

## MINISTER FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

### PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DPAC) - INDUSTRIAL LAND REVIEW - GEPPS CROSS AND POORAKA PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT BY THE MINISTER

---

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The draft Industrial Land Review – Gepps Cross and Pooraka Plan Amendment Report (PAR), has been prepared in accordance with Sections 24(1)(b)(i) and 26 of the *Development Act 1993*.

The draft PAR was placed on public exhibition from 2 November 2006 until 9 January 2007. A Public Hearing was convened at the Pines Stadium, Main North Road, Gepps Cross, on 24 January 2007. The DPAC Sub-Committee that conducted the Public Hearing comprised Mario Barone (Presiding Member), Steven Hooper, Hannah Eilyard and Demetrius Poupoulas.

The DPAC considered the written submissions on the draft PAR and the matters raised at the Public Hearing, at its meeting held on 21 February 2007.

This Public Consultation Report is submitted to you in accordance with section 26(7) of the *Development Act 1993*, being the advice of the DPAC on matters raised as a result of public consultation and on any proposed alterations to the draft PAR.

#### **2.0 DISCUSSION**

##### **2.1 Policy Changes**

The draft PAR proposes to change the zoning of the former abattoirs/stockyards area at Gepps Cross. As set out in the draft PAR, approximately 75 hectares of land is proposed be rezoned to allow for a wider range of commercial and business activities than is currently allowed under the present Industrial Zoning.

More specifically, the draft PAR proposes:

1. amendments to the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone in the Port Adelaide Enfield Development Plan to allow a full range of bulky goods retail type development including Retail Showrooms, Service Trade Premises and certain forms of shops; and
2. amendments to the Industry Zone in the Salisbury Development Plan to allow Service Trade Premises in the Pooraka Industrial Area.

To enable this, changes to Background and Desired Character Statements, non-complying lists and categories of public notification are proposed. A minimum building floor area, removal of the 30 metre setback requirement for arterial roads to encourage flexible 'gateway' and streetscape solutions, deletion of zone figures in light of the proposed changes, and removing anomalous policy relating to state heritage places, are also proposed.

## **2.2 Submissions**

A total of eight (8) written public submissions and a seven (7) Government Agency submissions have been received in relation to the draft PAR. Five (5) verbal submissions were made at the Public Hearing.

Tables containing a summary of the public submissions (including verbal submission received at the Public Hearing) and Government Agency submissions, are attached for your information (Attachment A). These tables detail the DPAC's response to the issues raised and whether amendments to the draft PAR are considered appropriate.

### **2.2.1 Public Submissions**

Most of public submissions which have been received generally support the overall intent of the draft PAR.

The submissions from each of the Cities of Salisbury and Port Adelaide Enfield Councils have raised number of general issues and have suggested changes in some instances.

The City of Port Adelaide Enfield has expressed concern about the possible loss of Prime Industrial Land, particularly if a large portion of the site is developed for commercial/bulky goods retail purposes. The Council has requested that the value of land from an industrial land use perspective, be assessed against the Prime Industrial Land criteria contained in the draft Metropolitan Adelaide Industrial Land Strategy. Following a similar theme, the Council has expressed concern that the proposal to introduce a minimum building floor area of 3000m<sup>2</sup>, may dissuade activities other than large industrial or bulky goods retail development. The Council also requests that existing policy which seeks to direct lower impacting activities towards the Main North Road frontage, not be deleted by the draft PAR.

The City of Salisbury has, amongst other things, noted that the removal of setback requirements as proposed in the draft PAR, may result in inconsistencies between the Gepps Cross and Pooraka parts of the site and has suggested that amendments be made to the draft PAR to address this.

Submissions have also been received from property owners directly affected by the draft PAR. They support the general approach taken in the draft PAR allowing market forces to determine the extent of development for different activities. However, some concerns have been raised. Some submissions have requested that the proposed

policy which seeks to increase the minimum building floor be removed. In addition, some submissions have requested that the 250m<sup>2</sup> floor area limit for restaurants be either increased or removed.

