

To the visionaries at DPTI,

My mother threw in the bin all photos of me as a baby and child. What has this got to do with you? Well I am missing a bit of my history. I don't even know what I looked like as a baby and young child. History is important and it helps make us distinct and different. (I am sure you have heard the saying “Be yourself because everyone else is taken.)

But it seems you are bent on creating a city “designed” predominantly by one group who are not interested in our history, and are building built environs predominantly with *profit driving the “design”*. These fast builds are lacking in many regards such as:

- essential rain inducing vegetation
- poor sound insulation and heat insulation
- no or little shading from the sun's radiant heat but are often dark inside requiring constant artificial lighting

Also you, the state government, are acting in an *oxymoron manner*, encouraging and subsidising people to install solar panels and batteries and then allowing these solar systems to be shaded several houses in from main roads by proposing that six and eight storey buildings can be built on main roads, in certain areas, rendering these solar systems mostly useless and distressing homeowners in the process.

A good painting needs rhythm; pleasant music needs rhythm; a pleasing outfit needs rhythm. A well planned and built city needs rhythm, but you are proposing a jarring Australian Los Angeles. You need to pull out a few photos of Los Angeles' suburbs. There you will find treeless, jarring, hotch -potch development, ugly, hot in summer, cold in winter streets. Due to the lack of greenery ugly infrastructure dominates the built environment. Is this what you really want for a city that is now considered gracious - but may fast lose that description? Or just choose one of the crammed in treeless middle eastern cities filled with multi-storey boxes for houses fronting right up to the footpath. Have a look at Aleppo or Beirut (pre-war). You need to look at Carmel (by the sea) USA. Again similar climate, but a place where people want to live, work and visit.

Been to Shanghai recently? Probably not but step back one street from the main shopping mall and the housing in the old part of the city is preserved and mostly only two storey. Here in Shanghai they get the importance of preserving history right now. These areas have communal areas too – different in structure than ours but balconies or car free lanes. Even Chinese high rise development, are not “cheek by jowl” with no green open space. Their high rise are spaced out with communal/ community spaces between them.

I am not against well thought out urban infill but it should be medium density in most of Adelaide with enough setback for trees or large shrubs to allow the city to maintain some greenness. Treeless suburbs/ streets in any city are not a good look. Buildings here are being built so close to roads that not only do they not have any real green space but street trees are needing significant pruning or are being removed all together, all in the name of making money for developers. Not my vision for Adelaide.

The new planning and development code with its vision for squashed in buildings, (mostly) no green space and no external social space does not encourage community and creates not just heat islands but heat corridors. We are a hot, dry city and we need trees to ameliorate our hot temperatures. These crammed in dwellings are also no more affordable than those less crammed in.

Allowing one group to so dramatically influence the outcome of city design is inappropriate and it is not a long term solution to jobs in Adelaide. When do we stop growing? When we get to Sydney's size? To Mexico city's population? *When we run out of water?*

Removing many historical buildings for short term gain is also short term vision. *Is that what the liberal government is about?* The new planning and development code is lacking and inappropriate for such a beautiful city. There is room for consolidation but development should be in most areas no more than two storeys high and with space to allow shading of walls of buildings (using eaves, verandahs, etc) and greenery.

High rise buildings need to be placed on larger sites where complexes of buildings and communal areas can be developed not squashed in here and there. U – shaped buildings work quite well on such sites where safe communal space can be situated in the middle. This also allows the building design the potential to have a higher environmental star rating.

Please reply to my correspondence and tell me -in non planning code – what is your vision for Adelaide now and in a hundred years time.

Also I would like to you to explain to me how allowing building to occur on 250 m² blocks with building frontages within a metre or two of the front boundary allows the government to achieve a 20% increase the tree canopy of Adelaide. (I do realize that garages will be setback and will have a concrete or similar hard surface driveway in front of them, i.e. no greenery to be seen there.)

On your “yourSAy” web page for the draft code (Planning and Development) it is with great irony and interest I note that the large dominant photo surrounding the text is of a lovely undeveloped hill providing an uninterrupted green view towards an extremely large bank of trees with Adelaide situated behind all this bucolic greenery. But that is not what the planning code provides for. Talk about rubbing salt into the wound.

Yours sincerely

Maxine Gibbs