hazards to school children on Pierson Street. Development near the Torrens should be strictly controlled. Set a precedent. Should change plans to be more like Metcash site. Not opposed to development, but suggest should be rezoned to Suburban Neighbourhood at maximum two storey building height.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Maria Dinow	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1												1	Do not agree with proposed amendment to height. Not consistent with neighbouring properties. Will create additional traffic congestion. Will not be beneficial to area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Maria Galouzis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1												Do not oppose redevelopment of the site, object to six storey buildings.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Maria Skouroumounis	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1														Worried about traffic congestion, impact on children walking to school and increased noise levels. Availability of street parking already limited. Difficulties for bin collection. Concerned this will become worse.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Marianne Nicole	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1											1	Size and number of storeys inappropriate, especially with lack of green space for number of people living in area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Marie Gomez	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Park brings so much joy and great meeting place. Please reconsider there is enough housing in other areas.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Marie Otway	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
Marilena Tripodi	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1													Understand need for growth. However, six storey development not in keeping with nature of Lockleys. Would prefer two storey. Concerned for safety, congestions on roads, shadow from buildings and lack of infrastrucure (sewers/drainage).	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mark Goudge	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1											1	Object to rezoning. Allowing for future construction of three to six storey buildings is out of character with surround Surburban Neighbourhood Zone. No ne of the supporting requirements for the Urban Neighbourhood Zone. Existing local road network will not be able to support increase in vehicle traffic. Increase vehicle traffic will increase risk to local residents. Inadequate consultation. No objection to removal of the Employment Zone. Area surrounding Affected Area is low scale and low density. Infill housing should be developed in a way that encourages and maintains social connectivity while creating vibrant, walkable and sustainable neighbourhoods that are complimentary to their surrounds.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mark Wundenburg	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												Opposed to development. Prefer Suburban Neighbourhood Zone with maximum two storeys and Code Amendment to be led by the City of West Torrens. Six storeys will not fit surrounding area. Proposal raises questions: impact on wildlife, noise pollution, traffic impact, parking isasues and impact on amenities. The proposal at Metcash would be a better fit.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Marlene Gregory	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												Code Amendment will result in increased traffic flow, pedestrian hazards, parking congestion, noise pollution, impact on wildlife and River Torrens. Six level development does not suit the surrounding area. Not opposed to development but object to anything over two levels. Should look at Metcash and make adjustments to current Code Amendment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Marta Trzesinski	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1	1											1			Object to amendment. Negatively impact wildlife, natural reserve, parking and traffic congestion and property prices. Does not align with the 30 Year Plan - not on a transit corridor and will not help health and wellbeing. Current subdivision is already concerning. Findon/Rowells Road already at a standstill during peak hours. Linear Park reserver not suitable for six storey buildings.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.				
Martin Rosser	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1	1	1													1	1	Main concerns with rezoning are: The proposed building height being significantly taller than surrounding area. Preference for two storeys maximum. Highest buildings will face onto the Linear Park. This will reduce amenity. Density also at odds with surrounding area. This could result in nearby streets being crowded with nighttime parking and noise. Buildings should have regular breaks to allow light penetration. Safety could be compromised with increased traffic.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Mary Perry	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1						1															Do not wish for multi storey affordable housing to be proposed on site.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Mary Terris	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1	1				1											1	Oppose to development. No precedent for buildings of six to eight storeys. Does not suit character of Lockleys. Pierson Street is not a major road corridor and increasing traffic and bus route would be a challenge to local streets. Not close to commercial precinct would expect traffic impact. Query whether there has been genuine community engagement by developer.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.		
