

CITY OF BURNSIDE

**MIXED USE (GLENSIDE) ZONE POLICY REVIEW
DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT**

**SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION AND RECOMMENDED
AMENDMENTS REPORT FOR THE MINISTER FOR
PLANNING**

**BY THE DEVELOPMENT POLICY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed amendments to development policy, processes and procedures contained in the Mixed Use (Glenside) Zone Policy Review Development Plan Amendment (DPA) have attracted a range of views, which are generally split between those expressing concerns about the negative implications of allowing additional development opportunities on the Glenside site, and in some instances seeking changes that would further support better development and design outcomes for the site.

There was a particular focus in the public submissions on proposed changes to building heights and consequential potential impacts on adjacent land, as well as the implications of additional infill growth on the local traffic network together with related car parking matters. Other issues that were raised related to the impacts of development on existing open space provision, heritage buildings and character, and overall infrastructure provision.

The above issues are discussed in the report and related Summary of Submissions table. In considering these issues, the Development Policy Advisory Committee (the Committee) has also had regard to how policy has been applied in similar mixed use multi storey infill zones already established in other parts of Adelaide, with a view to ensuring there is general consistency of related policy where relevant.

It should also be noted that the Committee's consideration of the DPA is in the context of the location's designation in the *30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide* (The Plan) as a potential regeneration area (non-corridor) where mixed use infill development of a 'medium rise' scale is envisaged. In this context, the Committee is of view that the policy in the DPA suitably balances the overriding strategic directions contained in the Plan tailored to local circumstances, subject to a number of amendments recommended in the report.

A key overarching issue that the Committee has identified in its report is the importance of future infrastructure co-ordination and delivery as the basis for creating a successful and liveable new community at Glenside.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides an account of the consultation process and the matters raised during the Public Consultation period, in respect to the draft Mixed Use (Glenside) Zone Development Plan Amendment, together with recommendations regarding the draft Development Plan Amendment.

2. CONSULTATION

Consultation process

Statutory consultation with State Government Agencies, Councils and the community, has been undertaken in accordance with the Development Plan Amendment process B and in accordance with Section 26 of the *Development Act 1993*.

The consultation period commenced on 23 June 2016 and concluded on 17 August 2016.

A list of the State Government Agencies, organisations and persons who were advised of the draft Development Plan Amendment, is contained in **Attachment A**.

Public notification

A Notice was published in The Advertiser on 23 June 2016.

Copies of statutory and other public notification documents are contained in **Attachment B**.

The draft Development Plan Amendment was placed on display at the offices of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (211 Victoria Square, Adelaide) and was made available at the Offices of the City of Burnside (401 Greenhill Road, Tasmore). The draft Development Plan Amendment was also available for viewing at www.sa.gov.au/planning/dpas.

Public Meeting

As required by legislation a public meeting was convened by the DPAC Sub-committee on 31 August 2016. A total of twenty (20) requests were received from the public to be heard, including a number of individuals, community group representatives and Council representatives in support of their submissions.

A total of twenty (20) individuals were heard on the night. This number includes thirteen (13) who made verbal submissions at the public meeting following an invitation by the Presiding Member.

The list of representatives and individuals who requested to make verbal submissions at the public meeting is contained in **Attachment C**.

3. SUBMISSIONS

Public submissions

At the conclusion of the consultation period, fourteen (14) written public submissions had been received. The main issues/comments which have been raised in written submissions are set out below:

- Safety and amenity impacts associated with increased traffic and access arrangements
- Safety and amenity impacts associated with insufficient parking arrangements
- Concerns regarding loss of open space

- Concerns regarding loss of trees
- Objections to proposed density and building heights
- Concerns regarding impacts on heritage buildings and character, including lack of design considerations.

A summary of each submission is contained in **Attachment D**.

Council submissions

One (1) council submission has been received from the City of Burnside. The main issues/comments which have been raised in the submission are summarised as follows:

- Objection to proposed heights
- Significant concerns regarding traffic impacts and access arrangements, including concerns with level of traffic investigations undertaken
- Concerns regarding open space provisions
- Concerns regarding impacts on heritage buildings/wall and character
- Numerous policy and technical amendments.

A summary of each submission is contained in **Attachment D**.

