

# ALEXANDRINA COUNCIL

## NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given to the Members that a meeting of the Development Assessment Panel 2008 will be held in the Community Chambers "wal Yuntu Warrin" on 22 April 2008 commencing at 12:30 pm

Your attendance is requested.

12:30 p.m.            Development Assessment Panel commencement

3:30 p.m.            Conclusion of meeting.

JOHN COOMBE  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

ALEXANDRINA COUNCIL

AGENDA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANEL MEETING  
TO BE HELD ON 22 APRIL 2008 AT 12:30 PM  
IN COMMUNITY CHAMBERS "WAL YUNTU WARRIN"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM NO.</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
ITEM 1	<u>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES</u> .....	1
ITEM 2.	<u>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS</u> .....	1
ITEM 3.	<u>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - NON COMPLYING</u> .....	2
3.1	455/D080/07 - David Grubb.....	2
ITEM 4.	<u>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - CATEGORY 3</u> .....	7
4.1	455/1293/07 - Bill Mckay .....	7
4.2	455/1517/07 - Norich Development Pty Ltd.....	7
4.3	455/1518/07 - Norich Development Pty Ltd.....	7
4.4	455/744/06 - Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc .....	7
ITEM 5.	<u>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - LAND DIVISION/COMMUNITY TITLE</u> .....	7
ITEM 6.	<u>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - BUILDING</u> .....	7
ITEM 7.	<u>MATTERS REFERRED FOR FOLLOW - UP</u> .....	7
ITEM 8.	<u>GENERAL ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION</u> .....	7

**Development Assessment Panel  
Report and Agenda  
on 22 APRIL 2008 commencing at 12:30 pm  
in the Community Chambers "Wal Yuntu Warrin"**

**PRESENT**

**APOLOGIES**

M Walker

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**ITEM 1      CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the Alexandrina Council Development Assessment Panel held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2008.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Alexandrina Council Development Assessment Panel held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2008 as circulated to members be received as a true and accurate record.

**ITEM 2.      DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

ITEM 3. **DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - NON COMPLYING**

3.1 455/D080/07 - David Grubb

**SUMMARY TABLE**

Date of Application	18 <sup>th</sup> September 2007
Subject Land	Lot 34 Point Sturt Road, Point Sturt
Assessment No.	A 10771
Relevant Authority	Alexandrina Council
Planning Zone	Waterfront Zone
Nature of Development	Land Division creating 2 extra allotments (Non-complying)
Type of Development	Non-complying
Public Notice	N/A
Referrals	N/A
Representations Received	N/A
Representations to be heard	N/A
Date last inspected	October 2007
Recommendation	Refusal
Originating Officer	Andrew Sladden

**ESD IMPACT/BENEFIT**

- Environmental Potential increased pollution risk for the lake.
- Social N/A
- Economic Future financial benefit to owners through creation of two new titles.

**BACKGROUND**

This application was lodged with the Development Assessment Commission in early September 2007 and sent to Council for assessment on 17 September 2007. The application was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant in October 2007 and reinstated by the applicant and the Development Assessment Commission in March 2008.

.../cont.

3.1 455/D080/07 – David Grubb (Continued)

**THE PROPOSAL**

**Nature of Development**

The proposal involves the division of an existing 32.2ha allotment into three lots. The subject site is located within the Waterfront Zone pursuant to Map Alex/4 from the Alexandrina Development Plan consolidated 23 November 2006. Principle of Development Control 12 for the Waterfront Zone states:

- 12 All kinds of development are non-complying in the Waterfront Zone, except the following:

*Land Division where no additional allotments are created, either partly or wholly, within the Mount Lofty Ranges Primary Production Area, and where the development of the proposed allotments does not result in a greater risk of pollution of surface or underground waters than would the development of the existing allotments, and provided a suitable site for a detached dwelling is available which complies with the following criteria:*

- (a) is not located in areas subject to inundation by a 100 year return period flood event or sited on landfill which would interfere with the flow of such flood waters;*
- (b) is connected to an approved sewerage or common effluent disposal scheme or has an on-site wastewater treatment and disposal method which complies with the Standard for the Installation and Operation of Septic Tank Systems in South Australia (including supplements A and B) as prepared by the South Australian Health Commission;*
- (c) not have any part of a septic tank effluent drainage field or any other wastewater disposal area (eg irrigation area) located within 50 metres of a watercourse identified on a current series 1:50 000 Government Standard topographic map;*
- (d) not have a wastewater disposal area located on any land with a slope greater than 20 percent (one in five), or depth to bedrock or seasonal or permanent water table less than 1.2 metres;*
- (e) not have a septic tank or any other wastewater treatment facility located on land likely to be inundated by a ten year return period flood event;*
- (f) is sited at least 25 metres from any watercourse identified on a current series 1:50 000 Government Standard topographic map.*

As the proposal involves the creation of two additional allotments the proposed development is considered to be a non-complying form of development pursuant to the above.

.../cont.

## 3.1 455/D080/07 – David Grubb (Continued)

### **Detailed Description**

The existing allotment comprises approximately 32.2ha and has frontage to Lake Alexandrina and Point Sturt Road. There are a couple of existing sheds located on the site and the allotment is largely devoid of any significant vegetation.

It is proposed to divide the allotment into three allotments comprising:

- Proposed lot 1: 13.9ha
- Proposed lot 2: 9.18ha
- Proposed lot 3: 9.18ha

Proposed lot 1 will retain the frontage to the lake and has the existing sheds located upon it.

REFER ATTACHMENT 3.1(a) (page 1)

### **SITE & LOCALITY**

The subject site is largely devoid of vegetation and appears to have been previously used for grazing purposes. There are a couple of existing sheds located on the site with an access road from Point Sturt Road.

The locality comprises of large rural land holding most with frontage to the lake, being used predominantly for grazing purposes. Few of these allotments have dwellings.

### **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Should the Development Assessment Panel resolve to proceed with the assessment of the Development Application, Category 3 Public notification will be required to be undertaken.

### **REFERRALS**

Planning SA have referred the Application to the following Departments for comment:

- Planning SA – “unlikely to support a request for concurrence should Council decide to approve the application”.
- SA Water – No requirements.
- PIRSA – No position, however makes the point that the “proposed division is unlikely to enhance the agricultural production from the land”.

.../cont.

3.1 455/D080/07 – David Grubb (Continued)

- Native Vegetation Council – No comment.
- DWLBC – supports the approval subject to one note.
- DoH – Environmental Health – no comment.

REFER ATTACHMENT 3.1(b) (page 15)

**CONSULTATION**

Should the Panel resolve to proceed with the assessment of the application, it will be internally referred to Council's Engineering and Environmental Health units for comment.

**COMMENTS**

The provisions for the Waterfront Zone within the Alexandrina Development Plan are not very supportive of land divisions proposing to create additional allotments as is evidenced by the fact that such a development is listed as a non-complying form of development. The general reason for this is that these land divisions generally can affect the agricultural productivity of the land and pollution potential for the environment through increased development.

It is noted however, that the proposal does not offend Principle of Development Control 4 which states:

- 4 New allotments should not be created within land inundated by the 1956 flood, except where required to facilitate development in accordance with the objectives of the zone where the zone adjoins Milang or Clayton.

Technically, the proposal is at variance as part of the subject land is located within the 1956 flood level, however, the two allotments proposed to be created as located outside of this flood level. Given the fact that a development of this nature may effect the agricultural viability of the land and increase the development potential, as well as the precedent such a division may create, the proposal warrants refusal.

Also, should Council resolve to proceed with the assessment of the application and resolve to grant consent, being a non-complying form of development, Development Assessment Commission (DAC) concurrence is required to be obtained. Planning SA have stated in their referral response that the Commission is unlikely to support a request for concurrence.

.../cont.

3.1 455/D080/07 – David Grubb (Continued)

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Development Assessment Panel resolve to refuse Development Application 455/D080/07, for a Non-complying Land Division to create two additional allotments at Lot 34 Point Sturt Road, Point Sturt.



ITEM 4. **DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - CATEGORY 3**

4.1 455/1293/07 - Bill McKay

**SUMMARY TABLE**

Date of Application	24 <sup>th</sup> October 2007
Subject Land	Lot 12 High Street, Lot 11 & 93 Murray Street, Strathalbyn
Assessment No.	A 10413
Relevant Authority	Alexandrina Council
Planning Zone	District Centre Zone – High Street Historic (Conservation) Policy Area 3 & Residential (Strathalbyn) Zone – Central Residential Historic (Conservation) Policy Area 21
Nature of Development	Commercial – addition hotel & bottle shop tourist accommodation (motel) with associated car parking and swimming pool
Type of Development	Consent / Merit
Public Notice	Category 3
Referrals	Heritage (informal)
Representations Received	N/A
Representations to be heard	N/A
Date last inspected	February 2008
Recommendation	Resolve to grant Provisional Development Plan Consent
Originating Officer	Andrew Sladden

**BACKGROUND**

This application was previously presented to the Development Assessment Panel at its meeting of March 2008. At the meeting the following recommendation was made:

*“...that the Development Assessment Panel resolve to defer Development Application 455/1293/07 for a hotel addition and renovation including bottle shop and tourist accommodation (motel) with associated car parking and swimming pool to allow the applicant time to provide a car parking study including details of the existing parking layout and addressing the issues of acoustic and visual privacy along the southern boundary.”*

.../cont.

## 4.1 455/1293/07 – Bill McKay (Continued)

The Applicant has provided a car parking assessment and addressed the issues acoustic and visual privacy along the southern side boundary as requested.

It is also noted that Council resolved to allow the encroachment of the bottle shop verandah over the footpath on Grey Street at its meeting of 17 March 2008.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.1 (page 21)

### THE PROPOSAL

#### **Nature of Development**

The proposed development involves the renovation of the existing Robin Hood Hotel and the erection of a bottle shop and motel at the rear of the subject site. As the site is located within both the District Centre Zone – High Street Historic (Conservation) Policy Area 3 and the Residential (Strathalbyn) Zone – Central Residential (Historic) Conservation Policy Area 21 pursuant to Maps Alex/26 and Alex/38 from the Alexandrina Development Plan, the proposed development is considered to be a Consent/Merit form of development within both zones as neither land uses are specifically listed as being non-complying forms of development.

#### **Detailed Description**

It is proposed to undertake internal and external renovations to the existing hotel. Also, as part of the external renovations, it is proposed to construct (formalise) beer garden and outdoor dining area, convert a storage room to a function bar room and construct a drive in bottle shop at the rear of the existing hotel.

Also forming part of the proposed development is the demolition of a number of existing buildings at the rear of the site including a dwelling located on the corner of Murray and Grey Streets, and the erection of a motel complex comprising a stand alone Managers Unit and seven single storey buildings proposed to be erected in a “U” shape around the perimeter of the site consisting of nine one bedroom hotel units, one two bedroom hotel unit, four 2 bedroom apartments and eight 1 bedroom motel units. The buildings containing the hotel/motel units are single storey with uniform roof pitches and of appearance which will blend with the hotel and proposed bottle shop in terms of bulk and scale, materials and colours and setbacks from the streets, especially Grey Street in which all of the existing and proposed buildings are located on the boundary in keeping with the existing hotel and historic and reproduction cottages located opposite the site.

.../cont.

## 4.1 455/1293/07 – Bill McKay (Continued)

Car parking for 24 cars are proposed to be located internally with a single 6.2m wide access point from Grey Street. The swimming pool is located in the centre of the proposed motel site.