A suggestion has also been made that the policies be amended to allow educational facilities of a technical nature to establish at the site.

A number of submissions have also made comment on issues relating to bulky goods retail. Concern has been expressed that certain types of bulky goods activities may not be able to be developed in combination in some instances under the proposed definition.

The only submission to oppose the draft PAR was put forward from Hassell (acting on behalf of Parafield Airport Limited the Parafield Airports). It is evident that the concerns expressed by Hassell relate to the potential impact on the bulky goods development at Parafield Airport. Hassell has expressed the view that the proposal is inconsistent with the Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide.

#### 2.2.2 Government Agency Submissions

Most of the responses submitted by State Government Agencies, had either no specific comment to make on the draft PAR or generally supported its overall intent.

The only notable matter raised by the Department for Trade and Economic Development (DTED) relates to the possible loss of Prime Industrial Land. In light of this concern, DTED has suggested that policy be included in the draft PAR to that guide the development of bulky goods retail development to the eastern side of the site.

#### 2.2.3 Public Hearing

The verbal comments made at the Public Hearing were largely in support of written submissions which were made during consultation period. While some additional points were made, these generally elaborated on the issues already raised in the written submissions.

### 2.3 Response to Consultation

I have set out below, a summary of the key issues raised in relation to the draft PAR.

#### 2.3.1 Draft Metropolitan Adelaide Industrial Land Strategy and Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide

Several submissions expressed concern that the draft PAR may result in the loss of Prime Industrial Land per the draft Metropolitan Adelaide Industrial Land Strategy. The City of Port Adelaide Enfield was concerned that this may result in establishing a of precedent for future industrial land and would undermine the effectiveness of the draft Strategy.

The DPAC notes that the Metropolitan Adelaide Industrial Land Strategy is a draft document which that has not been endorsed and therefore has no formal status in relation to the draft PAR.

The DPAC also notes that the Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide, seeks to preserve designated centres in accordance with the retail hierarchy, but that it also envisages 'out-of-centre' bulky goods development in certain circumstances. In relation to 'out-of-centre' bulky goods activities, there is no strategy or objective that limits the establishment of new areas on the basis of competition. The DPAC is therefore of the view that the draft PAR generally accords with the Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide.

### 2.3.2 Focus Bulky Goods Retail Activity to Main North Road

A number of submissions suggested that policy be included to guide commercial/bulky goods retail development so that it occurs on the eastern side of the site (ie Main North Road). The City of Port Adelaide Enfield's request to keep existing zone policy requiring low impacting activities to be located towards Main North Road, follows the same principle.

There are two benefits in agreeing to this request. Firstly, it would ensure that some of the more strategically important industrial land on the western side of the site, is preserved for industrial use. Secondly, by focusing commercial/bulky goods retail activity towards the Main North Road portion of the site, it is anticipated, that potential interface issues would be minimized through a more orderly alignment and clustering of similar or related activities.

### 2.3.3 Setback Requirement

The general setback in the Industry Zone in the Salisbury Development Plan is 8 to 10metres. This would apply once the 30m setback requirement for the area is deleted. To ensure consistency, the DPAC recommends that a 10metre setback be included in the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone. This will achieve a more desirable overall built form and urban design framework along Main North Road.

### 2.3.4 Minimum Building Floor Area

Several submissions expressed concern in relation to the proposed minimum floor areas for buildings. The DPAC notes that a 3000m<sup>2</sup> minimum is proposed for the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone and a 1000m<sup>2</sup> in the Pooraka Industrial Area part of the Industry Zone. Currently, a 600m<sup>2</sup> minimum applies to the area affected by the draft PAR. The City of Port Adelaide Enfield has expressed concern that the proposal to introduce a minimum floor area of 3000m<sup>2</sup> for buildings, may dissuade activities other than large industrial or bulky goods retail development.