State Government Agency submissions

Nine (9) responses have been received from State Government Agencies. The main issues/comments which have been raised in the submissions are set out below:

- Potential impacts on State Heritage Places and recommended amendments to policy
- Site contamination and recommended policy amendments
- Stormwater management and suggested policy updates
- Potential impacts of traffic/parking, noise, privacy and future use of the Elms Building on the operations of the SA Film Commission and Adelaide Central School of Art.

A summary of each submission is contained in **Attachment E**.

Public's access to submissions about the Development Plan Amendment

Copies of all submissions were made available for public review from 18 August 2016 to 31 August 2016 at www.sa.gov.au/planning/dpas and at the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's office.

4. ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIONS AND ISSUES

Most of the submissions which have been received express some level of concern with the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the Glenside infill site for a wide range of reasons, as outlined above.

A number of issues commonly raised in submissions and at the public meeting, relate to matters that cannot be addressed through the amendment to the Development Plan, such as the sale of Government land, the Master Plan consultation process and the type and quality of health services offered and proposed in the broader redeveloped Glenside Health Campus. These are broader matters for consideration by Government, and in particular, Renewal SA and the Department of Health (as the key service provider and the organisation responsible for redevelopment of the Glenside Health Campus).

There were, however, a number of issues raised that are relevant to the draft DPA policy and for which amendments can be reasonably justified. Discussion on these matters is provided in the following section of the report.

5. DISCUSSION

• Objections to Building Height / Form

The draft DPA released for consultation, proposes to increase building heights on the Glenside Infill site from the current allowable six (6) storey maximum to eight (8) storeys. The DPA also includes a new 'strategic development site' policy which permits development 30% over the maximum building height to occur where specific site area and locational criteria are met.

The DPA investigations outlines the methodology by which proposed building heights have been established – i.e. in the context of the locations designation in the *30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide* (The Plan) as a potential regeneration area (non-corridor) with mixed use development of a 'medium rise' scale to be accommodated. While 'medium rise', as defined in The Plan, contemplates development up to 10 storeys, the proposed DPA policy for the site could potentially allow for development over 10 storeys where it meets 'strategic development site' policy.

Many of the objections set out in the various submissions, are therefore concerned with the increased scale of development and the perceived impacts on the local open space and heritage character of the area. Some of the submissions have suggested retaining the current maximum height of 6 storeys to be consistent with the adjacent Urban Corridor zoning introduced for Fullarton Road in 2013 or development to be capped at a maximum of 8 storeys with no 'over-height policy' to be applied. Other submissions have requested that there be additional design requirements placed on multi-storey buildings so that they deliver tangible environmental sustainability outcomes.

DPAC agrees that there should be some scope for compromise on the ultimate building height which not only addresses the concerns of local residents, but also takes into account the viability of any redevelopment of the property.

The decision to increase the maximum building height from 6 to 8 storeys is supported by DPAC as the committee agrees that the Glenside Infill site is a well-positioned large strategic property and provides opportunity for multi-storey development with limited impacts (such as overshadowing and close building massing) on adjacent lower density residential areas.

'Strategic Development Site' Policy

In terms of 'strategic development site' policy, DPAC is of the opinion that the proposed increase in building heights (over the maximum) that could be accommodated through this policy could result in development that is out of scale and context for the site if not applied properly. For this reason, the committee recommends that the policy be retained but be tightened so that any over-height development (if it occurs) would need to be subject to a far greater range of performance criteria relating to contextual design, public realm improvement and environmental sustainability measures.

Recommendation

Maximum building height

1. Agree with maximum building height being increased from 6 to 8 storeys given the strategic context of the Glenside infill site.