### COMMENTS

The applicant has provided a detailed car parking study prepared by a suitably qualified traffic engineer which concludes:

*“Based on a comparison between the existing hotel uses and the proposed hotel uses, I estimate that the redevelopment would result in a net increase of 25 parking spaces. This calculation is based on commonly adopted parking rates for the various hotel uses and occupancy levels that are generally accepted by traffic engineers when assessing such developments.*

*There would be an opportunity to accommodate this increase in parking demand in an off-street car park arrangement, with the proposal to formally use the subject land opposite the hotel. If the subject car park site is maximised to its full parking potential (see Option 1), by removal of the public toilet and some trees, up to 29 parking spaces could be achieved on-site, which would be well in excess of the forecast increase in parking demand of the redeveloped hotel.*

*If the subject car park site were to retain existing trees and the toilet facility, formalising the car park arrangement would result in 16 spaces being possible (see Option 2). In this scenario, an overflow of parking would occur. My observations of the on-street parking show that there would be opportunity to park on-street in Grey Street, High Street and Sunter Street, clear of the frontages of residential zones. As part of the redevelopment proposal, a number of crossovers would also be rationalised which could increase the on-street parking, adjacent to the hotel and subject car park, by 2 or 3 spaces.”*

As stated in the report prepared by the Applicant's Planning consultant, the owner will be purchasing the vacant block of land opposite the hotel which is currently used as an informal car park. This allotment is currently leased to Council until 2015 (for use as public toilets and informal car parking area) with an option for a further 21 years which Council is likely to take up. One of the stipulations of the lease is that “The lessee and its employees and invitees shall have free and unrestricted access over the whole of the land...”. Given the location of service infrastructure on the land, the need to access this and impact on the amenity of the locality and stormwater system, it is not considered appropriate to seal this area. Also, as Council leases this allotment, it is not considered practical to formalise this car parking area beyond delineating the parking spaces.

.../cont.

4.1 455/1293/07 – Bill McKay (Continued)

Should the DAP still have concerns with car parking, a condition of approval can be added to the consent requiring delineation of these car parking spaces as per Option 2 of the Traffic Engineers Report with out sealing this area.

In reference to the boundary treatment along the southern side boundary, the applicants have amended the plans to provide for the following:

- Increasing the fence height from 1.2m to 1.8m.
- Increasing the setback of the units by .8m to 3.2m.
- Removing the proposed fencing between the motel units so that space between these units become common land discouraging noisy activities.

**CONCLUSION**

It is considered that the car parking study and amendments and fencing treatment along the southern side boundary adequately address the DAP's concerns.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Development Assessment Panel grant Provisional Development Plan Consent to Development Application 455/1293/07 for a hotel addition and renovation including bottle shop and tourist accommodation (motel) with associated carparking and swimming pool subject to the following conditions and notes:

**Conditions**

1. The development herein approved to be carried out in accordance with plans and details accompanying this application (amended plans received by Council on 4 April 2008)
2. No signs or advertising are to be erected or displayed on or about the buildings or the site without the prior consent of Council.
3. All of the carparks, driveways, and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall be constructed and bituminised, brick paved or concreted in accordance with sound engineering practice prior to the occupation of the development herein approved.
4. The applicant or other approved persons for the time being making use of the subject land now approved shall at all times maintain in good and substantial condition in all respects the subject land (including carparking areas, driveways and footpaths) all buildings and structures and all landscaped and open space areas.

.../cont.

4.1 455/1293/07 – Bill McKay (Continued)

5. Floodlighting shall be restricted to that necessary for security purposes only and shall be directed and shielded in such a manner as to cause no light overspill to adjacent residential development.
6. The Bottle Shop driveway shall be pavement-marked as 1-way ; IN at the eastern end and OUT at the western end. A 'NO ENTRY' sign in accordance with AS 1742.1 sign R2-4A, shall be installed adjacent to the Bottle Shop at the western-most driveway. All redundant gutter crossings, driveway aprons and kerb across the footpath shall be removed and replaced with kerb and gutter and footpath as appropriate.
7. Every effort shall be made to capture, store and re-use stormwater runoff from the site. Stormwater from the roofs and surrounding paving for 4-A2 and 2-U1 in Murray Street may be discharged to the street gutter in Murray Street via 6 separate piped outlets. Stormwater from the Beer Garden, Outdoor Dining, landscaping, Bottle Shop and unit MA may be discharged to the street gutter in Grey Street via piped outlets from the structures and overland on the Bottle Shop driveway. Stormwater runoff to the street from the balance of the site (units L, 7-U1, 1-U2, 8-M1, pool, carpark, driveway and landscaping) shall be limited to a maximum discharge rate of 15 L/s in a 1 in 20-year storm. Provision shall be made for an overland flow path(s) to discharge site stormwater from the 1 in 100-year storm to surrounding street(s) without risk of flooding to the habitable structures on the site.
8. Prior to the granting of Development Approval, the Applicant must obtain Waste Control Approval for connection of the Development to Council's Septic Tank Effluent Disposal System (STEDS). The waste control design is to include a trade waste application addressing the capacity of the existing grease arrestor.
9. Materials, finishes and details of restoration of the hotel, function bar and outdoor dining/waste collection buildings should be referred to the heritage advice prior to granting of final Development Approval. It is recommended that the applicant consult with the Heritage Adviser during the design development stage.
10. The stone boundary walls along or adjacent to the southern and western site boundaries shall be protected and retained.
11. Details of the placement and concealment of all mechanical plant including compressors and water heaters shall be included in the Building Application Drawings

.../cont.

- 4.1 455/1293/07 – Bill McKay (Continued)
12. An Arborists Report shall be provided in relation to the two trees to be retained, and recommended root protection zones and methods shall be incorporated into the Building Application Drawings
  13. Pool heating panels, if roof mounted shall be concealed from view from the surrounding streets.
  14. Fencing shall be established prior to occupation
  15. Proposed allotments to be connected to the Common Effluent Drainage Scheme
  16. Payment of the Common Effluent Drainage Scheme Levy shall be made to Alexandrina Council for (12 ) extra connection(s) at the fee set in Council's Schedule of Fees and Charges applicable at the time that payment is made and shall be paid prior to connection to the scheme. The fee for 2006/2007 is \$4125 per additional connection (\$49500).
  17. A 3m wide easement shall be provided to Council to allow access to and protection of the existing CED line within the subject land.
  18. Effluent drainage must be via gravity only, no pumping systems will be approved.
  19. All plumbing work to be inspected prior to the back filling of trenches. Please contact Councils Technical Officer on 8555 7000 to book an inspection giving at least one working days notice.
  20. As constructed drawings showing drain lengths,etc, shall be provided to Council prior to occupation.
  21. Installation of effluent drains and allotment connections to be in accordance with Community Wastewater Management Systems Standards document.
  22. All backwash water from the swimming pool and spa is to be retained on site.
  23. The existing carparking area at 16 High Street (CT ref: Vol 5790 Folio 86) shall be delineated (however, not sealed) in accordance with Option1 (16 parking spaces) referenced in the parking assessment report prepared by Frank Siow & Associates and received by Council on 4 April 2008.

.../cont.

4.1 455/1293/07 – Bill McKay (Continued)

Notes:

1. Consultation with Adjoining Owners

In addition to notification and other requirements under the Development Act and Fences Act, it is recommended that the applicant/owner consult with adjoining owners and occupiers at the earliest possible opportunity after Development Approval, advising them of proposed development work so as to identify and discuss any issues needed resolution such as boundary fencing, retaining walls, trees/roots, drainage changes, temporary access, waste discharges, positioning of temporary toilets etc. The Applicant should consult with all adjoining property owners in relation to fencing, with a view to increasing the height of boundary fences in order to minimise any incidental overlooking between the properties.

2. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the 3 m wide parcel of land, owned by Alexandrina Council, abutting the southern boundary. An approach may be made to Council with a view to consolidating this parcel with the subject land, subject to conditions.

3. Allotment boundaries will not be certified by Council staff. The onus of ensuring that the building is sited in the approved position on the current allotment is the responsibility of the owner. This may necessitate a survey being carried out by a licensed land surveyor.

4.2 455/1517/07 - Norich Development Pty Ltd

**SUMMARY TABLE**

Date of Application	11 <sup>th</sup> December 2007
Subject Land	Lot 1 & Lot 2 Alexandrina Drive, Clayton
Assessment No.	A 20860
Relevant Authority	Alexandrina Council
Planning Zone	Country Township
Nature of Development	Retail outlet comprising 5 shops, supermarket and associated car parking
Type of Development	Consent / Merit
Public Notice	Category 3
Referrals	N/A
Representations Received	11
Representations to be heard	5 Approx.
Date last inspected	March 2008
Recommendation	Refusal
Originating Officer	Andrew Sladden

**ESD IMPACT/BENEFIT**

- Environmental Potential impact upon locality through increased stormwater, etc.
- Social Potential benefit to local community through provision of retail outlets.
- Economic Potential benefit to local economy through increase in commercial development and employment opportunities.

**BACKGROUND**

The Applicant originally lodged a Development Application in early 2007 for a commercial development comprising a tavern with a second storey caretaker's residence, supermarket and 5 shops with associated car parking and landscaping on an adjoining allotment (lot 500 Alexandrina Drive). However, this was withdrawn by the applicant and replaced with this current Development Application.

.../cont.



4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

The applicant has since lodged two separate applications as follows:

455/1517/07 – Retail outlet comprising 5 Shops, supermarket and associated Car parking (the subject application) at lots 1 and 2 Alexandrina Drive Clayton.

455/1518/07 – Tavern and Residential Flat Buildings comprising 24 Units including a Swimming Pool at lot 500, Alexandrina Drive Clayton.

**THE PROPOSAL**

**Nature of Development**

The development is proposed to be constructed over two existing allotments. The development involves the creation of a retail outlet comprising 5 shops, a supermarket and associated car parking.

The subject land is located within the Country Township (Clayton) Zone pursuant to Map Alex/35 from the Alexandrina Development Plan. A development of this nature is not listed as non-complying pursuant to Principle of Development Control 12 for the Zone. Therefore, the proposed development has been classified as a Consent/Merit form of Development.

**Detailed Description**

The proposal involves the erection of a single storey building in the centre of both allotments setback 22m from the Alexandrina Drive boundary. The building measures 47m x 12m (564m<sup>2</sup>) and contains five shops with a retail floor area of 63m<sup>2</sup> each, and a supermarket with a retail floor area of 176m<sup>2</sup>. The total retail floor area of the complex is 491m<sup>2</sup>.

In front of the building is a car parking area for a total of 37 vehicles with an access point on the eastern side of the site and a service road around the building with a second access point from the side road in the north western corner of the site. The areas between the car park and the Alexandrina Drive boundary and side boundaries have been designated for landscaping purposes.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.2(a) (page 53)

**SITE & LOCALITY**

The proposed development is located on two allotments (created pursuant to land division 455/9004/05) located on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive. The allotments are adjoining and lot 1 on the corner of Alexandrina Drive and an internal access road has a total area of 1267m<sup>2</sup> and lot 2 has a total area of 1240m<sup>2</sup>.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

The allotments are reasonably level and devoid of significant natural vegetation. The locality consists predominantly of vacant residential allotments with a scattered number of single storey detached dwellings located on the southern side of Alexandrina Drive. The nearest building on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive is located to the west approximately 100m from the subject site. It is also noted that the Clayton CFS building and Clayton Community Hall are located on the southern side of Alexandrina Drive, approximately 120m and 140m respectively from the subject site.

**PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

The Development Application was the subject of Category 3 Public Notification and was advertised between 13 February 2008 and 27 February 2008. Eleven representations were received within this timeframe.

All of the representors were opposed to the proposed development with objection and concerns highlighted as being:

- No demonstrated need.
- Noise and increased traffic.
- Lighting of car park.
- Energy efficiency and water retention.
- Viability and potential vandalism of vacant shops.
- Loss of community feel.
- Increased risk of vandalism and burglaries.
- Perceived variance with the Development Plan.
- Competition with existing commercial development in Clayton and adjoining townships.

It is also noted that two late representations were received. However, as these were received after the closing of the notification period and after representations were sent to the applicant for comment as required by Section 38 of the Development Act 1993, they cannot be included.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.2(b) (page 66)

The applicant has also submitted a response to the representation.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.2(c) (page 82)

The issues raised and responded to include viability, lighting, noise and operating hours.

