To whom it may concern

This email is my submission in connection with Phase 3 of the proposed Planning & Design Code. I am the owner of a home located in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters zoned RH(C).

In summary, my submission is that the proposed Code should not go into operation unless very significant changes are made in connection with both built heritage areas and other matters. My view is that the bulk of the changes proposed by way of the Code should be rejected as they could create the conditions in which the inner suburbs of Adelaide become less livable, attractive and energy efficient.

I wish to make the following more specific points:

1. Encouraging urban density should be rejected as a guiding policy approach. Changes in work patterns, including the increase in people working from home and the increase in part-time work, mean it is less important that people be located right next to the urban core than it once may have been. It is also not obvious why, for example, a single house with a front and rear lawn and gardens should be overall less energy efficient than two townhouses with no gardens and twice as much driveway concrete built on the same block. Further, my own observation is also that newly built "hammerhead" or "battleaxe" design houses or three bedroom apartments are not significantly cheaper than the conventional homes offered for sale in comparable areas yet come with no or little garden.

2. Features of the proposed code, such as smaller (or no) set-backs, ease of demolition and subdivision and easier removal of trees will all combine to reduce the coverage of trees in suburban areas.

3. The code should specifically identify all Contributory Items and all existing Contributory Item protections should be maintained. Demolition should be made more difficult to achieve for Contributory Items and State and Local heritage places, rather than easier.

I understand that Norwood Payneham & St Peters Council is making a detailed submission as to the proposed changes and I support the approach which the Council has been taking.

Kind regards
Peter Leech
[Address and email details not for publication]