Strategic Development Sites policy

2. Agree with the introduction of the 'strategic development site' policy but request that the following amendments (in green) be made to the policy to tighten up how it is applied and to deliver improved built form outcomes:

*PDC 7 Within the Transit Living (Glenside) Policy Area, development **should not exceed the maximum building height** on strategic development sites (sites with a frontage to a primary road corridor and over 1500 square metres in area, which may include one or more allotment) ~~unless~~**should:***

(a) It meets one or more of the following:

- (i) The proposed building is **be**-constructed within the zone's Interface Building Height provision*
- (ii) **Not** result in an increase in building height of more than 30 percent above the maximum that would apply to non-strategic development sites in the policy area*
- (iii) **E**nsure the massing of taller building elements are distributed across the site to minimise impacts on the streetscape and residential/sensitive uses in adjacent zones.*

(b) And only if at least two of the following features are provided:

- (i) The development incorporates the retention and conservation of a character building or listed heritage place;*
- (ii) 50% of all on site car parking is provided underground;*
- (iii) Residential, office or any other actively occupied use is located on the side of the building directly facing the street or formal public space areas, with any above ground car parking located behind;*
- (iv) A range of dwelling types that includes at least 10% of 3+ bedroom apartments;*
- (v) More than 15 per cent of dwellings as affordable housing.*

(c) Plus at least one of the following sustainable design features is also provided:

- (i) A rooftop garden covering a majority of the available roof area;*
- (ii) A greenroof, or greenwalls / facades;*
- (iii) On site water collection and storage for non-potable purposes; or*
- (iv) External shading on all of the western facing façade of the building.*

• **Building Envelopes / Setbacks**

The City of Burnside in its submission, raised the issue of residential setbacks – in particular Council considers the zero setback prescribed for rear allotment boundaries and side boundaries to be unacceptable where it relates to sites which abut the adjacent Residential Zone.

Council has requested that the above setbacks should reflect those of the adjacent Residential Zone. DPAC notes that the requirements for this zone are far more onerous than those proposed for Transit Living Policy Area. Notwithstanding this, DPAC does see merit however in amending the required setbacks for those allotments that directly interface with the adjacent Residential Zone.

DPAC considers that the following setbacks prescribed in those areas already zoned "Urban Corridor" in the Development Plan should be applied to the Transit Living Policy Area:

- Rear allotment boundary setbacks to be in the order of 3 metres; and
- Side boundary setbacks to be either be 'no minimum' (for allotments of 20 metre frontage or less) or 1 metre (for allotments of more than 20 metre frontage).

Recommendation

Amend residential setback policy in the Transit Living Policy Area as follows:

1. Replace '0 metre minimum setback from rear allotment boundary' within the relevant table, with the following:

"0 metres except where the boundary abuts an existing residential zone in which case the setbacks at both ground floor levels and at upper levels should be in the order of 3 metres."

2. Replace 'minimum setback from side allotment boundary' within the relevant table, with the following:

"...except where the boundary abuts an existing residential zone in which case the setbacks should be 'no minimum' (for allotments of 20 metre frontage or less) or 1 metre (for allotment of more than 20 metre frontage)."

- **Impacts on local traffic network**

Concerns about local traffic network impacts were raised in many community submissions. The Committee notes that Glenside is an identified location for infill growth in The Plan, is supported by an adjacent established commercial precinct and well serviced public transport on Glen Osmond Road, and already contains several high rise buildings in the general vicinity. The DPA therefore seeks to align planning policy, where relevant, with this strategic direction. However, implications on the local traffic network will still need to be carefully managed. The Committee notes that existing policy in the Burnside (City) Development Plan can address issues associated with individual development proposals on a case by case basis in regard to access and function of the immediately adjacent road network, and in this context further consideration is not necessary in regard to Development Plan policy itself.

A study undertaken by Wallbridge and Gilbert and reviewed by the Transport Services Division of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has indicated that the existing arterial road network can be modified to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the road network as a result of the development of the area affected by the DPA. This includes proposed improvements to the Fullarton Road and Greenhill Road intersection as well as signalisation of the main Fullarton Road access to the site.

In addition, Council, as the controlling body of the local road network, will have a key role of contributing to local road and traffic management in the area in the future.

Notwithstanding this, DPAC is of the view that issues relating to traffic generation and potential traffic management treatments should be considered and assessed in greater detail at the development assessment stage when the detail regarding final allotment yield and land division layout will be better known.

Recommendation

No further recommendations are considered necessary to address this issue.

- **New off street parking rates**

The DPA proposes to introduce off street car parking rates to the Glenside infill site consistent with those rates which already apply to the broader Urban Corridor Zone in the Burnside (City) Development Plan.

The off street parking rates that currently apply in the affected zone are generally comparable to those typically found in low density residential zones.

