

What do you think of the four outcomes guiding how Greater Adelaide should grow? Are there any other outcomes the commission should consider?

**Overall, the outcomes are hitting on the broader themes which must be addressed going forward. The plan must be strong in its advocacy for creating real change in the environment and climate change space so that future development controls can adequately enforce a pathway toward net zero through multiple means.**

**Creating safer communities is another outcome which is potentially missed although partly covered through the equitable communities goal. A community which is both safer in terms of the physical sense but also in regard to the perception of safety is important. This is not just in relation to crime and violence but also creating communities which you would feel safe to leave more vulnerable populations without ongoing direct supervision. This includes traffic safety in neighbourhood streets and designing neighbourhood streets to be more useable as human spaces, rather than solely useful for vehicles only.**

What other major trends and drivers might shape the future of Greater Adelaide? How should a land use plan address these trends and drivers?

**Change to the community through the increase in working from home which is here to stay is another trend which is perhaps under-addressed. This changes the way suburbs operate and increases the importance of having multiple services within the short distance, rather than relying on services which may be centralised. This in turn reduces the number of services and businesses required within the centralised areas such as the CBD which may need to be addressed during future rezoning and reuse proposal as requirements change.**

**A land use plan needs to ensure that it has thought of all potential changes and has sufficient mechanisms to deal with these changes as these trends continue to affect different land use supply and demand. The land use plan should not rely on the market to dictate the decision making process, and should continue to focus heavily on what is needed to make Adelaide a more equitable and environmentally friendly place. This means putting more social and health orientated goals in place when formulating future land use plans.**

What else could the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan do to contribute to a greener, wilder and climate resilient environment?

**Looking at any reduction of EFPA is not the right way to go about meeting the overall requirements and goals of the GARP. Leaving the door open on this is not the correct way to protect our food production areas and important environmental features from being developed. Realistically, Adelaide is already far too big for its population base and therefore should be heavily restricted from any further Greenfield development into EFPA and other important localities. Increased densities within the existing urban area and identified growth areas should be prioritised to protect green spaces and ensure climate resilience.**

**Targeted growth should be within surrounding satellite cities and sufficient spacing be maintained so that these satellite cities be sufficient for employment needs and services without needing to travel to Adelaide. There should also be barriers put in place to ensure that connection of the satellite cities to Adelaide does not occur over time. Exploring public transport expansion to these cities should be prioritised so that car based transport requirements are reduced and a Mt Barker 2.0 does not happen as a result.**

What else could the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan do to contribute to a more equitable and socially cohesive region?

**Identify how bland and underused residential neighbourhoods can be brought to life as social spaces with high levels of perceived and real safety. Review reducing speed limits within pockets of residential neighbourhoods to encourage greater use of the street corridors for human activities and reduce dependancy on private open space and anti-social behaviour.**

**To allow for wider socio-demographic mixing within inner urban areas, pockets of rezoning should be identified to allow for more intensive social and affordable housing within already established neighbourhoods. Protection of character housing should be maintained, but where possible higher density housing should be implemented within the inner city.**

What else could the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan do to contribute to a strong economy built on a smarter, cleaner and regenerative future?

**Identify locations for activities in relation to the circular economy to take place. This would be industrial or commercial activities with a view towards reuse and recycling and other requirements of the circular economy. This could also be tacked onto current innovation hubs to identify new technologies to improve our pathway towards a fully circular economy.**

**The plan should review and identify opportunities to incentivise future development which is done in a sustainable manner, and even more so for carbon negative development. The GARP needs to strongly advocate for changes in the planning systems to encourage this type of development, to rapidly progress carbon neutral and carbon negative development.**

What else could the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan do to encourage the delivery of greater choice across housing types and locations?

