

**From:** [Lesley Davies](#)  
**To:** [DPTI:Planning Reform Submissions](#)  
**Cc:** [Bragg EO](#)  
**Subject:** Draft Planning and Design Code  
**Date:** Thursday, 27 February 2020 6:19:19 PM

---

## **Draft Planning and Design Code**

### **Have you considered the children and the birds???**

It is my understanding that there has been a long-term plan for Greater Adelaide to encourage greening Adelaide and Suburbs. It has been my observation when flying into Adelaide that there is a good tree canopy but the basic concepts of your proposed code will almost certainly lead to a diminution of trees.

Under the existing regulations older homes have been razed to the ground with the removal of all greenery, including trees and large shrubs. The urban infill creates multiple residences where there once was one. The type of dwellings such as multiple town-house rows and large, uniform, two-story homes, built boundary to boundary on reduced block sizes means that there is no room for trees, fruit trees native trees and shrubs.

So don't expect to see so many eucalyptus, bottlebrush, melaleucas, grevillea and so on...Our lorikeets, wattle birds, honey-eaters to name a few will no longer visit such areas.

In a time when the obesity of children is a growing concern, there are already, and would be increasingly so under your plan, developments built boundary to boundary with no yard for children in which to play. Time-poor parents are already too busy to make regular visits to public playgrounds...and these are not always within easy access for everybody. Under your planning changes for more urban infill, more green spaces would be needed.

Not only for the children and the birds but also for the planet, there are ramifications in the lack of green space around houses and apartments where hard surfaces for patios and driveways in the limited space is causing temperatures to rise. I quote:

*The urban heat island effect is a key example, where cities are warmer than their surrounding hinterlands due to the complex topography and mass of buildings, replacement of pervious vegetated surfaces with impervious built surfaces and the emission of heat from anthropogenic activities (Gartland, 2008, Smith et al., 2009).*  
(<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305900614000397>)

Under the proposed changes, I find it unacceptable that a neighbouring property may be developed without requesting my feedback as to any adverse effects, such as height and proximity to boundary, impacting on privacy and the enjoyment of my property.

The home with a back yard is one of the prime reasons which attracts people to Adelaide suburbs. Another major reason is the nature of the residential areas which would be lost under your proposed changes to allow non-residential developments in these areas.

One feels that your reforms to the planning approvals, currently managed by local councils, will hasten the demise of what is essentially the character of Adelaide and its suburbs. There are lovely homes in good condition in many parts of the Adelaide suburbs and this character should be retained.

Lesley Davies, David Radford

Kensington Park