The DPAC agrees with the issue raised regarding this matter. Many commercial and industrial activities do not require large buildings, and therefore the proposed minimum building floor area, may dissuade smaller scale development activity that would otherwise be anticipated in the area.

### 2.3.5 250m<sup>2</sup> Floor Limit for Restaurants

In relation to land owner requests that the maximum floor area limit for restaurants be increased or removed, when such land uses as contemplated in association with large scale bulky goods retail development, no rational or justification is provided as to why this should occur.

The 250m<sup>2</sup> maximum floor area limit for a restaurant, or group of restaurants, ensures that small scale facilities can be developed to support bulky goods activity. The DPAC notes that there is no aggregate limit proposed for restaurants, so a number of small scale food outlets could be developed, should the scale of the corresponding bulky goods development warrant this.

The proposed policy framework provides sufficient flexibility for an appropriate level of small scale restaurant development to complement bulky goods retail development to occur. The DPAC also notes that the proposed policy is generally consistent with other zones of a similar nature.

### 2.3.6 Allowing Educational Facilities

The DPAC notes that the draft PAR contains a proposed amendment to 'soften' the current policy in the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone, to allow educational facilities in their own right, as opposed to these being required to be developed in association with industrial development, as is currently the case.

However, the DPAC is of the view that allowing independent educational facilities to be developed in the zone introduces an activity that is inconsistent with the broad objectives of the zone – (ie to allow development of an industrial nature, and, as proposed through the draft PAR, to also allow commercial/bulky goods retail activities).

The current policy (ie allowing educational facilities in association with industrial development) provides sufficient scope for activity of this nature to an appropriate level consistent the objectives of the zone.

### 2.3.7 Definition of Bulky Goods Retail

The DPAC notes that the draft PAR proposes to introduce a definition via an amendment to Principle of Development Control 3 in the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone. This proposed definition appears to limit the ability of certain types of bulky goods retail development to locate within the same building. The DPAC also notes that Attachment B (which proposes to insert new policy into the same zone), also contains a definition and policy applying to bulky goods retail development and is supported by corresponding changes to the non-complying land uses/activities within the zone. This alternative definition and policy allows for all types of bulky goods retail development to occur in combination.

The DPAC agrees that policy in the zone should allow bulky goods retailing either alone or in any combination. To avoid confusion, the DPAC recommends that the draft PAR should contain only one definition for the zone. The proposed definition and policy in Attachment B is preferred as it allows for bulky goods retailing either alone or in any combination, in addition so that all the policies relating to bulky goods are grouped together in the zone.

## 3. RECOMMENDATION

The DPAC is of the opinion that the draft Industrial Land Review – Gepps Cross and Pooraka PAR, is in a form suitable for APPROVAL, pursuant to Section 26(8) of the *Development Act 1993*, subject to the following amendments being made:

- a. the inclusion of policy to guide the location of commercial/bulky goods retail activity towards Main North Road;
- b. a 10 metre building setback be included in the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone;
- c. deletion of the 3000m<sup>2</sup> minimum floor area for buildings proposed for the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone and the 1000m<sup>2</sup> minimum floor area for buildings proposed for the Pooraka Industrial Area part of Industry Zone;
- d. deletion of the proposed amendments to Principle of Development Control 5 (and the corresponding amendment to the non-complying principle) in the Industrial (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone allowing educational facilities in their own right, rather than in association with industrial development as is currently the case;
- e. deletion of the proposed amendment to Principle of Development Control 3, in the Industrial (Gepps Cross Gateway), Zone which introduces a separate bulky goods definition in addition to that contained in Attachment B; and

- f. the various additional minor and technical amendments recommended in the Agency and Public Summary of submission Tables being included in the draft PAR.



Mario Barone FPIA  
PRESIDING MEMBER  
**DEVELOPMENT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Date: 06 March 2007

Attachment: (a) Summary of Public Submissions & Summary of Government Agency Submissions