.../cont.

## 4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

### REFERRALS

There are no mandatory referrals for such an application.

### CONSULTATION

Consultation has been undertaken with Council's Environmental Health Department (EHO Karen Rokicinski) with regard to the effluent disposal system. The advice of the EHO is that a Waste Control System Application should be lodged prior to approval. At the time of writing this report the applicant is yet to lodge a WCS application despite being asked to do so. Therefore it is proposed to treat this as a reserved matter should the Panel resolve to approve the proposed development.

Consultation has been undertaken with Council's Engineering and Infrastructure Services Department (Infrastructure Manager Peter Wood). The advice of the Engineering and Infrastructure Department is as follows:

*" Provide details on :*

- *Endwall and erosion protection treatment at the DN 300 and additional pipe discharging to the basins*
- *Gross Pollutant Traps*
- *Outfall points and treatment for ag. drains behind retaining walls*

*Amend stormwater drainage layout to :*

- *Connect east car park of Units Site to system draining to existing basin (not discharge to road)*
- *Interconnect the 2 east-west drains in the Shops Site, serving the service road and roof runoff. Delete the 2 discharge points from the shops site to the 'dirt track'.*
- *Provide details for the drains to the road from the front car park of the shops (these are permitted to remain)*
- *Connect the drain from the Shops Site to the drainage system on the Tavern Site.*
- *Delete the 2 discharge points from the Tavern Site to Alexandrina Drive.*
- *Interconnect the 2 north-south drains on the Tavern Site and discharge to a new basin constructed on the Drainage Reserve*
- *Install a suitably-sized GPT in the Tavern Site drain, located in the south-western corner of the Tavern Site.*
- *Make provision to intercept gutter flows in Alexandrina Drive and divert them to the new basin*

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- *Construct the new basin to a size capable of accepting and temporarily storing stormwater runoff from the 3 sites ('apartments', 'tavern', 'shops') and the new road ('dirt track') and the frontage portion of Alexandrina Drive for storms up to and including the Average Recurrence Interval 20-year storm.*

*Provide details on the construction of the 'dirt road' and its connection to Alexandrina Drive :*

- *Extent - to the northern boundary of the Units Site*
- *Carriageway width - 7m from the northern boundary of the Units Site to the northern boundary of the Shops Site, hence tapering over 20m to 8m wide to the intersection at Alexandrina Drive.*
- *Semi-mountable kerb and gutter on each carriageway edge*
- *7m return radii to Alexandrina Drive kerblines*
- *Double side entry pits on each kerblines over the drain that connects the Shops Site to the Tavern Site*
- *Spoon drain across the intersection of the 'dirt road' and Alexandrina Drive*
- *Semi-mountable kerb and gutter in Alexandrina Drive for the frontages of the Shops Site and the Tavern Site*
- *Kerblines alignment in Alexandrina Drive is 1 m north of the edge of the existing sealed surface*
- *Pavement details for the new carriageway in the 'dirt road' and the widening strip in Alexandrina Drive*
- *Street lighting to P5 standard. Note 1 : It would not be the intention to erect the lights nor energise them until the retirement village was operational or alternative land uses in place and occupied. Note 2 : It would be desirable for the Units and Tavern Sites to have a level of public lighting adjacent to the road that would assist patrons and road users. "*

The applicant has not provided details on these issues, however it is proposed to treat this as a reserved matter and request this information prior to Development Approval should the panel resolves to grant Development Plan Consent.

**ALEXANDRINA COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

As the Application was lodged in December 2007 it has been assessed against the Development Plan current at the time of lodgement being that consolidated on 20 September 2007. The following Principles of Development Control are seen as especially relevant to this application:

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**PART A – COUNCIL WIDE**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Form of Development**

**Objective 1:** Orderly and economic development.

**Comment**

It is arguable whether the proposed development complies with this objective or not. This Objective is interpreted to mean, amongst other things, whether the proposed development is justified in terms of population to support such a development financially.

There are a large number of allotments in the immediate locality which have been approved pursuant to Development Application 455/9004/05 which will eventually be sold, adding to an increase of residents both permanent and casual. Efforts to get the applicant to provide a financial justification for the proposal resulted in the following written response:

“with the proposed 50 (approximately) residential allotments & a 100 unit ‘lifestyle’ village (that area of Land currently under contract to a Major Adelaide based Life Style Village Building firm) having a potential population increase of some 350 further residents, NORICH is confident that the Tavern and Community shopping centre will be well attended by the Residents, Surrounding Communities, Present and Future as well as visiting Tourists.”

It is noted that at the time of writing this report Council has no record of any Development Applications for the 100 unit lifestyle village mentioned above.

In the assessment of the application I endeavoured to find some population statistics. The Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006 Census data counts 464 residents who reside in Clayton as their usual place of residence. It is arguable whether a development of this nature with a total retail floor area of 491m<sup>2</sup> is justified and would be financially viable given such a small population. On the other hand, it is unlikely that the applicant would invest such money into this development if they haven't done the background research to determine if such a development will be economically viable.

The proposed development is not considered to be orderly as it is directly abutting residential allotments and has the potential to create conflict between land uses.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Objective 2:** A proper distribution and segregation of living, working and recreational activities by the allocation of suitable areas of land for those purposes.

**Objective 3:** The proper location of public and community facilities by the reservation of suitable land in advance of need.

**Objective 4:** Land division which sets aside suitable sites for shopping, open space, employment, education, recreation, human services and community facilities.

**Comments**

Given the size of the allotments (approximately 1200m<sup>2</sup> each) and their locality, it is considered that they were intended for residential purposes only. The surrounding allotments are all approximately 1200m<sup>2</sup> and as there is no buffer between these allotments, the proposal is considered to be at variance with the abovementioned Objectives.

**Country Townships**

**Objective 49:** Development of country townships contained within defined boundaries.

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to comply with the above, particularly given the fact that it is located within the township boundary being located in the Country Township Zone.

**PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**PDC 1** Development should be in accordance with the structure plans for the whole of the council area and the townships of Port Elliot, Middleton, Goolwa, Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton shown on [Maps Alex/1\(Overlay 1\) Enlargements B to J](#).

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to be at variance with the Structure Plan for Clayton (Map Alex/1 Overlay 1 Enlargement F) as the map shows the area of the proposed development being designated for "living" purposes, not as a town centre or commercial. This structure plan envisages the town centre as being near the centre of the township, however as most of the allotments in the vicinity of where this is located are in private ownership and developed for residential purposes the practicality of compliance with this should be questioned and limited weight placed upon this plan.

**PDC 2** Development should be orderly and economic.

**Comment**

In accordance with my previous comments it is difficult to determine whether the proposed development is economic. It is considered to not be orderly given its proximity to residential allotments, lack of buffers and potential conflicts between land uses.

**Centres and Shops**

**PDC 88** Shopping development should be located as follows:

- (a) a shop, or group of shops, with a gross leasable area of greater than 450 square metres should be located in a business, centre, or shopping zone, or area;
- (b) a shop or group of shops with a gross leasable area of 450 square metres or less should not be located on a primary arterial road unless located in a business, centre, or shopping zone, or area;
- (c) a shop or group of shops with a gross leasable area of 450 square metres or less located outside a business, centre, or shopping zone, or area, should:
  - (i) not hinder the development or function of any business, centre, or shopping zone, or area; and
  - (ii) conform to the design, access, and car parking requirements for business, centre and shopping zone, or area, set out in principles of development control numbered 89, 90 and 91 below.

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to be at variance with PDC 88 (a) as the proposed development has a floor area greater than 450m<sup>2</sup> and is located within the Country Township Zone, not a commercial zone or area.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- PDC 89** Business, centre, and shopping zones, or areas, should meet the following criteria:
- (a) their location and assigned role in the hierarchy of designated centres and designated centre zones, or areas;
  - (b) the need to integrate facilities in the zone, or area;
  - (c) the need for any future expansion of the zone, or area, as a whole;
  - (d) multiple use of facilities and sharing of utility spaces;
  - (e) attractive development, with a unified design of buildings and a close relationship between shops in a lively setting;
  - (f) materials compatible with the natural features of the site and adjacent development;
  - (g) acceptable microclimatic conditions and degree of exposure in designing and orienting buildings, and locating open space and parking areas;
  - (h) development and operation of facilities within a zone, or area, compatible with adjoining areas. This should be promoted through landscaping, screen walls, centre orientation, location of access ways, buffer strips and transitional use areas;
  - (i) signs designed in scale with the amenity of the area, and be carefully located. Illumination from signs or floodlights should not spill over to adjacent areas;
  - (j) access and parking for residential areas located with centres separate from the access and car parking areas serving the other centre facilities;
  - (k) integration of public transport requirements, where appropriate.

**Comment**

The proposal is considered to generally comply with the above, although it is considered to be in an inappropriate location as it is not within a designated centre or commercial area.

- PDC 90** Provision for the movement of people and goods within business, centre, and shopping, zones, or areas, should comply with the following:
- (a) development should not cause inconvenient and unsafe traffic and pedestrian movements, or be likely to result in the need for significant expenditure on transport and traffic works, or facilities within, or outside, the locality;
  - (b) developments should be concentrated for pedestrian convenience and not allowed to extend unnecessarily along road frontages; (increasing the depth of development is a more desirable alternative);
  - (c) the separation of pedestrian and vehicle movements within zones is most desirable to ensure safety and convenience;

.../cont.



4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- (d) access to car parking areas should be designed not to cause congestion or detract from the safety of traffic, on abutting roads;
- (e) adequate and convenient provision should be made for service vehicles and the storage and removal of waste goods and materials;
- (f) car parks should be orientated to facilitate direct and convenient access of pedestrians between them and the facilities they serve;
- (g) parking areas should be consolidated and coordinated into convenient groups, rather than located individually, and access points should be minimised.

**Comment**

As Alexandrina Drive is considered to be one of the main thoroughfare roads in Clayton and the main access point is proposed to be located on this road, the proposed development may create impacts and congestion on this road. The car park however, is considered to meet the abovementioned principle.

**PDC 91** Landscaping should form an integral part of centre design, and be used to foster human scale, define spaces, reinforce paths and edges, screen utility areas, and generally enhance the visual amenity of the locality.

**Comment**

There are dedicated areas for landscaping shown on the site plan submitted, however, should the panel resolve to grant consent, a detailed landscaping plan will be required to be submitted and approved by Council prior to Development Approval being granted.

**PDC 93** Centres should have a minimal adverse impact on traffic movements on primary and primary arterial roads.

**PDC 94** Centres should develop on one side of a primary, or primary arterial road, or one quadrant of a primary, or primary arterial road intersection. Where centre facilities already straddle a primary or primary arterial road, or the intersection of two primary, or primary arterial roads, development within them should:

- (a) concentrate on one side of the primary, or primary arterial road, or one quadrant of the primary, or primary arterial, road intersection; and
- (b) minimise the need for pedestrian and vehicular movement across the primary or primary arterial road, from one part of the centre to another.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

Although not a centre, the proposed development is of a size which is considered to be appropriate within a centre pursuant to Principle 88, and therefore this Principle is appropriate. As Alexandrina Drive is a main thoroughfare within Clayton and the main access point is from this road, the proposal will have some adverse impact upon this road.

**PDC 95** Centres should have minimal adverse impacts on residential areas.

**Comment**

Given the presence of residential allotments directly abutting the subject site, the proposed development is considered to have a potential adverse impact upon this land through potential noise, lightspill, odour etc.

**PDC 96** Centres should be so located as to make effective use of existing investment in public infrastructure utilities, transport and other facilities, and any costs involved should be off-set by benefits to the population being served.

**Comment**

As it is difficult to determine the viability of such a development, it is difficult to determine compliance with the above. It is noted that the proposed development is located within an area which has not been designated a centre area pursuant to the Clayton Structure Plan and relevant zone Principles.

