

## **DTI:Planning Review**

---

**From:** Peter Lumb [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 4 December 2022 5:39 PM  
**To:** DTI:Planning Review  
**Subject:** PLANNING SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW submission Peter Lumb  
**Attachments:** PLANNING SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW.docx

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

### **Submission from Peter Lumb 48A Halifax Street Adelaide SA**

[REDACTED]

## **PLANNING SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**

### **Car Parking Policy: Planning and Design Code**

*There is opportunity to explore how we provide car parking, particularly for developments near public transport, and whether it is necessary to provide as many car parking spaces in these locations.*

My suggestion to those reviewing the Planning System Car Parking policy is to consider above all else, two issues

1. To what extent does requiring two car parks for two-bedroom infill homes increase CO2 emissions?
2. What does the requirement to have two car parks for two-bedroom infill homes with at least one of the car parks undercover, impact on the price of dwellings?

I argue that these considerations should be placed above else, given that the planet is in a global warming crisis. Everything possible must be done to push down CO2 emissions. In addition, Australia has a housing crisis which is significantly a housing affordability crisis. Public policy needs to find a variety of ways to urgently reduce house prices.

I submit that the Planning System Review should commission research to establish the CO2 and house price impacts of requiring car parking.

I submit that it is necessary to significantly reduce car parking supply and to rapidly increase public and active transport in South Australia in order to reduce CO2 and other emissions, and to reduce land and home prices.

## Increasing car parking has the following consequences

- Increased low density population in Greater Adelaide and other cities, and therefore continuing and greater urban sprawl.
- Massive investment in roads (for example currently approximately one billion dollars a kilometre on South Road), which negatively impacts on established communities and which consumes quality agricultural land, and which only encourages more private car mobility and driving over longer distances. Roads predominantly built to accommodate private car use require vast quantities of concrete and steel, which are major producers of CO<sub>2</sub>.
- Increasing and costly congestion (not 'perceived congestion'). That congestion is a costly problem and an increasing one, is well established.

average speeds across Adelaide's metropolitan network have been steadily decreasing for the past 10 years, with the annual urban speed in central Adelaide deteriorating by 1.1% per year in that period. The Australian Infrastructure Audit (2015) estimated that the cost of delay in Adelaide will increase from approximately \$1b in 2011 to \$4b in 2031 in the absence of any additional capacity (Infrastructure SA p31 2019).

Further congestion is not a problem to be solved by replacing internal combustion engine cars with electric cars.

- Under-investment in public transport, which has led to nationally low levels of public transport mobility in SA.
- Increasing social inequality, as lower income people very often purchase or rent homes on Greater Metro Adelaide fringes, and therefore must own more cars per household and travel longer distances, pay out more in running costs, and allocate more time to travel.
- Takes up space that could be used by greening. Mandating car spaces denies people choice about planting trees or shrubs, or choosing to provide more space for family outdoor activities. This is additionally problematic when a car park must be covered (and thus also increases the price of the home).
- Active and public transport is a necessary determinant of better population health (RMIT Healthy Liveable Cities Lab). Car centric cities formed around abundant car parking do not promote better population health.

Infrastructure SA June 2019 *20-Year State Infrastructure Strategy* Discussion Paper

<https://cur.org.au/research-programs/healthy-liveable-cities-group/> accessed 04/12/2022

## **My experience of mandating car parking in Unley in 2006**

I previously owned a home in Porter Street Parkside. The home built in the 1880s, was large and on a large block. My children had left home and I wanted to down size the home.

I decided to renovate the home, and remove poor quality unoriginal additions, while increasing the sustainability and heritage value of the home. I planned to build a small high quality un-attached eco home on the same land. One aim was to diversify the housing stock available, the eco home could provide for a single or couple, while the original renovated home could house a family. (My wife and I thought we might 'age in place' and move into the small eco home).

I employed an architect who began work but soon told me that there was insufficient land to proceed. For each of the two dwellings, two car parks were required. The requirement for on-site car parking thus went from one to four and the land size was deemed insufficient. I had to abandon my plans.

At the time Porter Street was a bikeway, (though less developed than today) and bus services along George and Duthy Streets and Unley Road were nearby and frequent.

Each day I walked or rode to work into the CBD. Taking a car into the city, in my mind was costly burden. Buses were a convenient option when I wanted to catch one.

My desire to do my bit for the environment, and for diversifying housing, was thwarted, and in my view for no good purpose. In my view the consequences of car parking requirements were negative to the environment, to housing diversity and to my preferred convenient chosen lifestyle.

I sold up and moved to the City.