Mary Wooden	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1	1	1															1	1	Object to Code Amendment. Not against development, but object to development of more than two storeys. Reasons for objection are increased traffic, lack of street parking, rubbish collection. No shopping or nearby transport hub to support density. Noise pollution. Negative impact on wildlife along Karawirra Parri due to human activity. Not in character with Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
The Honourable Matt Cowdrey, Member for Colton	OPPOSE	State Member of Parliament								1	1															1	Clear than community of Lockleys do not believe the Code Amendment to be consistent with zoning or development principles in surrounding area, does not satisfy considerations or Urban Neighbourhood Zone and is not consistent with the 30 Year Plan. Site is not in the vicinity of a transport corridor. Site is not proximate to transport hub or train. The site is not positioned on a main road. The site is not proximate to a significant place of interest. Commuting from the site to CBD by walking/cycling not widely feasible. Site opposite school and school zone. Streets are not designed to take uplift. Rezoning would allow density not inline with recent infill sites. Code Amendment would allow development up to six storeys, higher than any other development facing Linear Park. Proposal not consistent with P1, P2, P5 and P 30 of the 30 year Plan. Community views Code Amendment as inappropriate.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Matt Mingal, SA Water	NEUTRAL	Utility Provider																									Extent of augmentation works (if required) will depend on final scope and layout of development. General comments. Information provided through Code Amendment will be incorporated into SA Water's planning process. Development shall not have a deleterious impact on quality or quantity of water. Applications for connection will be assessed on individual commercial merit and have regard to relevant standards.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Matthew Fromm (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1				1	1				1												1	1	Oppose the Code Amendment. Sought after suburb. Four - six storey apartments go against everything the suburb has to offer. Encroach on privacy. Be an eyesore. Add extra foot traffic and vehicle traffic on already busy Pierson Street. Future development at Metcash or on Findon Road has been taken into account when looking at traffic flow. Maximum of two storey apartments would be a suitable development. No open space provision for the type of development proposed. Public transport is limited, only one bus service no trains or trams. Not enough provision for onsite parking. Pierson Street is a narrow and busy street. This will increase traffic, as will the homes to be built on Findon Road. Buildings will overshadow existing dwellings, encroach on privacy and cause overcrowding of schools and facilities. Development at Rivergreen more suitable.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Max Sebben	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			For any Gov. office to entertain such an outrageous proposition speaks volumes how far they have fallen.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Max Sebben & Diane Howard	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Any politician who would consider this proposal for this location has questionable integrity. Unlikely decision will be based on the will of the people. Decision should be undertaken by the conscience of those who seek the best outcome for the people they serve.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Melissa Cutting	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1												Against changes. Don't have community resources to support development. Not fitting to local landscape.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Melissa Ponci	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1														Please don't put a high rise building there. We love in beautiful area. This will cause so much traffic and the construction will be horrible and unsafe. Don't destroy it.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mervyn Collins	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																Code Amendment will allow buildings up to 24.5 metres which is not amenable to the surrounding neighbourhood.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Michael Economou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public								1		1									Should not be allowed to destroy the aesthetics of the suburb will be an eyesore.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Michael Heim	OPPOSE	Member of the Public										1									Please do not build highrise apartments near the River Torrens and Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Michael Wooden	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1			1									Not objecting to smaller scale infill development. Object to Code Amendment. Do not want three, four, five or six storey development. Increased density that would increase traffic, create pedestrian hazards, parking congestion and noise pollution. Negative impact on wildlife around River Torrens/Karawirra Park. Area does not a transport hub/bus interchange or significant place of interest inconsistent with Urban Neighbourhood Zone. Should make adjustments to code amendment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Michele Lucas	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1								1								Chose to live in area due to outlook, natural environment, access to Linear Park and character of Lockleys. Great opportunity to develop the site in a manner sympathetic to the surrounding suburb, increase the green canopy and reduce hard paved surfaces. Multi storey buildings are more appropriately sited along urban corridors and not green recreation corridors. Would detract from the amenity of the resource. Conclusions in traffic study seem unlikely and is a concern given already high levels of traffic.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Michelle Campbell	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1												Brought in area for serenity and bush setting to think this could be taken away and instead look at buildings and devaluing our home, still in shock. Streets were not constructed to cater for increased traffic, let alone power and water demands. Building height is capped at two - three storeys. Development is not in line with this. Oppose this.