**PDC 97** Centres should be located consistent with policies pertaining to adjoining council areas.

**PDC 98** The development of centres should not result in the physical deterioration of any designated centre.

**PDC 99** Shopping development which is more appropriately located outside of business, centre, or shopping zone, or areas, should:

- (a) be of a size and type which would not hinder the development or function of any business, centre, or shopping zone, or area, in accordance with the objectives and principles of development control for centres and shops, and the objectives and principles of development control for the appropriate zones, or areas;
- (b) conform to the criteria above, and the design, access, and car parking requirements for business, centre, and shopping zones, or areas, set out in principles of development control above;

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- (c) result in a maintenance of retail employment in the locality; and
- (d) not demonstrably lead to the physical deterioration of any designated centre.

**Comment**

Although there is no commercial or business centre in Clayton, in reference to PDC 99 (a) above, the proposed development is considered to be at variance as Principle of Development Control 9 and 10 for the Country Township Zone provides for commercial and retail development being located near Island View Drive in the locality of the existing General Store.

**Movement of People and Goods**

**PDC 100** Development within the Strathalbyn District as identified on [Map Alex/1 \(Overlay 1\) Enlargement A](#) should have car parking spaces designed to the Australian Standard AS2890.1 (1986), located on the site, or on a suitable site nearby, at a rate not less than that prescribed in [Table Alex/3](#).

**Comment**

Table Alex/3 provides for one car parking space per 15 m<sup>2</sup> for a shop. As the total retail floor area is 491m<sup>2</sup>, 33 car parks are required to be provided. As 37 car parking spaces are provided for on the Site Plan, the proposal is considered to comply.

**PART B - STRATHALBYN DISTRICT**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Form of Development**

**Objective 1:** Development in accordance with the Structure Plans for the Strathalbyn district and townships of Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton as shown on [Maps Alex/1\(Overlay 1\) Enlargement B, C, D, E and F](#).

The Clayton Structure Plan ([Map Alex/1 \(Overlay 1\) Enlargement F](#)) shows in general terms the preferred form of future development based upon:

- (a) continued development of the two existing living areas of Clayton. Some expansion to the north west is envisaged in addition to residential infill development of vacant allotments;

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- (b) identification of the waterfront land which should be kept free from unsightly development, and maintenance of public access to that land;
- (c) identification of existing and future recreational areas and their development for public recreation;
- (d) identification of a town centre serving residents and tourist needs;
- (e) identification of a possible tourist lookout;
- (f) identification of a local road to facilitate movement to and from Clayton and the possible provision of a ferry to Hindmarsh Island; and
- (g) identification of a future urban area where control over rural or urban development will ensure that the attractive waterfront characteristics of the town are retained.

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to be at variance with the Structure Plan for Clayton (Map Alex/1 Overlay 1 Enlargement F) as the map shows the area of the proposed development being designated for "living" purposes, not as a town centre or commercial. This structure plan envisages the town centre as being near the centre of the township, however as most of the allotments in the vicinity of where this is located are in private ownership and developed for residential purposes the practicality of compliance with this should be questioned and limited weight placed upon this plan.

**Objective 4:** Industrial, commercial, office and retail development satisfying the requirements of the population of the district.

**Objective 7:** Satisfaction of the social, cultural and economic needs of the local community.

**Comment**

It is noted that the proposed development will provide a level of retail development aimed at satisfying the requirements and needs of the population of Clayton and surrounding locality.

**Objective 16:** Urban development designed and constructed to retain and enhance the amenity of the area and blend with existing development in the locality.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

Given the fact that the locality largely consists of vacant allotments with a scattering of detached dwellings, the proposed development, at this point in time is considered to be at variance with the above as it will be of a bulk and scale which is far in excess of the existing development. However, when the surrounding allotments are sold and dwellings constructed, the proposed development may not look so out of place and may better blend with the locality.

**PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**Form of Development**

**PDC 1** Development should be orderly and economic. Division of land for urban purposes should be by infilling or compact and contiguous extensions to existing developed areas.

**Comment**

In accordance with my previous comments it is difficult to determine whether the proposed development is economic. Given the potential land use conflicts, the proposed development is not considered to be orderly.

**PDC 4** Development should not occur on land which is unsuitable for the purpose.

**PDC 5** Development which is incompatible with other uses within the locality should not be undertaken.

**Comment**

The proposed development is generally considered to be at variance with the abovementioned Principles as the Clayton Structure Plan, Map Alex/1 (Overlay1) Enlargement F shows the town centre, of which such retail developments are envisaged, to be located in the general vicinity of the existing General Store, not the location as proposed. Therefore, it is argued that the subject site is unsuitable for the proposed development being envisaged for living purposes according to the structure plan. Given the location and size of the subject allotments it can be reasonably assumed that they were intended for residential purposes only. Also, as this site directly abuts other residential land, there is potential for conflict pursuant to Principle 5 above, this retail development is considered to be at variance as the noise, light, traffic etc... generated from such a development is not considered to be compatible with the surrounding residential area.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Movement of People and Goods**

**PDC 23** Car parking areas should be designed, constructed and landscaped to facilitate the efficient movement and parking of vehicles, ensure long term stability and ease of maintenance and screen the areas from adjoining roads.

**Comment**

Compliance with the above has been achieved through the design of the proposed car park meeting engineering requirements and Table Alex/3.

**COUNTRY TOWNSHIP ZONE**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Objective 1:** A zone mainly accommodating a range of urban development and facilities serving the surrounding district.

**Objective 5:** Development of Clayton primarily for detached dwellings.

**Objective 8:** Substantial development of vacant allotments within Clayton prior to extension of the township.

**Comment**

The proposal is generally considered to comply with the relevant Objectives for the Country Township Zone as in accordance with Objective 1 the proposed development will provide a facility which will serve the surrounding district. As Objective 5 states that development should be primarily for detached dwellings, the proposal is considered to be at variance. In accordance with Objective 8, the development will utilise existing vacant allotments.

Also, the Desired Future Character Statement for this zone states:

**DESIRED FUTURE CHARACTER**

"It is envisaged that development should comprise low density residential areas, local shops, community sport and recreation facilities, commercial enterprises and service industries allied to the rural uses in the locality."

.../cont.

## 4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

Given the size and number of shops, permanent population of Clayton and Council Wide Principles which envisage shops with this retail floor area being located within specific centre zones and areas, it can be reasonably assumed that the proposal is at variance with the Desired Character Statement as these shops exceed what would be considered for local purposes only.

### PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

**PDC 9** Commercial development compatible with adjoining development at Clayton should be located on Allotments 1 and 17 to 26, adjacent to Allotments 99 and 100 in DP21377, Hundred of Alexandrina.

#### Comment

In accordance with the above, allotments 99 and 100 in DP 21377 are large allotments comprising 46.06ha in total (lot 99 is 13.76ha and lot 100 being 32.30ha). Lot 100 is located on the Clayton-Milang Road and lot 99, which has since been divided (pursuant to Development Application 455/9004/05), no longer exists. However, the subject allotment created by this land division is located on what was previously lot 99. A search of Council records for adjoining allotments (lots 1 and 17 to 26) has revealed that there are currently only allotments 21 to 25 located adjacent on the southern side of Alexandrina Drive almost directly opposite the subject site and an allotment 1 located on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive, directly adjacent the original western boundary of allotment 99. As there has been a lot of land division in the area over the years and I am unable to determine when this Principle was consolidated into the Development Plan I cannot be certain that the allotments mentioned above are the ones referred to in the Principle. A search of Council records could not reveal the location of all of these allotments.

REFER ATTACHMENT4.2(d) (page 85)

Given the fact that allotment 99 no longer exists and only an allotment 1 and 21 to 25 can be found in an area considered to be adjacent this original allotment it can be reasonably assumed that this Principle is difficult to demonstrate compliance therefore little weight should be placed upon it except to highlight the fact that commercial development has been envisaged as being appropriate along Alexandrina Drive in the vicinity of the subject site.

**PDC 10** Retail or business development at Clayton should be located adjacent to Island View Drive between Edgewater Road and Rankine Street, and in proximity to existing retail development.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to be at variance with the above as it is commercial development and not located in the locality indicated above. It is noted, however that there is no existing retail development in this locality either. The existing general store is located on the corner of Island View Drive and Bayview which is outside of the locality mentioned by the above Principle. Therefore, little weight should be placed on this principle also. It is also noted that along Island View Drive, between Edgewater Road and Rankine Streets, there is very little available land with the predominant land uses being residential (almost all developed) located along the northern and eastern side of the road and coastal reserve (not being suitable for commercial development) located almost entirely along the southern and western side of this road. Compliance with this Principle is considered to be impractical.

**CONCLUSION**

Given the locality and size of the subject allotments, it is considered that they were created for residential purposes only. A commercial development of this nature directly abutting other residential land will potentially create conflict between land uses.

Also, given the size of the proposed development and the fact that is not located within a Centre Zone or designated commercial area, the proposed development is considered to be significantly enough at variance with the Alexandrina Development Plan to warrant refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Development Assessment Panel resolve to refuse Development Application 455/1517/07, for a Retail Outlet comprising 5 Shops and associated Carparking at lots 1 and 2 Alexandrina Drive Clayton (CT Ref: Volume 5979 Folio: 138 and Volume: 5979 Folio: 139) as it is considered to be at variance with the following Objectives and Principles of Development Control from the Alexandrina Development Plan:

**PART A - COUNCIL WIDE**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Objective 1: Orderly and economic development.**

.../cont.



4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

Objective 2: A proper distribution and segregation of living, working and recreational activities by the allocation of suitable areas of land for those purposes.

PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

PDC 1 Development should be in accordance with the structure plans for the whole of the council area and the townships of Port Elliot, Middleton, Goolwa, Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton shown on Maps Alex/1(Overlay 1) Enlargements B to J.

PDC 2 Development should be orderly and economic.

Centres and Shops

PDC 88 Shopping development should be located as follows:

- (a) a shop, or group of shops, with a gross leasable area of greater than 450 square metres should be located in a business, centre, or shopping zone, or area;
- (b) a shop or group of shops with a gross leasable area of 450 square metres or less should not be located on a primary arterial road unless located in a business, centre, or shopping zone, or area;
- (c) a shop or group of shops with a gross leasable area of 450 square metres or less located outside a business, centre, or shopping zone, or area, should:
  - (i) not hinder the development or function of any business, centre, or shopping zone, or area; and
  - (ii) conform to the design, access, and car parking requirements for business, centre and shopping zone, or area, set out in principles of development control numbered 89, 90 and 91 below.

PART B - STRATHALBYN DISTRICT

OBJECTIVES

Form of Development

Objective 1: Development in accordance with the Structure Plans for the Strathalbyn district and townships of Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton as shown on Maps Alex/1(Overlay 1) Enlargement B, C, D, E and F.

.../cont.

4.2 455/1517/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Form of Development

PDC 4 Development should not occur on land which is unsuitable for the purpose.

PDC5 Development which is incompatible with other uses within the locality should not be undertaken.

COUNTRY TOWNSHIP ZONE

OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: A zone mainly accommodating a range of urban development and facilities serving the surrounding district.

Objective 5: Development of Clayton primarily for detached dwellings.

PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

PDC9 Commercial development compatible with adjoining development at Clayton should be located on Allotments 1 and 17 to 26, adjacent to Allotments 99 and 100 in DP21377, Hundred of Alexandrina.

PDC 10 Retail or business development at Clayton should be located adjacent to Island View Drive between Edgewater Road and Rankine Street, and in proximity to existing retail development.

