

## DTI:Planning Review

---

**From:** Greg O'Grady [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 23 August 2022 3:22 PM  
**To:** DTI:Planning Review  
**Cc:** Member for Waite MP  
**Subject:** Initial feedback - review of SA Planning Laws

Hello -

Thankyou for welcoming community feedback. I hope that this is not a tick-box exercise and that the community feedback is properly acknowledged and considered.

In relation to the community feedback, one thing that I (and many others) are interested in is that a summary of the community feedback is made public. We do not want to see a team of "experts" purportedly state that feedback has been considered and yet there be no evidence of that being the case when it comes to presenting outcomes from a review. This happens a lot, and hence the reason that I want to draw particular attention to the community concern.

In regards to community feedback for the review of SA Planning Laws, here's my initial summary of points for consideration:

- SA Govt development approval for new housing estates does nothing but encourage incredibly low quality sprawl of thermally inefficient 'energy hog' box houses that unsuspecting future home owners and occupants ultimately have to deal with. The low thermal comfort brings about unnecessarily high energy bills. Installation of rooftop solar PV and batteries only mask the underlying problem by making energy bills lower than they would otherwise be. But the fact remains that these homes are more often than not energy hogs. This does nothing to help the trajectory towards low energy buildings.... <https://www.energy.gov.au/government-priorities/energy-ministers/energy-ministers-publications/trajectory-low-energy-buildings>
- Tree regulations are terrible. The fact house blocks start with a completely cleared and levelled site amplifies the effects of low quality sprawl mentioned above. With the blinkers only looking at the house, external shading in our forever warming climate is incredibly important. When looking at biodiversity, retaining native vegetation is critical.
- Urban infill is generally executed poorly. The whole "TOD" concept seems to have been forgotten about. It appears that there's zero consideration for public and active transport. The "Car Is King" thinking places Adelaide in the 1960s style thinking that ends up resulting in badly considered "Busting Congestion" intersection 'upgrades' and trying to add more lanes to existing roads to fit more cars. We have seen very clearly over the past 4 years in particular that we cannot keep trying to cram more cars on our roads and expect that our quality of life won't diminish as a consequence. Destroying homes, businesses, heritage, the environment and established community connectivity in order to build bigger roads is completely foolish. Please note the highlighted paragraph below.

Having lived in the Queen Victoria Apartments (Rose Park) and appreciating the quality of life affordable in such a setting, it seems very odd to me that here in South Australia we

seem to hold on to this strange idea that having a badly laid out 'house' sprawl to all edges of a boundary with zero yard space is somehow better than a well constructed apartment with accessibility to communal green space - serviced by good quality public / active transport options. Every major housing development in planning at the moment needs some serious scrutiny. 10 Anzac Highway (the old LeCornu site) amongst them.

## Quotes attributable to Nic

*We're committed to a future path to building the state for*

*Adelaide is consistently ranked without a bold vision and strategy of our streets and neighbourhoods*

Regards,  
Greg O'Grady

o0o

---