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mike Yang	OPPOSE	Member of the Public										1									Increased traffic and congestion.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Miriam Hamoy	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1							1									Object to proposal to allow apartments higher than three storeys. Surrounding neighbourhood is single storey dwellings. Proposed development will stick out like a sore thumb. Will be more evident on Linear Park where it will be a blight on the landscape. Development should be restricted to three level apartments and single dwelling homes/town houses.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mirjana Marchioro	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1								1								Don't mind residential homes but object to high rise apartments disfiguring the landscape and harmful to wildlife. Hoping something will be done for water as water pressure is low.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mishel Elsley	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Against the proposal.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Monique Van Pelt	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1																Will take away from the area and be a disruption to nature. No higher than three storeys should be allowed so as to keep the surrounds of Linear Park harmonious.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Mrs Gudolin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public								1		1									Don't want high rise buildings on River frontage. Will impact wildlife. Increase traffic flow. Pedestrian Hazards. Parking congestions. Noise pollution. Overshadowing. Two storeys maybe, but not six storeys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Nancy Hannan	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1		1										Oppose the Code Amendment. Change from commercial to Urban Neighbourhood does not suit Lockleys. Maximum height should be two storeys. Prefer smaller housing estate rather than apartments or medium density town houses. Too much pressure on roads and infrastructure. No major shops nearby. Transport is limited. No train or tram and average bus system. Modern housing does not allow for adequate carparking. Spill out to local streets would have a significant impact on residents. Safety issues for children. Add pressure on over crowded schools. Environmental impact on River Torrens a concern.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Nathan Ellul (two submissions received one of which was blank)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																	1		Do not amend the Code and ruin the suburb of Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Nathanael Brown (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1		1										Object to Code Amendment. Would permit six storey buildings facing the Linear Park, higher than anything else in Lockleys. Nearest transit corridor is Henley Beach Road. Site serviced by Pierson Street a narrow local road serviced by only one bus. No shopping centres in walking distance to the site. Issues with transport would lead to suburb becoming car dependent. Development would need appropriate onsite carparking. Impact on high density development on flora and fauna of the Linear Park, particularly trees. Would support residential development of an appropriate height.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Navreet Kaur Malhi	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1		1											1	A multi-storey building in the existing area wukk negatively impact aesthetics in the nature reserve. Parking congestion. Shading to existing houses. Overlooking of backyards. Other buildings like this will follow.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Nicholas Ryder	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1													Do not let this happen in Lockleys. Worried for extra traffic and congestion. No place for high density in this part of Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Nick and Caterina Valenzisi & Nicholas and Stephanie Valenzisi & Michael & Nicole Valenzisi & Coz Pezzaniti	SUPPORT	Member of the Public	1																		Like how buildings have been pushed towards river front giving Pierson Street a two storey view. Ask that we try and consider people parking on street. If that can be avoided to minimise cars arking on street and emergency services can access buildings. Overall aesthetics of the area would look clean and tidy.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Nick Hodder	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1			1	1									Allowing proposal will dramatically reduce land values in area. Cause increased traffic. Parking congestio. Put a strain on surrounding amenities.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Nick Jones	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
Nicole Brown	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1		1										Object to Code Amendment. Proposed building height is considerably higher than anything else in Lockleys. Density not supported by public transport, road network or shopping centres. Number of dwellings would result in significantly more traffic. Must be sufficient parking for future development on the site. Concerned about increased traffic flow and access points at Azalea Drive and racey Crescent. Impact of high density development on the flora and fauna of the Linear Park, particulary trees, has not been considered.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Olivia Dawes	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1				1	1									Against the proposed development. Will fundamentally alter the character of the suburb and place pressure on amenities, traffic and parking. Development will decrease suburbs appeal and housing prices.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Pamela Kirkham	SUPPORT	Member of the Public	1																		Support Code Amendment. Current use of land out of character with neighbourhood. Environmentally unsound to encroach into the Linear Park for high rise density. If amendment is no made it will impact on area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Patrick Dawes	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1				1								1	Opposed to development and Code Amendment. Not in the interests of the local community for innumerate reasons.