4.3 455/1518/07 - Norich Development Pty Ltd

**SUMMARY TABLE**

Date of Application	11 <sup>th</sup> December 2007
Subject Land	Lot 500 Alexandrina Drive, Clayton
Assessment No.	A 20869
Relevant Authority	Alexandrina Council
Planning Zone	Country Township
Nature of Development	Other – Tavern & residential flat building comprising 24 units including swimming pool
Type of Development	Consent / Merit
Public Notice	Category 3
Referrals	N/A
Representations Received	10
Representations to be heard	5
Date last inspected	March 2008
Recommendation	Approval
Originating Officer	Andrew Sladden

**ESD IMPACT/BENEFIT**

- Environmental Potential impact upon locality through increased stormwater etc.
- Social Potential benefit to local community through provision of a commercial facility.
- Economic Potential benefit to the economy through increased commercial development.

**BACKGROUND**

The Applicant originally lodged a Development Application in early 2007 for a commercial development comprising a tavern with a second storey caretaker's residence, supermarket and 5 shops with associated car parking and landscaping. However, this was withdrawn by the applicant and replaced with this Development Application.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**THE PROPOSAL**

**Nature of Development**

The subject site (lot 500, Alexandrina Drive Clayton), was created pursuant to Land Division 455/D004/05 creating 62 allotments located on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive. The allotment is located in the centre of this land division, is "L" shaped and has a total area of 1.35ha with a frontage to Alexandrina Drive and an access road proposed as part of the land division.

The subject site is located within the Country Township (Clayton) Zone pursuant to Map Alex/35 from the Alexandrina Development Plan. A development of this nature is not listed as non-complying pursuant to Principle of Development Control 12 for the Zone, and therefore, the proposed development is a Consent/Merit form of Development.

**Detailed Description**

The proposed development involves the construction of a two storey building comprising a tavern on the ground floor and caretaker's residence on the upper floor. The tavern is setback 15m from the Alexandrina Drive front boundary and 17m from the boundary with the side access road. The tavern comprises a bar, restaurant and beer garden areas. There are 71 car parks with areas around the boundaries set aside for landscaping.

Also forming part of the application are four two storey buildings (residential flat buildings) each comprising 6 two storey units (24 units in total) with a communal swimming pool and car parking areas. These buildings are located at the rear of the subject site and arranged in a rectangular pattern around a communal court yard area.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.3(a) (page 87)

**SITE & LOCALITY**

The subject site is an existing "L" shaped allotment of 1.35ha which is located on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive, Clayton. The allotment is generally devoid of significant vegetation and slopes upwards towards the rear from the road.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

The locality consists predominantly of vacant residential allotments with a scattered number of single storey detached dwellings located on the southern side of Alexandrina Drive. The nearest building on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive is located to the west approximately 100m from the subject site. It is also noted that the Clayton CFS building and Clayton Community Hall are located on the southern side of Alexandrina Drive, approximately 100m and 120m respectively from the subject site.

**PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

The Development Application was the subject of Category 3 Public Notification and was advertised between 13 and 27 February 2008. Eleven representations were received within this time frame.

All of the representors are opposed to the proposal and issues raised include:

- No demonstrated need for the development.
- Lack of viability of such a development.
- Operating hours of tavern will lead to noise pollution
- Lack of Police presence in Clayton.
- Noise and increased traffic.
- Lighting of car park.
- Energy efficiency and water retention.
- Viability and potential vandalism and delinquent behaviour.
- Loss of community feel.
- Increased risk of vandalism and burglaries.
- Perceived variance with the Development Plan, and
- Negative impact of poker machines on the community.

It is also noted that two late representations were received. However, as these were received after the closing of the notification period and after representations were sent to the applicant for comment as required by Section 38 of the Development Act 1993, they cannot be included.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.3(b) (page 108)

The applicant has also submitted a response to the representation.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.3(c) (page 122)

.../cont.

## 4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

The issues raised and responded to include viability, lighting, noise and operating hours.

### REFERRALS

There are no mandatory referrals for such an application.

### CONSULTATION

Consultation has been undertaken with Council's Environmental Health Department (EHO Karen Rokicinski) with regard to the effluent disposal system. The advice of the EHO is that a Waste Control System Application should be lodged prior to approval. At the time of writing this report the applicant is yet to lodge a WCS application despite being asked to do so. Therefore it is proposed to treat this as a reserved matter should the Panel resolve to approve the proposed development.

Consultation has been undertaken with Council's Engineering and Infrastructure Department (Infrastructure Manager Peter Wood). The advice of the Infrastructure Manager is that the car parking areas and access are acceptable, however the following information will need to be provided prior to Development Approval:

" Provide details on :

- *Endwall and erosion protection treatment at the DN 300 and additional pipe discharging to the basins*
- *Gross Pollutant Traps*
- *Outfall points and treatment for ag. drains behind retaining walls*

*Amend stormwater drainage layout to :*

- *Connect east car park of Units Site to system draining to existing basin (not discharge to road)*
- *Interconnect the 2 east-west drains in the Shops Site, serving the service road and roof runoff. Delete the 2 discharge points from the shops site to the 'dirt track'.*
- *Provide details for the drains to the road from the front car park of the shops (these are permitted to remain)*
- *Connect the drain from the Shops Site to the drainage system on the Tavern Site.*
- *Delete the 2 discharge points from the Tavern Site to Alexandrina Drive.*
- *Interconnect the 2 north-south drains on the Tavern Site and discharge to a new basin constructed on the Drainage Reserve*
- *Install a suitably-sized GPT in the Tavern Site drain, located in the south-western corner of the Tavern Site.*

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- *Make provision to intercept gutter flows in Alexandrina Drive and divert them to the new basin*
- *Construct the new basin to a size capable of accepting and temporarily storing stormwater runoff from the 3 sites ('apartments', 'tavern', 'shops') and the new road ('dirt track') and the frontage portion of Alexandrina Drive for storms up to and including the Average Recurrence Interval 20-year storm.*

*Provide details on the construction of the 'dirt road' and its connection to Alexandrina Drive :*

- *Extent - to the northern boundary of the Units Site*
- *Carriageway width - 7m from the northern boundary of the Units Site to the northern boundary of the Shops Site, hence tapering over 20m to 8m wide to the intersection at Alexandrina Drive.*
- *Semi-mountable kerb and gutter on each carriageway edge*
- *7m return radii to Alexandrina Drive kerblines*
- *Double side entry pits on each kerblines over the drain that connects the Shops Site to the Tavern Site*
- *Spoon drain across the intersection of the 'dirt road' and Alexandrina Drive*
- *Semi-mountable kerb and gutter in Alexandrina Drive for the frontages of the Shops Site and the Tavern Site*
- *Kerblines alignment in Alexandrina Drive is 1 m north of the edge of the existing sealed surface*
- *Pavement details for the new carriageway in the 'dirt road' and the widening strip in Alexandrina Drive*
- *Street lighting to P5 standard. Note 1 : It would not be the intention to erect the lights nor energise them until the retirement village was operational or alternative land uses in place and occupied. Note 2 : It would be desirable for the Units and Tavern Sites to have a level of public lighting adjacent to the road that would assist patrons and road users. "*

The applicant has not provided details on these issues, however it is proposed to treat this as a reserved matter and request this information prior to Development Approval should the panel resolves to grant Development Plan Consent.

#### **ALEXANDRINA COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

As the Application was lodged in December 2007 it has been assessed against the Development Plan current at the time of lodgement being that consolidated on 20 September 2007. The following Principles of Development Control are seen as especially relevant to this application:

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**PART A – COUNCIL WIDE**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Form of Development**

**Objective 1:** Orderly and economic development.

**Comment**

It is arguable whether the proposed development complies with this objective or not. This Objective is interpreted to mean, amongst other things, whether the proposed development is justified in terms of population to support such a development financially.

There are a large number of blocks in the immediate locality which have been approved pursuant to Development Application 455/9004/05 which will eventually be sold, adding to an increase of residents both permanent and casual. Efforts to get the applicant to provide a financial justification for the proposal resulted in the following written response:

“with the proposed 50 (approximately) residential allotments & a 100 unit ‘lifestyle’ village (that area of Land currently under contract to a Major Adelaide based Life Style Village Building firm) having a potential population increase of some 350 further residents, NORICH is confident that the Tavern and Community shopping centre will be well attended by the Residents, Surrounding Communities, Present and Future as well as visiting Tourists.”

It is noted that at the time of writing this report Council has no record of any Development Applications for the 100 unit lifestyle village mentioned above.

During the assessment of the application, I endeavoured to find some population statistics. The Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006 Census data counts 464 residents who reside in Clayton as their usual place of residence. I have tried to obtain some information from Planning SA regarding the economic viability of such developments in relation to supporting population as a way of determining whether such a development could be “orderly and economic” however, could not obtain any. It is noted, however that it is unlikely that the applicant would invest such money into this development if such a development will be economically unviable.

**Objective 2:** A proper distribution and segregation of living, working and recreational activities by the allocation of suitable areas of land for those purposes.

.../cont.



4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Objective 3:** The proper location of public and community facilities by the reservation of suitable land in advance of need.

**Objective 4:** Land division which sets aside suitable sites for shopping, open space, employment, education, recreation, human services and community facilities.

**Comment**

Although specifically not referenced as being set aside for commercial purposes within the original land division application (455/D004/05), an allotment of this size (1.35ha) located in the centre of the land division site with direct access to Alexandrina Drive, is likely to have been set aside for a non-residential purpose. This is also evidenced by the fact that the site is bordered on two sides by drainage reserves acting as a buffer. As Council granted consent to the land division, it is considered that the proposed development complies with the above Objectives.

**Country Townships**

**Objective 49:** Development of country townships contained within defined boundaries.

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to comply with the above, particularly given the fact that it is located within the township boundary being located in the Country Township Zone.

**PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**PDC 1** Development should be in accordance with the structure plans for the whole of the council area and the townships of Port Elliot, Middleton, Goolwa, Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton shown on [Maps Alex/1\(Overlay 1\) Enlargements B to J](#).

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to be at variance with the Structure Plan for Clayton (Map Alex/1 Overlay 1 Enlargement F) as the map shows the area of the proposed development being designated for "living" purposes, not as a town centre or commercial. This structure plan envisages the town centre as being near the centre of the township, however as most of the allotments in the vicinity of where this is located are in private ownership and developed for residential purposes the practicality of compliance with this should be questioned and limited weight placed upon this plan.

**PDC 2** Development should be orderly and economic.

**Comment**

In accordance with my previous comments it is difficult to determine whether the proposed development is orderly and economic.

**Movement of People and Goods**

**PDC 100** Development within the Strathalbyn District as identified on [Map Alex/1 \(Overlay 1\) Enlargement A](#) should have car parking spaces designed to the Australian Standard AS2890.1 (1986), located on the site, or on a suitable site nearby, at a rate not less than that prescribed in [Table Alex/3](#).

**Comment**

From the floor plan provided with the application there is a requirement for 69 car parks pursuant to the requirements of Table Alex/3 as follows:

Hotel:

- |                |                                                |            |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------|------------|
| • Beer garden: | 66m <sup>2</sup> @ 1 park per 6m <sup>2</sup>  | 11 spaces. |
| • Lounge:      | 211m <sup>2</sup> @ 1 park per 6m <sup>2</sup> | 35 spaces. |
| • Bar:         | 12m <sup>2</sup> @ 1 park per 2m <sup>2</sup>  | 6 spaces   |

Restaurant

- |                      |                                                |           |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| • Indoor and outdoor | 172m <sup>2</sup> @ 1park per 10m <sup>2</sup> | 17 spaces |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------|

TOTAL REQUIRED		69 spaces
----------------	--	-----------

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

As the proposal provides for 71 parking spaces the development meets the abovementioned Principle of Development Control. It is also noted that as 56 parking spaces are proposed to be provided for 24 units, there is sufficient parking for this aspect of the proposed development.

**Form of Development**

**PDC 154** Development should take place on land which is suitable for the intended use of that land having regard to the location and condition of that land and the objectives for the zone in which it is located.