**Importance of having a variety of housing in all areas. There is not currently enough focus on providing the missing middle style of housing both in character/historic areas and within Greenfield development. There needs to be greater balance of power to force changes both on the inner and outer metro areas and within satellite cities. Investigating how clusters of higher intensity development can occur in key locations around transport and services is key.**

**Examples of alternative design solutions should be reviewed and supported going forward to provide higher density housing within traditionally lower density areas which remain consistent with the overall character of the locality. This can be achieved through smart design techniques. The plan should investigate how these solutions can be implemented into planning legislation to allow greater density in these locations where great design outcomes are achieved.**

**Perhaps most importantly is the installation of greater flexibility within the code for decisions to be made without the involvement of Council to achieve faster approvals,. In particular focussing on projects which improve the range of housing available across the metropolitan area. Currently decision processes are still heavily dominated by Councils when private systems could achieve faster and better results. Moving Development Approval stage to a state based system could also be favourable to standardise procedures and ensure that a consistent approach to variations and inconsistencies within private certification are achieved.**

What neighbourhood features enhance living and working locally?

**Walkability and close proximity to a wide variety of services makes for a great community feel. Reducing the number of times a person needs to get in the car is the ultimate goal in this space and creates more opportunity for social interaction and interaction with the environment. This interaction with the world outside of the private home ultimately leads to better communities and happier people. Look at country towns for an example of how smaller and more social communities generally lead to happier people who feel more connected with others in the community.**

**Ensuring there are a range of employers locally is just as important. Particularly in satellite cities, employment needs to hit on all levels of education and reduce the number of people travelling long distances into Adelaide CBD to work. This creates commuter towns like Mount Barker which is the opposite of a tight knit and functioning community. If pushing for satellite cities to be the next urban growth within the region, jobs must be created for all members of the community to ensure a wide socio-economic spread is achieved.**

How can Greenfield development achieve an urban form that is consistent with the principles of Living Locally?

**All Greenfield development needs to look to achieve local or near local employment and reduce the necessity for travel to the CBD. This may not be the case immediately, but perhaps with more encouragement can be done earlier than perhaps previously envisaged. This may be through release of industrial and commercial land earlier and incentives for businesses to relocate to these areas. Currently, the system is too focussed on residential first, but perhaps looking the other way will assist in creating more localised communities.**

**By focussing on jobs first, Greenfield development should achieve an urban form similar to older towns and cities when they were initially founded and people naturally went to where the work is. This creates a better space and more natural urban form which meets the needs of workers around, rather than a clunky and over-designed space. Planning departments focus too heavily on over designing masterplanned communities which takes out all of the humanity of the urban form.**

What is the ideal urban form to support the growth of satellite cities like Murray Bridge and Victor Harbour?

**Incentivise and direct employment opportunities to these localities. No one wants to drive an hour from the city to these locations or vice versa, but if decent paying jobs are located in these areas the residential population will follow. More incentives to existing or future businesses and employers need to be identified.**

What do you see as the benefits and potential drawbacks of Greenfield development?

**Greenfield development for the sake of cheap development is a bad outcome. Greenfield development around satellite cities can be beneficial to create a larger urban form for these areas which in turn creates less reliance on Adelaide. Creating commuter towns is a terrible outcome for the residential population, but also for businesses and employers who are losing hours of productivity from overtired drivers who are adding 1-2 hours onto their work day commuting.**

Environmentally, Greenfield development can be a huge negative, and it also bolsters the lack of affordability in the inner and middle urban ring as commute distances rise. Short term affordable housing at the fringe just leads to less happiness for the lower income earners who are forced to live in these locations, while higher income earners enjoy the amenities of inner city living. Greenfield development must be more naturally driven by employment, and not driven by developers.

How can infill development achieve an urban form that is consistent with the principles of Living Locally?

Infill development needs to be located in areas which are adequately supported by services and businesses to meet the needs of locals. This may mean pocket rezoning to allow more commercial activity to support local communities, or relaxing the rules to allow more mixed use development within the general neighbourhood zones.