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Paul Campbell	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1					1									River Torrens precinct is an idealistic location and major attraction. Development would destroy the skyline and impact the area in many ways. Demand on infrastructure, traffic and hgh density. Should be rejected on grounds it will have a negative impact to the area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Paula Whelan	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1												Will impact on the environment. Walks along Linear Park and appreciate the improvements that have been made to encourage native flora and fauna.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Peter Balazs	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														Opposed to multi storey housing development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Roger and Jan Boyce	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1						1						Code Amendment does not consider Lockleys residents. Will increase traffic flow and create difficulties for residents. Not opposed to site being built on but to two levels.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ronald Mills	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1												Object to buildings over two levels. Buildings of four to six levels will create a visual wall. Traffic increases to Pierson Street. Impacts from rubbish truck movements. Privacy will be encroached on. Impact on bird life and native bees established in the Linear Park. Area will become a parking problem.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Roslyn Miles (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1	1						1						Do not support Code Amendment. Buildings will tower over the streets. Will not enhance the Linear Park. Heavy traffic on Pierson Street. Buildings three stories and higher would be out of character. Know there is a shortage of housing, but does not suit Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ruth Butler	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1								1					Affordable housing needs to be built in a way to sustain a healthy community. Six to eight storey buildings with no green space will not enhance the area. Surrounding roads will be congested. Character of area will change.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ruth McDonald	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1				1												Don't lose peace of Linear Park. No high rise encroaching on the Linear Park. Buildings more than two storey should be away from the perimeter. Green space included. Additional access from Pierson Street. Azalea Drive not used as a through road.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ruth Richards	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1					1									Six storeys is too high. Need more trees in the area and more off street parking. Allowance for extra water and electricity.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Ryan Campbell	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1		1					1							Pierson Street is not an urban corridor. Height is not consistent with other development in Lockleys. Inadequate public transport. No carparking. Linear Park needs to be preserved. Safety considerations with traffic movements.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sally Hannan	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1			1						1			Not near a transport hub, place of interest or shops. Pierson Street is not an urban corridor. Congestion would be a major problem. Lack of on site parking. Six storeys would tower over homes and blot out landscape. Proximity of the River and environmental impact on animals and vegetation. Burden on local amenities from increased population. Do not oppose change to the Suburban Neighbourhood Zone.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sally Hyam	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1						1					1		If zoning changed it should be changed to Suburban Neighbourhood. Area not at a transport corridor or major shopping centre. Impact on infrastructure and road network. Increase traffic would be dangerous for children. High rise does not compliment existing housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sally Kungel	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														Congestion on the roads not sustainable. White Ave already narrowed and Pierson and Azalea cannot cope with increased population.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Samuel Baker (two submissions received, both with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1												This will ruin the River.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sara Gogel	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1													No high rise development. Don't want higher traffic disturbing the environment. Risk of higher crime rate due to affordable housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sarah Kipling	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1													Against Code Amendment due to impact build will have on suburban feel of suburb. Don't need high rise.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Scott Guy	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public						1	1												No comments provided with submission.	
Sean Robinson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1										1						Will be an eyesore. Extra cars. Area should be turned into nice little subdivision like end of Main Street, Lockleys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sharon Aiozza	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1	1			1	1											Ghetto style housing. Area is apacious quality housing not high and medium density. Not against redevelopment but in style that suits the area. Will impact Linear Park. Allowance for carparks will not house all of the cars.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Shauna Morris	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1							1									Not in favour of proposal. Will devalue the community socially and economically with affordable housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Shirley Andrewartha	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																			No comments provided with submission.	
Shirley Wright (three submissions, one directed to PLUS, Attorney-Generals Department)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1			1	1	1		1	1								Do not want high rise buildings. Will lower land value. Additional traffic and noise pollution. Parking congestion. Risk of crime given lower income residences. Don't want cheap housing. Water supply and pressure will drop. Will not feel safe in area. Increase in cars.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sigrid Malessa	OPPOSE	Member of the Public													1						Not in line with character of area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

Silvi Crawford	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1														Not fitting with Lockleys area. Do not want a six storey development in low density setting. Not opposed to development up to two storeys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Silvia Ashfeild Smith	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1																		Local area not right for an affordable housing development. Apartments not required in area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Silviea Oconner	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Do not want project to proceed due to negative impacts on the community.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Simon Johns	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Only people that want this are the developers.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Simon Taylor	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Reject proposal.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Sophie Baldwin	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Do not want.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Sophie Mauriello	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1	1		1															Opposed to six storey affordable housing. Development will cause increased traffic problems. Will be an eyesore. Lower property values. Bring transient occupiers and crime. No precedent along the River Torrens for six storey buildings. Development should be consistent with the character of the area. Natural habitat of the River Torrens will be ruined and wildlife impacted.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Stella Robinson	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																		1	Concerns with how land will be used. Multi storey buildings out of step with aesthetic of area. Development needs to be done sensitively.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Stephen Christiansen	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1														1	Will set a precedent for other land holdings. Will be an eyesore. Increase traffic. Impact environment along the River Torrens. Impact foot and bike traffic.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Steve Busuttill (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1														1	Amount of extra traffic will cause concerns. Opening up Azalea and Tracey Crescent will make them into busy roads. Parking congestion. Hazards to pedestrians. Noise pollution. Buildings blocking the sun. Adverse impact on wildlife along the River Torrens. Loss of trees. Impact on property values. Should be low density housing.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Steve Markovic (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1												1	Preference for the site to be rezoned Suburban Neighbourhood. The site is not on an urban corridor. There is only one bus and no train services or shopping centres in close proximity. Support development but no more than two storeys. Impact on the River Torrens environment with loss of trees and impact on wildlife. Density resulting in traffic congestion.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Susan Mlaco	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1														Against high density living on the Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Susan Toth	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1				1														Understand the need to build homes, but to cram so much into the space will be an eyesore and destroy ambience of area.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Sussanna Filippin (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1														1	Proposal does not suit demographic of Lockleys. Rezoning would result in: Increased traffic flows and pedestrian hazards. Parking Congestion. Noise pollution. Impact on wildlife around the River Torrens. Overshadowing and invasion of privacy. Impact on local amenities and services (e.g. parks and bus). Not opposed to development, but object to anything over two storeys in height.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Susannah Zhang	NEUTRAL	Member of the Public																				Need to look after the River Torrens.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Suzanne Van Dijk	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1														Not acceptable for Lockleys and should be restricted to the city. Housing in Lockleys should be no greater than two storeys to reflect the area and protect the River Torrens.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Talia Wyman	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1														Above two storeys in unacceptable and unworkable given connecting streets and river.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Tania Andrews	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1															High rise buildings detrimental to the suburb the River Torrens. Unsightly and introduces more people into a small area without sufficient infrastructure to support. More cars with minimal parking.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Tania Mullaart	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																				No comments provided with submission.	
Tania Whittenbury	OPPOSE	Member of the Public						1														Not in support of high rise development along the River Torrens Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Tanya Withers	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1		1														Dwellings up to six storeys are not in keeping with the character of area. What will happen to staff of office and child care centre.	Noted. Existing uses of the site will continue despite of the Code Amendment. These employment opportunities are likely to continue into the future with opportunities for non-residential uses to be considered as part of a redevelopment of the site.

Trevor Wirkus (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1	1	1	1															Oppose high rise density. Development will attract high level unemployable people that will bring crime and drug use. Would not object to a sensible three level development and not high density. Site should be rezoned Suburban Neighbourhood. High density apartment living is unsuitable fit in suburb. No capacity for parking. Capacity for vehicles to enter/exit the site safely. Noise pollution.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Troy Boswell (two submissions received)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1	1		1											Will damage the community of Lockleys. Increase traffic congestion, impact pedestrian safety and place a strain on facilities. Impact on River Torrens Linear Park environment and wildlife. Out of character for the area. Site does not have the characteristics of an Urban Neighbourhood Zone. Support rezoning to Suburban Neighbourhood Zone.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Uma Preston	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Welcomes housing development on land, but should integrate with existing community. Would like future residents to have access to same livability as lower density housing. Six storey too big for residents to be connected. Would prefer three storey maximum. Provision for community interaction. Water harvesting. Recycling of waste, including green waste. Solar panels.	Noted. The application of the Stormwater Management Overlay makes provision for future development to uncorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design, which includes collection and reuse of water as well as improvement of water quality before discharging to the stormwater water system. Private and communal open spaces would be incorporated into future development of the Affected Area, with opportunities existing for these to become shared spaces (such as community gardens). All new development must provide waste disposal that incorporates general waste, recyclables and green waste.