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to generally comply with the above as the very size of the allotment lends its self to development of a non-residential nature. As there is sufficient area for car parking which meets the requirements of Table Alex/3 and landscaping areas, the land is considered to be suitable for its intended use. Also, as demonstrated later in the report, the proposed development is considered to generally comply with the relevant Objectives for the Country Township Zone (Objectives 1, 5 and 8) in that the use (tavern) will serve the needs of the surrounding district (Objective 1), and utilise an existing vacant allotment (Objective 8).

**PDC 155** Development should take place in a manner which will not interfere with the effective and proper use of other land in the vicinity and which will not prevent the attainment of the objectives for that other land.

**Comment**

As the 24 proposed units located towards the rear of the site are essentially residential land uses, it is considered that this is compatible with the surrounding residential allotments. The proposed tavern, which is located at the front of the allotment is separated from surrounding residential land by roads to the east and south, the proposed units and a drainage reserve to the north and a drainage reserve to the west. Therefore it is not considered to interfere with the effective use of other land within the vicinity or prevent the attainment of objectives (residential) for that other land.

**PDC 158** Development should not detrimentally affect the amenity of its locality or cause nuisance to the community:  
(a) by the emission of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, grit, oil, wastewater, waste products, electrical interference or light; or  
(b) by stormwater, or the drainage of run-off from the land; or

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

(c) by the loss of privacy.

- PDC 163** Development should not be undertaken if the construction, operation and/or management of such development is likely to result in:
- (a) the pollution of surface or groundwater;
  - (b) degradation of watercourses or wetlands;
  - (c) unnecessary loss or damage to native vegetation;
  - (d) the denudation of pastures;
  - (e) erosion;
  - (f) dust;
  - (g) noise nuisance;
  - (h) the introduction of or an increase in the number of pest plants or vermin;
  - (i) increased risk of flooding or impairment of stream water quality through the disposal of stormwater; or
  - (j) sealing of large areas of ground likely to result in increased stormwater run-off.

**Comment**

Given the location of residential development and allotments within the locality and the normal operating hours of hotels being quite late at night, it is considered that the proposed development may have some effect on the amenity of the locality via noise. This nuisance can be minimised through the regulation of operating hours (undertaken at the licensing stage).

**PART B - STRATHALBYN DISTRICT**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Form of Development**

**Objective 1:** Development in accordance with the Structure Plans for the Strathalbyn district and townships of Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton as shown on [Maps Alex/1\(Overlay 1\) Enlargement B, C, D, E and F](#).

The Clayton Structure Plan ([Map Alex/1 \(Overlay 1\) Enlargement F](#)) shows in general terms the preferred form of future development based upon:

- (a) continued development of the two existing living areas of Clayton. Some expansion to the north west is envisaged in addition to residential infill development of vacant allotments;  
.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- (b) identification of the waterfront land which should be kept free from unsightly development, and maintenance of public access to that land;
- (c) identification of existing and future recreational areas and their development for public recreation;
- (d) identification of a town centre serving residents and tourist needs;
- (e) identification of a possible tourist lookout;
- (f) identification of a local road to facilitate movement to and from Clayton and the possible provision of a ferry to Hindmarsh Island; and
- (g) identification of a future urban area where control over rural or urban development will ensure that the attractive waterfront characteristics of the town are retained.

**Comment**

The proposed development is considered to be at variance with the Structure Plan for Clayton (Map Alex/1 Overlay 1 Enlargement F) as the map shows the area of the proposed development being designated for "living" purposes, not as a town centre or commercial. This structure plan envisages the town centre as being near the centre of the township, however as most of the allotments in the vicinity of where this is located are in private ownership and developed for residential purposes the practicality of compliance with this should be questioned and limited weight placed upon this plan.

**Objective 3:** Development of the township's of Milang, Langhorne Creek, Clayton, Woodchester and Ashbourne as local service centres for the Strathalbyn District.

**Objective 4:** Industrial, commercial, office and retail development satisfying the requirements of the population of the district.

**Objective 6:** Separation of incompatible land use.

**Objective 7:** Satisfaction of the social, cultural and economic needs of the local community.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

It is noted that the proposed development will provide commercial development aimed at satisfying the requirements and needs of the population of Clayton and surrounding locality. The tavern will essentially meet the needs of the local community and tourists and therefore is not likely to prejudice the status of Clayton as being local service centre for the Strathalbyn District. The tavern is considered to potentially be at variance with Objective 6 due to the residential development within the locality and potential for conflict between these land uses, however its locality on Alexandrina Drive and adjacent a drainage reserve adjacent provides some separation.

**Objective 16:** Urban development designed and constructed to retain and enhance the amenity of the area and blend with existing development in the locality.

**Comment**

Given the fact that the locality largely consists of vacant allotments with a scattering of detached dwellings, the proposed development, at this point in time is considered to be at variance with the above as it will be of a bulk and scale which is far in excess of the existing development. However, when the surrounding allotments are sold and dwellings constructed, the proposed development may compliment the locality. Also, the Landscaping Plan, which will be required to be approved by Council prior to Development Approval, may help to screen the buildings.

**PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**Form of Development**

**PDC 1** Development should be orderly and economic. Division of land for urban purposes should be by infilling or compact and contiguous extensions to existing developed areas.

**Comment**

In accordance with my previous comments it is difficult to determine whether the proposed development is orderly and economic.

**PDC 4** Development should not occur on land which is unsuitable for the purpose.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**PDC5** Development which is incompatible with other uses within the locality should not be undertaken.

**Comment**

The proposal is considered to generally comply with Principle of Development Control 4 above, as the allotment is considered to be of a size and in a locality (surrounded by reserves and roads) which is suitable for its purpose. However, it can be argued that the proposed tavern is unsuitable for the purpose when looking at the locality in context with the Clayton Structure Plan (Map Alex/1 (Overlay 1) Enlargement F) as the site is envisaged for living purposes only.

The proposed tavern however, can be considered to be at variance with PDC 5, given the usual operating hours and noise generated therein being a potential nuisance for residential development within the locality. The residential flat buildings do comply with PDC 5 as they are residential in nature and are likely to have minimal impact upon the locality.

**Residential Development**

- PDC 16** Residential flat buildings, multiple dwellings, and row dwellings, should not be erected unless:
- (a) space is provided for the parking and manoeuvring of tenant and visitor vehicles at a rate not less than that specified in [Table Alex/3](#);
  - (b) buildings, car parking spaces, and driveways, cover less than 60 percent of the site or the site is located in the Residential (Strathalbyn) Zone or the Residential (Golf Course) Zone;
  - (c) the scale and form of the development is compatible with that of existing development in the locality;
  - (d) the design and siting of the building will minimise loss of privacy of adjoining development; minimise potential
  - (e) adequate private and communal open space is provided together with a screened area for storage of refuse containers and clothes drying facilities; and
  - (f) effective landscaping is undertaken to enhance the external appearance of the development and assist in maintaining privacy.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

Table Alex/3 does not provide any details of parking requirements for residential land uses. The closest use is a motel which provides for one car parking space per room. As the proposed development provides for two spaces per unit, it is considered to have adequate car parking. In reference to (c) above, the proposed residential flat buildings are at variance as they are of a bulk and scale which far exceeds existing development within the locality. It is noted however, that the surrounding allotments are vacant and could be developed with substantial two storey dwellings in the future. The upper floor western side balconies of the western side residential flat building will overlook two existing vacant allotments abutting the site to the west and in order to minimise overlooking a proposed condition requiring obscured glazing and privacy screens to a height of 1.5m above the finished floor level will be added to the consent should the Panel resolve to approve the application.

**COUNTRY TOWNSHIP ZONE**

**OBJECTIVES**

- Objective 1:** A zone mainly accommodating a range of urban development and facilities serving the surrounding district.
- Objective 5:** Development of Clayton primarily for detached dwellings.
- Objective 8:** Substantial development of vacant allotments within Clayton prior to extension of the township.

**Comment**

The proposal is generally considered to comply with the relevant Objectives for the Country Township Zone as in accordance with Objective 1 the proposed development will provide a facility which will serve the surrounding district. Although the tavern is at variance with Objective 5 not being residential, the proposed residential flat buildings are residential in nature and do comply. In accordance with Objective 8, the development will utilise an existing vacant allotment.

**PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

- PDC 9** Commercial development compatible with adjoining development at Clayton should be located on Allotments 1 and 17 to 26, adjacent to Allotments 99 and 100 in DP21377, Hundred of Alexandrina.

.../cont.



4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

**Comment**

In accordance with the above, allotments 99 and 100 in DP 21377 are large allotments comprising 46.06ha in total (lot 99 is 13.76ha and lot 100 being 32.30ha). Lot 100 is located on the Clayton-Milang Road and lot 99, which has since been divided (pursuant to Development Application 455/9004/05), no longer exists. However, the subject allotment created by this land division is located on what was previously lot 99. A search of Council records for adjoining allotments (lots 1 and 17 to 26) has revealed that there are currently only allotments 21 to 25 located adjacent on the southern side of Alexandrina Drive almost directly opposite the subject site and an allotment 1 located on the northern side of Alexandrina Drive, directly adjacent the original western boundary of allotment 99. As there has been a lot of land division in the area over the years and I am unable to determine when this Principle was consolidated into the Development Plan I cannot be certain that the allotments mentioned above are the ones referred to in the Principle. A search of Council records could not reveal the location of all of these allotments.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.3(d) (page 125)

Given the fact that allotment 99 no longer exists and only an allotment 1 and 21 to 25 can be found in an area considered to be adjacent this original allotment it can be reasonably assumed that this Principle is difficult to demonstrate compliance therefore little weight should be placed upon it except to highlight the fact that commercial development has been envisaged as being appropriate along Alexandrina Drive in the vicinity of the subject site.

**PDC 10** Retail or business development at Clayton should be located adjacent to Island View Drive between Edgewater Road and Rankine Street, and in proximity to existing retail development.

**Comment**

The proposed tavern is considered to be at variance with the above as it is commercial development and not located in the locality indicated above. It is noted however, that there is no existing retail development in this locality either. The existing general store is located on the corner of Island View Drive and Bayview which is outside of the locality mentioned by the above Principle. Therefore, little weight should be placed on this Principle.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

It is also noted that along Island View Drive, between Edgewater Road and Rankine Streets, there is very little available land with the predominant land uses being residential (almost all developed) located along the northern and eastern side of the road and coastal reserve (not being suitable for commercial development) located almost entirely along the southern and western side of this road. Compliance with this Principle is considered to be impractical.

**CONCLUSION**

Given the fact that the subject allotment was approved by Council in 2005 and is of a size and in a locality which lends itself to non-residential lands uses (located on main road and separated from surrounding residential development by reserves and roads) the proposed development is considered appropriate. Although the intention of Clayton Structure Plan and relevant Country Township Principles of Development Control relating to commercial development is to congregate this type of development near the existing general store and the centre of the township, it is impractical to do so due to the proximity of these areas to the river, unsealed roads, surrounding residential development and lack of available land.