The Committee is of the view that lower vehicle parking rates compared to standard residential zone are warranted in infill locations, where a wider choice of more compact housing is anticipated. The proposed vehicle car parking rates are consistent with other established infill zones across Adelaide that are close to public transport and services, align with the government's strategic directions for the area, and so are supported.

It is also important to note that on site car parking requirements are a minimum, so additional spaces can be provided by a developer / proponent if they wish, or if it is considered necessary to meet market expectations at a given point in time.

Recommendation

No further recommendations are considered necessary to address this issue.

- **Provision of open space / Loss of established trees**

Public Open Space

There are a number of submissions which raise general objection to the loss of open space that will result from the development of the Glenside infill site for housing. One of the key issues relates to the provision and location of future active recreational spaces on the site. The use of the expanded stormwater detention basin area for recreation is in particular mentioned as is the decision to redevelop the existing oval on the south-western corner of the site for housing.

In respect to the loss of open space, DPAC understands that Renewal SA and the preferred developer 'Cedar Woods' have agreed to provide a large amount of open space on the site in addition to that normally required by the *Development Act 1993*. Approximately 5 hectares of the 16 hectare site is therefore proposed to be retained for open space purposes. This large area of open space is reflected in Urban Corridor Zone Transit Living (Glenside) Policy Area Concept Plan Fig UrC(TL(G))/1 for the site.

In terms of the existing oval, DPAC notes that there was an informal arrangement in place up until 2007 which allowed limited use of the oval by local schools and sporting clubs. A decision to not reinstate the former oval has been made in the context of the sites suitability for housing as outlined in the Master Plan process. It is the Committee's view that there is a generous amount of public open space and recreational opportunities provided within the site and in close proximity (for example, the nearby Park Lands and Webb Oval / Glenunga community hub in Conyngham Street).

DPAC also acknowledges the concerns raised in submissions about the potential impact of the dual use of open space for both recreation and stormwater retention / flood mitigation purposes. The shared use of open space for such purposes is generally supported, however it is recommended that policy be strengthened to ensure that, for those larger areas of open space, stormwater water management infrastructure does not result in useable open space being diminished by the installation of flood mitigation infrastructure.

Private Open Space

A number of submissions from local residents oppose the proposal of the DPA to reduce private open space requirements (in some instances) for residential development in multi-storey buildings on the Glenside infill site.

Given the intent of the DPA is to create a more 'urban' rather than 'suburban' form of development in the precinct, DPAC is of the view that the proposed changes to private open space requirements are appropriate in the context of the following:

- The sites strategic inner city location;
- Proximity to the Park Lands; and
- Provision of large areas of communal open space on the site and within the general area.

Trees

A number of submissions have raised concerns that the development of the Glenside infill site will also result in the loss of trees.

DPAC notes that there is commentary in the draft Desired Character Statement contained within the draft DPA that seeks the retention of the majority of existing mature trees. It is also noted that many of the existing Significant and Regulated Trees will be protected by their inclusion in the open space area designated in the Concept Plan for the site.

DPAC also understands that the removal of Significant or Regulated Trees would be subject to an assessment based on the existing regulations and Council Wide policies.

Recommendation

DPAC recommends the following amendments to the Desired Character for the Transit Living Policy Area of the Urban Corridor Zone to:

- Promote stormwater management approaches that result in the reduction of inundation impacts in larger areas of open space, thereby optimising the proportion of useable active areas.

- **Site Contamination**

The investigations undertaken as part of the preparation for the draft DPA, have acknowledged that some parts of the site are known to be contaminated as a result of past hospital / institutional use on the site.

In this context, DPAC understands that a site contamination audit will be undertaken prior to construction commences on the site to confirm the suitability of the land for the proposed use. As required by the Environment Protection Act an environmental

auditor will also oversee this process. This is consistent with usual practice as part of the development assessment process.

DPAC also understands that a concept remediation scheme has already been outlined for the majority portion of the 16 hectare site, which will involve removing the contaminated soil and containing it within repositories so that residential allotments, public open space and roads will not be subject to ongoing management agreements.

Notwithstanding the above, in terms of the draft DPA, the EPA:

- Has reaffirmed its support for the use of planning policy to specifically address site contamination issues in areas that are known to be contaminated or potentially contaminated, to ensure adequate consideration at the development assessment stage; and
- Recommends that additional amendments be made to the Desired Character Statement with respect to site contamination to strengthen it to reflect the nature of contamination on the site and the consultant advice to date.

On the basis of the information provided, the DPAC agrees to the suggested amendments to the Desired Character Statement to address the issues raised by the EPA.

Recommendation

DPAC recommends the following amendments to the Desired Character for the Transit Living Policy Area of the Urban Corridor Zone:

“Due to previous activities within the area, management of contaminated land may be necessary to ensure that is (sic) suitable for the intended use development is expected to occur on a precautionary basis where a site contamination audit verifies that a site or sites are suitable for the intended use, particularly where it involves sensitive uses such as residential development”.

- **Heritage and Design**

Concerns regarding the impacts of development on heritage buildings and character of the Glenside site and surrounding areas have been raised in several submissions, including:

- Views to asylum building from Fullarton Road;
- Impacts on the state heritage listed stone wall; and
- Impacts of high rise buildings on adjacent heritage places and on the overall urban design of the whole site.

With regard to the preservation of views to the asylum building from Fullarton Road, DPAC confirms that the proposed Master Plan provides for a 50 metre curtilage from the main access point on Fullarton Road to protect the views / setting of this important State Heritage Place. DPAC considers this to be an appropriate response.

In terms of the stone wall, the City of Burnside has recommended minor amendments to Principle of Development Control 9 which DPAC considers are suitable and will assist in maintaining the future structural and design integrity of the wall.

Submissions from the SA Heritage Council and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Heritage both support the draft DPA but have suggested minor amendments to the Transit Living Policy Area Desired Character Statement to:

- Allow State Heritage Places in the precinct to be sensitively adapted for a broader range of uses than those currently prescribed in the DPA; and
- Address concerns identified about the division of the Glenside site into two zones (Urban Corridor and Mixed Use [Glenside] Zone and the negative impacts that this may have on the historic context of the whole site.

DPAC supports the suggested amendments to the Desired Character Statement in this respect.

DPAC also notes the general concerns identified about the impacts of high rise buildings on adjacent heritage places and on the overall urban design of the whole site, however wishes to emphasise that such matters will be appropriately addressed by:

- Existing Council-wide policy in the Development Plan which provides appropriate guidance on development adjacent to heritage places.
- A mandatory referral to the Minister for Environment, Conservation and Heritage (for regard) if the development directly affects a State Heritage Place, or 'materially affects the context within which the State Heritage Place is situated'.
- A Design Review Process and consideration by the Government Architect applying to any development on the site above 4 storeys in height.

Recommendation

DPAC recommends the following amendments to Principle of Development Control 9 for the Transit Living Policy Area of the Urban Corridor Zone:

“ ...

- (a) *preserve the structural integrity of the wall,*
- (b) *minimise disturbance to the wall,*
- (c) *enhance the heritage significance of the wall, such as through improved visual and pedestrian access.”*

DPAC recommends the following amendments and inclusions to the Desired Character for the Transit Living Policy Area of the Urban Corridor Zone:

‘State Heritage Places in the Policy Area will be sensitively adapted for reuse in a manner that conserves their historic and cultural significance.’

‘The division of land, movement networks and built form will take cues from the layout and scale of the State Heritage Places located in this policy area and in the adjoining Mixed Use Zone by:

- *The formalisation of the primary vehicle access from Fullarton Road;*
- *The alignment between the main Administration Building and the State Heritage Places to the north (within the Zone); and*
- *Establishing a layout of built form that complements the State Heritage Places.’*

- **Social and Physical Infrastructure Provision (Schools, Public Transport, Stormwater, Water and Wastewater)**

Concerns about the need to plan and coordinate future infrastructure and service provision to match the planned development of the site has been raised in many submissions, including that from the City of Burnside. More specifically, concerns were raised about the effect of the rezoning in relation to:

- Need for improved public transport;
- Infrastructure capacity for stormwater, water and wastewater; and
- Future 'social infrastructure', including schools, community facilities and health services.

DPAC acknowledges the importance and need for infrastructure and service provision to support development of the Glenside site. The Committee also notes that the draft DPA investigations identify that infrastructure upgrades may be necessary over time, depending on the extent and timing of new development. This is also reflected in agency comments received from infrastructure providers, which also add that developers may be required to contribute towards the augmentation of upstream infrastructure upgrades as well as for connection for their development.