Val Loose	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Oppose the suggested plan for development.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Vanessa Heading	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1														Area zoned low density. Proposal will create parking issues. Opposite of what this area is. Do not want apartments in this zone.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Vicki Markou	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1	1													Object to Affordable Housing Overlay and building height. Will increase traffic flow which is already an issue. Pedestrian hazards. Street parking congestion. Noise pollution and littering. Impact on wildlife around the River Torrens. Does not suit neighbourhood. Natural habitat needs to be preserved and protected. Will negatively impact the River Torrens and Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Vince Aiossa	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1														Development does not belong here. If land to be redeveloped it should be Torrens titled homes and no apartments.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Vincent Schirripa	OPPOSE	Member of the Public				1	1														Oppose medium to high density housing. Will cause increased traffic. Against standard of area. Development will be good for the site or should not be medium-high density with high rise buildings.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Virginia Nash	OPPOSE	Member of the Public					1	1													Don't want this type of housing spoiling suburb. Would ruin the Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Viv Dichiera	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Will impact sustainability programs in the area and destroy ecosystems. Educational programs will be compromised.	Noted. The rezoning provides opportunities in the future to improve the environmental impact from the site and in the local area. Including through improved stormwater management, provision of open space, reduced hard paved surfaces and increase in tree canopy. Future development is proposed to be setback from the northern boundary of the site to minimise visual impact on the Linear Park, ensure protection and preservation of existing trees and environment. Future development will also seek to improve linkages between the Affected Area and the Linear Park, with direct improvements to the wider community.
Warren Button	OPPOSE	Member of the Public	1	1		1	1														Not an appropriate height for area. Nothing like it in the area. Not suitable for affordable housing. Public transport not appropriate or carparking. Safety concerns for children.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Warren Hofen (three submission received, all with the same content)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public		1		1	1														Will destroy this part of Lockleys that could have quality homes. Will be an eyesore. Already have vehicle congestion and parking problems and development will add to this. Out of character with the area. All for development of site as long as buildings don't exceed two storeys.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.
Wendy Mutton	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			Should be single block allotments with same density as surrounding area with consideration of Linear Park.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.

William & Carlene Starr	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1			1											Not agianst development, but two storeys not six. Do not want to see medium/high density living. Would impact traffic and availability of parking. Needs to be sufficient off street parking. Infrastrucure and stormwater need to be considered. Would spoil Lockleys. Land should be developed doe two storey living with community facilities, including a gym.	Noted. Other non-residential uses, which could include gym (indoor recreation facility), are contemplated by the Urban Neighbourhood Zone and can be considered as part of a future development for the Affected Area.	
William Thomas Trueman (Estate of)	OPPOSE	Member of the Public			1		1	1	1					1								Code amendment does not meet the Desired Outcomes for the Urban Neighbourhood Zone. Built form will not provide a positive contribution to the local afrea. Would be inconsistent with landscape. Result in overlooking. Built form and visual impact on Linear Park. Will have an adverse impact on roads and pedestrian access to the Linear Park. Increase risk to pedestrians.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Yvonne Ragg	OPPOSE	Member of the Public							1													Will spoil the beauty of the River Torrens and all of the redevelopment.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Zo Do	OPPOSE	Member of the Public																			1	To build something like this in the neighbourhood would be ridiculous.	Noted. Please refer to Interim Engagement Report for detailed response.	
Zoe Craig	BLANK RESPONSE	Member of the Public																				No comments provided with submission.		
Percentage of Responses			2%	7%	37%	2%	48%	54%	43%	5%	20%	1%	1%	25%	17%	1%	2%	2%	5%	6%	8%	0%		