As highlighted in my assessment above, although the proposed tavern has potential to cause some conflict with nearby residential land uses, the application as a whole is not considered to be seriously at variance with the Alexandrina Development Plan and accordingly, Development Plan Consent is recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Development Assessment Panel grant Provisional Development Plan Consent to Development Application 455/1518/07 for a Tavern and four Residential Flat Buildings comprising 24 units including swimming pool subject to the following conditions and notes:

**Conditions**

1. The development herein approved to be carried out in accordance with plans and details accompanying this application (plans received by Council on 7 December 2007).
2. No signs or advertising are to be erected or displayed on or about the buildings or the site without the prior consent of Council.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

3. All of the carparks, driveways, and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall be constructed to Australian Standard AS2890.1 (Carparking Facilities) and be of bituminised, brick paved or concreted in accordance with sound engineering practice prior to the occupation of the development herein approved.
4. The applicant or other approved persons for the time being making use of the subject land now approved shall at all times maintain in good and substantial condition in all respects the subject land (including carparking areas, driveways and footpaths) all buildings and structures and all landscaped and open space areas.
5. Floodlighting shall be restricted to that necessary for security purposes only and shall be directed and shielded in such a manner as to cause no light overspill to adjacent residential development.
6. Prior to the granting of Development Approval, the Applicant must obtain Waste Control Approval for connection of the Development to Council's Septic Tank Effluent Disposal System (STEDS). The waste control design is to include a trade waste application addressing the capacity of the grease arrestor.
7. Prior to the granting of Development Approval, three copies of a site layout plan drawn to scale and dimensioned must be submitted to and approved by council. The plan must show the proposed landscape treatment and maintenance of the site including details of species and their mature height. When approved, the plan will be endorsed and will then form part of the approval.
8. Floodlighting shall be restricted to that necessary for security purposes only and shall be directed and shielded in such a manner as to cause no light overspill to adjacent residential development.
9. Prior to granting Development Approval, Stormwater Management Plan must be lodged and approved by Council which is to provide details on :
  - End wall and erosion protection treatment at the DN 300 and additional pipe discharging to the basins
  - Gross Pollutant Traps
  - Outfall points and treatment for ag. drains behind retaining walls
  - Connect east carpark of Units Site to system draining to existing basin (not discharge to road)

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- Interconnect the 2 east-west drains in the Shops Site, serving the service road and roof runoff. Delete the 2 discharge points from the shops site to the 'dirt track'.
  - Provide details for the drains to the road from the front carpark of the shops (these are permitted to remain)
  - Connect the drain from the Shops Site to the drainage system on the Tavern Site.
  - Delete the 2 discharge points from the Tavern Site to Alexandrina Drive.
  - Interconnect the 2 north-south drains on the Tavern Site and discharge to a new basin constructed on the Drainage Reserve
  - Install a suitably-sized GPT in the Tavern Site drain, located in the south-western corner of the Tavern Site.
  - Make provision to intercept gutter flows in Alexandrina Drive and divert them to the new basin
  - Construct the new basin to a size capable of accepting and temporarily storing stormwater runoff from the site ('apartments', 'tavern') and the new road ('dirt track') and the frontage portion of Alexandrina Drive for storms up to and including the Average Recurrence Interval 20-year storm.
10. All scarring or physical disturbances of the land surface during any excavation work shall be restricted to only that which is shown on the approved plan as required for building work and/or access purposes. All exposed faces around such scarred areas and spoil shall be screened with suitable ground cover to the reasonable satisfaction of Council.
11. All external cladding and trim of the proposed building/s must be of a non-reflective nature to the reasonable satisfaction of Council.
12. Temporary silt control devices in the form of hay bales or silt fences to be installed on the development site prior to commencement of works. The devices are to be maintained throughout the construction period and dismantled at the conclusion of works. Any silt captured by the device/s to be disposed of to the satisfaction of Council.
13. Upstairs balconies on the western side of the western side residential flat building shall have privacy screens with a minimum height of 1.5m above the finished floor level.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

14. All mechanical plant installed as part of this development should meet the noise output requirements of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA). If the noise output exceeds these requirements, an acoustic enclosure shall be installed around the plant to ensure it complies, if an enclosure is required, these details shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Council.
15. All kitchen and cooking facilities must comply with the requirements of the Food Act 2001, Food Regulations 2002 and the Food Safety Standards.
16. The use and any associated processes or activities carried on shall not detrimentally affect the amenity of the locality by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.
17. The use shall not involve exposure of goods or equipment from any adjacent properties or from a public place of any unsightly matter.
18. The noise emanating from the subject land shall be restricted to levels meeting the reasonable requirements of the Environment Protection Authority.

Notes

1. A wall retaining a difference in ground levels of more than 1 metre requires consent under the building rules as they apply to the Development Act 1993.
2. Allotment boundaries will not be certified by Council staff. The onus of ensuring that the buildings are sited in the approved position on the current allotment is the responsibility of the owner. This may necessitate a survey being carried out by a licensed land surveyor.
3. Building Site Management

Upon granting of Development Approval, any person undertaking the development shall be required to conform to the following guidelines:

- Construction Hours  
That construction shall take place between 7am and 7pm Monday to Saturday and between 9am and 6pm on Sundays and public holidays. All such work shall be undertaken in such a manner so as not to cause any nuisance or annoyance to any of the occupiers of buildings within the locality.

.../cont.

4.3 455/1518/07 – Norich Development Pty Ltd (Continued)

- **Dust Emissions**  
That dust emissions from the site shall be controlled by a dust suppressant or by watering regularly.
- **Waste Receptacle**  
That the builder shall at all times provide and maintain a waste receptacle on the site for the storage of builder's waste. This receptacle shall be located on site for the duration of the construction period and be emptied as required.
- **Stormwater Runoff**  
That all runoff and stormwater from the subject site during the construction period must be either contained on site or directed through a temporary sediment trap, prior to discharge to the stormwater system.
- **Hard Waste Litter Storage**  
That all hard building materials be stored in a manner that secures it on site during the construction works.
- **Site Security**  
That the site shall be secured at all times to prevent unauthorised access and that adjoining properties are secure at all times during the period of construction works where fences have been removed.
- **Public Realm**  
That any work in the public realm requiring street occupation or hoardings requires Council consent, which must be granted prior to the commencement of the construction works.
- **Damage to Council's Footpath/Kerbing/Road Pavement/Verge**  
Section 779 of the Local Government Act provides that where damage to Council footpath/kerbing/road pavement/verge occurs as a result of the construction, the owner/Applicant shall be responsible for the cost of Council repairing the damage.

For further information in relation to the above, please call either Council, the EPA or SafeWork SA.

4.4 455/744/06 - Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc

**SUMMARY TABLE**

Date of Application	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2006
Subject Land	Lot 6, 269-289 Waterport Road Hayborough (CT Vo: 5478 Fol: 125)
Assessment No.	A 3831
Relevant Authority	Alexandrina Council
Planning Zone	Landscape (Port Elliot West)
Nature of Development	Primary School – Reception to Year 7
Type of Development	Consent on Merit
Public Notice	Category 3
Referrals	Nil
Representations Received	17 (7 support, 10 opposed)
Representations to be heard	4 Approx.
Date last inspected	3 April 2008
Recommendation	Refusal
Originating Officer	Tom Gregory

**ESD IMPACT/BENEFIT**

- Environmental                      Significant vegetation landscaping proposed. Loss of open rural character. Loss of amenity for existing residents in immediate locality.
- Social                                      Development at a greater density than that evident in existing locality may lead to a loss of separation between the townships on the South Coast.
- Economic                                No direct economical benefit is anticipated, however I am unsure about procedures of Private School funding and fees etc. Opportunity for 12 full time staff at the completion of the final stage of development.

.../cont.

4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

**THE PROPOSAL**

**Nature of Development:**

The development incorporates the construction and establishment of a Primary School for Reception to Year 7 (R-7) students. The subject land is located in the Landscape (Port Elliot West) zone, as identified within the Alexandrina Council Development Plan, consolidated 22 June 2006 - current at the time of lodgement.

**Detailed Description:**

The applicant is Emmanuel Christian Schools and Ministries Inc., who currently run the Murraylands Christian College located at 28 East Terrace, Strathalbyn. Approval is sought in order to provide an additional campus for the abovementioned school to be located on the South Coast, in order to provide a further educational choice for perspective students and their families. Currently there are approximately 65 students who commute daily from the South Coast via bus to the Murraylands Christian College in Strathalbyn.

The proposed primary school is intended to provide for a maximum of 200 students and is proposed to be developed in four stages over a period of five years. A maximum capacity of 84 students is intended for the second stage, and 125 at the completion of the third. It is anticipated that at full capacity (after the completion of the final stage), that the primary school will employ 12 full-time staff members

The following is summary of the intended stages:

**Stage One**

Erection of two new temporary class rooms, consisting of seven learning areas, a reception area, an early Learning Centre building and toilet facilities. Vehicular drop-off driveway is intended with parking provided for 8 cars and a bus.

**Stage Two**

Construction of permanent buildings containing a library, administration offices, a general classroom and a special education classroom. The administration area in the temporary buildings will be converted to another (fourth) classroom. Stage 2 will accommodate 84 students and 6 staff members and will provide adequate parking for an additional 12 cars.

.../cont.



4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

Stage Three

The temporary classrooms and amenities block will be removed and replaced with two new permanent buildings. The northern group will consist of four classrooms whilst the southern group will consist of three classrooms and a reception area. An additional toilet and amenities block will be provided. In total, this stage will accommodate 125 students, 8 staff, and an additional 16 car parks.

Stage Four

The final stage will involve the construction of two new buildings and an addition to the southern classroom block. The applicant has indicated that a music building will be located to the west of the classrooms behind the amenities building, and that a building containing an Early Learning Centre will be constructed to the east of the classroom buildings, adjacent to the car park. It is intended that this building will accommodate further administration offices, kitchen and toilet amenities, and an activity area for the Early Learning Centre. A grassed sports oval, and two multi-purpose sports courts will also be completed at this stage.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.4(a) (page 127)

The applicant has indicated that the existing on site vegetation will be retained where possible and that the site will be substantially landscaped with native species. A list of native species has been provided and is located in the applicant's Planning Report.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.4(b) (page 136)

**SITE & LOCALITY**

The subject land; 269-289 Waterport Road, Port Elliot, has two road frontages, one to the north (Waterport Road – 226metres), and the other to the south (Mentone Road – 250metres). The subject land is 4.98hectares in size, with a western boundary length of 274metres, and an eastern boundary of 166.5metres.

The subject land could be described as having a subtle undulation in its topography, with a general slope from north-east (adjoining Waterport Road) to the south-west, where it adjoins the final stretch of Mentone Road (a 'no through road').

The subject land is adjacent farmlands to the north, sloping towards the hills behind the township of Port Elliot (also within a Landscape Zone). West of the subject land is a large open farmland area, together with a number of rural living sized allotments. Similar sized allotments bound the remainder of the subject land, and contain a number of scattered detached dwellings and associated outbuildings, at low densities.

.../cont.

4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.4(c) (page 150)

**PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Section 38 of the Development Act 1993 and Schedule 9 of the Development Regulations 1993 prescribe public notice categories for different types of development. The proposed Primary School is not identified in either Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 9, and as the Development is not considered to be of a minor nature, the application was notified as a Category 3 Development.

Category 3 Public Notification was conducted between 9 September and 6 October 2006. 26 Properties were sent notice of the application, and invited to make a representation in support or otherwise on the proposal. Pursuant to the Development Regulations 1993, a Public Notice for the application was published in The Times newspaper on 21 September 2006.

Seventeen written representations were received within the prescribed timeframe, of which 7 were in support of the proposal, and a further 10 were opposed.

The main concerns of those opposed to the proposal are detailed as follows:

- That the development is not compatible with the zoning criteria or current landscape amenity;
- Loss of privacy;
- Vehicular Access – issues regarding potential congestion, increased vehicular frequency, safety, noise and dust impacts and the like;
- Possible erosion of current separation between specific South Coast communities i.e Port Elliot and Hayborough.
- Viability of the school.
- That the proposed development should be completed in full, rather than in 4 stages.

REFER ATTACHEMENT 4.4(d) (page 151)

Whilst some of these are valid planning concerns, others such as the Primary School's viability cannot be taken into account whilst making an assessment against Council's Development Plan objectives and principles.

Pursuant to Section 38(8) of the Development Act 1993, the Applicant submitted a response to the representations.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.4(e) (page 173)

.../cont.

## 4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

Since the public notification, the applicant has been engaged in further discussions with some residents along Mentone Road regarding access and the like. This has resulted in a number of additional letters in support of the proposal. As these letters were not received within the prescribed time frame, they cannot be considered as a 'representation' pursuant to the Development Act and Regulations 1993. Despite this, they have been included in the attachments of this report.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.4(f) (page 177)

### REFERRALS

There is no requirement to refer this application for comment, regard or direction to any external statutory bodies, pursuant to Schedule 8 of the Development Regulations 1993.