By increasing density along with increasing opportunities for local commercial activities, the living locally principles will naturally align. Similar to Greenfield development, the over planning and over-restriction of quality and compatible mixed use development has resulted in stale residential suburbs, and a reversal of this will result in better infill results.

What do you see as the benefits and potential drawbacks of infill development?

Infill development can create more congestion on inner city roads and can sometimes lead to housing which is awkward in design. Creating incentives for larger scale infill development is one possible way to create better outcomes where possible. To relieve congestion, public transport systems need to be overhauled to allow a significant reduction on road congestion. As densities increase, public transport systems naturally become more efficient and cost effective which will lead to better use and operations of these systems.

Tree removal is also a big drawback, but is sometimes necessary for future development. A valuation system should be applied to discourage removal of large trees in good health, and encourage the planting of new trees. Small street trees are often obstructing high quality development from taking place, and valuation or contribution schemes could allow better development to occur, and allow for replanting more trees in better locations.

The positives of infill are numerous and result in an urban form which is more dense and often more efficient. It also means the need for Greenfield development is reduced which in turn ensures that the environmentally sensitive areas are protected, rather than developed. Overprotection of character and historic areas is also counter productive to making the Adelaide metro area more efficient. Protection of high quality heritage buildings should be undertaken, but less important structures may need to go for the sake of progress. This will only further highlight those heritage buildings and character areas that are left.

Where is the next generation of strategic infill sites?

The CBD should become the next strategic infill site as we transition to a decentralised system with employment located in satellite cities and across the metro area. This would create a reduction in the need for commercial buildings which can be repurposed or rebuilt for residential living. Making the CBD the central hub for residential, social and community events will lead to a more active space which extends beyond the traditional 9-5 working hours.

What are the most important factors for the Commission to consider in meeting future demand for employment land?

**Don't look so closely at the number of residential properties within close proximity of employment, but instead push for the opposite. Direct new employment to satellite cities and incentivise workers to relocate, which they will for high quality employment opportunities. This doesn't mean to push only low-pay low-education jobs to the satellite cities, but rather send all ranges of jobs to these areas to encourage a diverse migration to satellite cities. As we have seen through COVID, most would prefer to live out of the city if the right employment options were there.**

**Perhaps it is more important to look at the potential for residential expansion rather than the population already being located in these areas. Ensuring there is suitable land ready to go once more jobs come online will ensure that there is adequate land supply as the cities naturally grow. This may include provision of infrastructure etc. so that new divisions can be quickly put online once land is activated. This would also allow land release to be more natural, which should ensure housing prices are more stable in these areas to match demand.**

What are the most important factors for the commission to consider in meeting future demand for open space?

**Ensure open space is assigned for future divisions and prevent mass rezoning so that corridors of open space are protected. This may mean park spaces are zoned accordingly at the same time as new residential land comes on line. This would require a level of masterplanning by the commission or Councils prior to zoning activation and would force developers to work around this land which has been put aside. Development contributions from the division could then go into these set aside areas and designed and implemented by government. This would result in better open space outcomes as developers are often trying to achieve the bare minimum to protect profits.**

What are the most important factors for the Commission to consider in reviewing and achieving the Urban Green Cover Target?

**Introduce a tree valuation scheme to protect the largest of trees with significant fees for cutting down. This would also put a financial burden on developers cutting down trees which are not regulated but still established and mature. These fees would then go to urban greening projects in suitable areas. At the moment, the current system is missing the mark for trees under 2 metres in size, and could capitalise on removal of these trees to support urban greening or reduce the number of these trees being removed.**

**This would also reduce some of the obstructionist behaviour of Council tree policies when dealing with small trees as a means to reduce development of land. By exponentially increasing the fees for tree removal as the size and health of the tree increases there will be a natural push to work around larger trees. This would also work together with regulated and significant trees to ensure that the best specimens are protected regardless of how much the developer is willing to pay for removal.**