In terms of education facilities, the Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) consistently reviews enrolment pressures at local schools and will consider amending local school zoning or expanding enrolments as required. Public transport services are also subject to continuous review and are updated every year based on patronage levels.

With regard to stormwater management, the DPA investigations have identified the expansion of the existing 18.5 ML stormwater detention basis to 37 ML capacity to accommodate additional inflows to the site.

It is also noted that the existing Burnside (City) Development Plan contains adequate policies to prevent development occurring if infrastructure capacity is not available. These matters will therefore be assessed in greater detail at the development assessment stage.

Recommendation

The level of investigations provided in the DPA is considered adequate. Most of the physical infrastructure requirements of the development and adequacy of proposed solutions will be appropriately assessed at the development assessment stage.

Social infrastructure provision (school capacity and public transport improvements) will be the subject of ongoing review by the relevant State Departments as the site develops.

- **Issues identified by on-site stakeholders – Arts SA (on behalf of SA Film Corporation Studios and Adelaide Central School of Art) and Adelaide Hebrew Congregation**

Most of the issues identified by the above stakeholders (eg. relating to traffic, parking and development interfaces) relate to management issues which are outside the scope of the DPA but will be appropriately addressed during the development assessment stage.

DPAC is also aware that many of the issues raised here are proposed to be discussed and addressed in an upcoming stakeholder meeting involving Renewal SA, Cedar Woods, SA Film Corporation and the Adelaide Central School of Art.

Recommendation

The level of investigations provided in the DPA is considered adequate. Most of the issues raised here relate to matters that will be addressed at the development assessment stage and through ongoing discussion between the relevant stakeholders (as outlined).

• **General commentary on the importance of future infrastructure co-ordination**

The DPAC recognises that, although the subject of ongoing debate in the community, there are inherent limitations on Development Plan policy performing a significant role in the delivery of infrastructure.

That being said (and recognising the limitations of this report), DPAC still wishes to emphasise the importance of future infrastructure co-ordination and delivery as the basis for creating a successful and liveable new community at Glenside.

In this context, the Committee would like to see any new infrastructure provided in a timely manner that not only meets the needs of the local community but does not place any additional burdens on the existing infrastructure.

In particular, improving the existing capacity of the local school / public transport systems and local road network are areas that the Committee views as being critical to the success of the new development and will require careful co-ordination between all agencies involved as well as input from the local Council.

Recommendation

DPAC encourages ongoing dialogue between relevant agencies (eg. DPTI, DECD and Renewal SA) and the City of Burnside to address some of those infrastructure capacity issues which have been highlighted in submissions on the DPA.

6. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS FOLLOWING CONSULTATION

Based on a review of all the representations made in relation to the DPA, the Committee has resolved to recommend the following:

- (a) Agree with the maximum building height being increased from 6 to 8 storeys given the strategic context of the Glenside infill site.
- (b) Agree with the introduction of the 'strategic development site' policy but request that amendments be made to the policy to tighten up how it is applied and to deliver improved built form outcomes.
- (c) Amend residential setback policy from rear and side allotment boundary in the Transit Living Policy Area to be consistent with the rest of the Urban Corridor Zone.
- (d) Amend the Desired Character Statement for the Transit Living Policy to strengthen it in relation to site contamination and heritage matters.

- (e) Amend Principle of Development Control 9 in the Transit Living Policy Area to strengthen it in relation to maintaining the future structural and design integrity of the heritage listed stone wall.
- (f) Make other minor alterations to the DPA in accordance with those identified in the Summary of Submissions tables.
- (g) Ongoing dialogue is encouraged between relevant agencies and the local Council to address those infrastructure capacity issues which have been identified during consultation of the DPA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bryan Moulds', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Bryan Moulds
PRESIDING MEMBER
DEVELOPMENT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: 28 October 2016

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A:

List of agencies and persons who were advised of the Development Plan Amendment

Attachment B:

Copies of statutory and other public notification documents

Attachment C:

List of speakers at the Public Meeting

Attachment D:

Summary of public and council submissions

Attachment E:

Summary of state government agency submissions