### CONSULTATION

Consultation has been undertaken with Council's Environmental Health Department with regard to effluent disposal. No approvals have been issued, and should this application be approved, pursuant to Section 33(3) Development Act 1993, a condition will be placed indicating that approval must be sought and granted for sufficient means of effluent disposal prior to full Development Approval.

Consultation was undertaken with Council's previous Infrastructure Manager who had concerns relating to vehicular/traffic movements, and stormwater. As such, it was requested that the applicant provide an independent Traffic Management Plan, together with an Independent Stormwater Management Plan.

Both of these reports/plans were provided by the applicant, and were conducted by Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB). A copy of both are included as attachments to this report.

REFER ATTACHMENT 4.4(g) (page 184)

In response to the independent reports/plans provided by the applicant, Council's (then) Infrastructure Manager indicated the following:

#### *Traffic Management Plan*

- *Council would require that the 50m set back from Waterport Road required for the junction of Mentone Road be shored up prior to approval. If land acquisitions are required then this will need to be formal agreement between the developer and the land owners ensuring this is possible.*

.../cont.

4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

- *Generally the peak traffic times in the south coast region are generally more widely spread and commence at or around 3:30pm. This is mainly due to the industrial areas adjacent the proposed school, the nature of the work in the area, being predominately rural duties and trades (generally not 9 til 5 jobs). Therefore is can not be safely assumed that the school traffic will miss the general peak times.*
- *Council would not support the relocation of the drop-off zone to Waterport Road (as mentioned in the PB report) due to its nature and current speed environment.*
- *The PB report states "The final location of the Mentone Road realignment will be subject to site survey and land acquisition negotiations". Council strongly believes this should be resolved prior to any approval being granted.*

In response to the above, the applicant has since advised Council that a resolution has been agreed by way of a binding legal Option Agreement and a Real Estate Contract being signed and entered into by the affected parties for the purpose of land acquisition to realign Mentone Road. The applicant has also indicated that these agreements are pending a successful resolution of this application.

A further response to the PB report is as follows, and should the application be approved, these requirements will be covered by a condition.

- *Council would require a wider than 6.0m seal. During peak times, like at every school I have ever seen, parents will drop off kids where is most convenient to them resulting in cars pulling over onto the shoulder, therefore a 7.0m wide seal will be necessary and I believe more appropriate. It is recommended that the surface be a hot mix (asphalt) pavement to ensure turning buses do not cut up a spray seal surface.*

*Stormwater Management Plan*

- *Council has no major concerns with the stormwater management of the site and would encourage a basin to be constructed as a wetland rather than a general basin.*
- *Any overflow from the site shall discharge into the adjacent proposed wetland but be free of gross pollutants and other contaminants.*

Further to the above, since there has been some considerable time since the advice was given and several internal staff changes, it is suggested that pursuant to Section 33(3) Development Act 1993, that all Engineering issues (ie. access, stormwater and the like) will be conditioned as 'reserve matters', and shall be resolved prior to full Development Approval (should this application be granted Development Plan Consent).

.../cont.

## 4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

The applicant has provided a response to each of the above engineering related issues.

REFER ATTACHEMNT 4.4(h) (page 207)

### **ALEXANDRINA COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The following Principles of Development Control are seen as especially relevant to this application.

Please REFER ATTACHEMENT 4.4(i) (page 228 for a detailed list of the relevant Objectives and Principles)

### **Council Wide**

Objectives 1, 2, 3, 18, 27, 38, 48

Principles of Development Control 2, 3, 4, 34, 35, 82, 83, 102, 136, 209, 211, 215, 218, 220

Comment:

This proposal is not considered to be orderly. The location of the proposal is sited a significant distance away from existing services and infrastructure. A proper distribution and segregation of various land-uses is desirable in order to benefit the community and enable a town to function more efficiently. Accessibility is an important factor in this, which generally speaking, makes a town more safe and convenient.

The Landscape zoned subject land currently assists in the separation between the existing South Coast communities and townships of Port Elliot and Hayborough. 'Infill' development such as this could lead to a degradation of this separation, and furthermore the uniqueness and identity of the diverse townships on the South Coast.

The subject land is situated adjacent to existing residences on medium-large rural living sized allotments. A number of Representors have indicated that a school in close proximity to their dwellings could lead to future land use conflict issues. Representors have indicated that they have chosen to reside where they are for reasons regarding privacy and the like.

.../cont.

### 4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

The proposal does not allow for the retention of rural land for the purposes of primary production, however the applicant has indicated water and nature conservation details, which could preserve the beauty of the countryside. The applicant has provided a substantial landscaping plan that may assist in the beautification of the 'open nature' of the subject site, however beautification can be interpreted differently depending on an individuals aesthetic taste. This landscaping will assist in the screening of buildings, however the intent of the zone is for an open rural character.

It is anticipated that this type of development will attract large numbers of vehicles at certain times of the day, which could lead to the creation of traffic hazards and congestion on roads and intersection in the vicinity. To address this, the applicant provided the abovementioned Traffic Management Plan, which recommends a number of resolutions that may minimise some concerns. These concerns were raised by Council staff and also a number of Category 3 Representatives. One resolution is to realign the intersection Mentone and Brickyard Road as mentioned above. This may solve the congestion, however will not impact on the additional vehicular movements in the locality.

As will be addressed in further detail in this report, the Landscape (Port Elliot West) Zone describes this land as being 'rural land' and/or 'semi-rural land'. Council wide Objective 48 indicates that "the retention of rural areas primarily for agricultural, pastoral and forestry purposes, and the maintenance of the natural character and beauty of such areas" is desirable.

Council wide Principle of Development Control (PDC) 3 indicates that urban development should be a continuous extension of an existing built up areas, and be located so as to achieve economy in the provision of public service, and create a safe, convenient and pleasant environment in which to live. The proposal in this locality is considered to be at variance with this as it is not a continuous extension of the built up urban form.

On the balance, PDC 215 indicates that 'the rural character, comprising natural features and man made activities, should be preserved by careful siting, design and landscaping of new building development and or intensive land uses'. Furthermore PDC 218 suggests that 'buildings or structures should be sited unobtrusively and be of a character and design which will blend naturally with the landscape'. The applicant has attempted to address this by minimising the built form (by way of clustering the buildings), and has provided a substantial landscaping plan.

.../cont.

4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

**Port Elliot and Goolwa District**

Principles of Development Control 1, 11, 15

Comment:

It is my opinion the three abovementioned PDC's are quite explicit in their intent and can be read alone or as a whole. For the ease of reading, the following is a dot-point form of these PDC's

- Land proposed for living, working and recreational activities should be used only for those purposes.
- Development should not impair the character or nature of buildings or sites of architectural, historical, or scientific or sites of natural beauty.
- Rural areas should be retained primarily for agricultural, pastoral and forestry services.

The Landscape (Port Elliot West) zone contains a number of Rural Living sized allotments. The zoning provisions cater for one detached dwelling per allotment, together with associated outbuildings, at low densities. This in my opinion is an appropriate use of the land, and provides the opportunity for low intensity rural activities to take place. The existing land use character assists in the retention of the land for the intended purpose, as well as retaining the natural beauty of open space.

The proposed development introduces a number of buildings, at a density that is not evident elsewhere in the immediate locality. Although the built form intensity is still considered to be low, it is greater than the current existing character. The open areas such as the grassed playing field may assist in maintaining the rural landscape, however the development in its entirety must be taken into account. A Primary School on land set aside for rural activities does not appear to be consistent with the desired character of that locality.

**Landscape (Port Elliot West) Zone**

Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4

Principles of Development Control 1, 2, 3, 11, 12

Although this zone does not explicitly specify the desired future character in a single statement, the underlying intent of the zone can be interpreted from the Objectives. These Objectives therefore become of greater importance in an assessment, and more weight should be placed upon them in order to facilitate desirable and quality development.

.../cont.

### 4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

The intent of the zone is primarily for the retention of the landscape qualities together with detached dwellings at low densities and allowing for low intensity rural and rural living activities to take place. The zone alludes to the fact that the land has a pleasant rural character derived from revegetated allotments, accommodating mixed and small scale rural activities amongst scattered dwellings.

The establishment of a Primary School in this zone does not seem to be compatible with the desired and existing character of the zone. If the proposal was to be developed, it could potentially have an adverse impact on the existing character of the locality. Furthermore it may erode at the division and separation of the specific townships on the South Coast.

The development does have a high standard of appearance, however this would become more evident upon completion of the final stage. All buildings (other than the initial transportables) have a high standard of external materials and colours which blend with the proposed landscaping. The clustering of the proposed buildings will assist in limiting the sprawl of development, which aesthetically is desirable. The siting of the proposed school buildings are satisfactorily setback from the adjoining roads and neighbouring boundaries. The buildings are low profile with a minimal roof pitch. Stage 1 of the proposal incorporates two transportable buildings, which will be replaced by more substantial buildings upon completion of successive stages.

The applicant has somewhat addressed the principles relating to the appearance of the land and buildings, and also the requirements of the zone in regards to landscaping. However, it is the underlying intent of the zone and the proposed land use that is not compatible.

PDC 1 indicates that this zone should accommodate no more than one dwelling per allotment together with associated land uses such as horticulture, and activities that are of a small scale or are ancillary to the rural residential use of the land and that promote environmentally sustainable living and farming practices. As suggested previously, no residential use will take place on the subject land, nor activities ancillary to a rural residential use. Despite this, the school may be able to encourage environmentally sustainable farming practices in their curriculum.

.../cont.



4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

Further Comment:

Further to the above, this application is for a Primary School to be established in the Landscape (Port Elliot West) Zone, and the fundamental question is whether this land use (together with the associated buildings etc) is a compatible use for the subject land and if the proposed development compromises the open rural intent of the zone. Furthermore that the development may erode the separation of the townships of the South Coast, and ultimately have a negative impact on the surrounding locality.

It is my opinion that this proposal does not provide sufficient merit in order to warrant Development Plan Consent, and therefore I recommend that Development Plan Consent be refused.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Development Assessment Panel REFUSE Development Application 455/744/07 for a Primary School Reception - Year 7 at 269-289 Waterport Road, Port Elliot as it is at variance to the following Objectives and Principles of Development Control.

**Council Wide**

- O 1 - The Development is not considered to be orderly
- O 18 - The development is considered to create traffic hazards and congestion
- O 48 - The proposed development does not allow for the retention of rural areas for the primary use of agriculture, pastoral and forestry purposes
- PDC 2 - The development is not considered to be orderly
- PDC 3 - Not a continuous extension of an existing built up area. Not located to achieve economy in the provision of public services, and has adverse impacts on living environments, impacts of noise and traffic etc.

**Port Elliot and Goolwa District**

- PDC 1 - Land proposed for living and other activities should be used for that purpose
- PDC 11 - Development impairs the character of site of natural beauty
- PDC 15 - Rural areas should be retained for rural uses

.../cont.

4.4 455/744/06 – Emmanuel Christian Schools & Ministries Inc (Continued)

Landscape (Port Elliot West) Zone

- O 1 - Development in this zone should accommodate detached dwellings in association with low intensity rural and rural living activities
- O 2 - Not compatible with the character of revegetated allotments, accommodating mixed small scale rural activities amongst scattered dwellings
- O 3 - Not compatible with the intended character. Degradation of township boundaries.
- PDC 1 - Zone caters for small scale rural residential use
- PDC 2 - Encourages mixed use residential development

ITEM 5. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - LAND DIVISION / COMMUNITY TITLE

ITEM 6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS - BUILDING

ITEM 7. MATTERS REFERRED FOR FOLLOW - UP

ITEM 8. GENERAL ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Meeting closed at: