

14th November, 2020

Hon. Sandra Kanck



Re the current **consultation on the Code & Development Plan Amendments**: you're having a lend of me, right?

The web page advising of the consultation says 'From time to time, the planning and development system is amended to improve the way it works in South Australia'. Missing at the end of the sentence should be 'for the developers'.

This new code appears to be the last nail in the coffin of local government playing a role in planning decisions and there's more fast-tracking than ever before. But I guess that was the aim of the exercise, wasn't it?

In September 2019 the upper house of the South Australian Parliament declared a climate emergency, as have a number of local government entities in this state. Yet parts of your document 'Phase three (urban areas) planning and design code amendment: Summary of post-consultation amendments' thumbs its nose at the idea.

An offset program to allow developers to get away with not planting new trees on development sites is proposed for 'higher density areas where minimum setbacks may make tree planting in public reserves more appropriate than on-site'. This is a cop-out.

If the density is such that tree-planting is impossible, then clearly the intention is to have barren tree-less development, what is known as a heat island. How will planting a tree in a park make up for that heat and the extra electricity infrastructure which will be required in that development and the resultant increase in greenhouse gas emissions? The solution is not planting a tree in a park some distance away. The solution is to reduce the density and the setbacks so that trees can be accommodated.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sandra M Kanck".

Hon. Sandra Kanck