

MEETING OF PLANNING EXPERTS – Port Adelaide Residents Environment Action Group (ERD 308/2013)

Dennis Batge (DB) & Djordje Rogic (DR)

FRIDAY 9 MAY 2014

Item and Comments

1. *Relevant Zones* – Commercial, Residential & Policy Area 65 & Industry Zones – Agreed that the land is primarily within the Commercial Zone with only a limited portion of the site in the Residential Zone. The Industry Zone is relevant only insofar as it is an abutting zone.
2. *Locality* – similar localities adopted but DB's is slightly wider – no changes.
3. *Land Use* – no disagreement over the overall nature of what is proposed. Broader than 'petrol filling station' as defined in the Development Regulations 2008.
Agreed that the subject land may be used for commercial kinds of land uses but this is subject to minimising impacts on the Residential Zone and Policy Area 65.
4. *Boundary fencing* – there was some uncertainty regarding the extent of the boundary fencing along the southern and southern portion of the western boundary.
5. *Relevant provisions of the Development Plan* – it was agreed on the part of both planners to make some amendments to harmonise their list of relevant provisions. DB included some additional provisions but GR did not think all of these were necessarily relevant to forming his opinion. It was agreed to include reference Procedural Matters for the Commercial and Residential Zones as these are relevant to the non-complying status of the proposal in each of these zones. For example GR agreed with DB's listing and commenting on energy efficiency he did not as he did not consider these issues fundamental to the development.
6. It was agreed that reference should be made to flooding issues but as definitive information is lacking at this stage, that it would be left to relevant experts to inform the Court as to the extent of any such issues.
7. Although the land is close to coastal waters is not coastal land as defined in the Development Regulations 2008, being more than 100m from the coast.
8. It was agreed that there is potential for impact on amenity from noise and is a planning matter. GR thought it was acceptable but DB has some concerns. Both agreed that the precise level of likely noise generated by the proposal is a matter for the relevant experts to advise the Court.
9. *Traffic* – it was generally agreed that traffic movements would be safe and convenient and that car parking would be adequate. DB is concerned that the location of the Hargrave Street access is detrimental to amenity however. Both defer to traffic experts on the safety and convenience of traffic movements.
10. *Minimisation of impacts on amenity* - It was not agreed as the acceptability of attempts to minimise the impacts on the amenity of premises within the Residential Zone. GR thought it was sufficient but DB did not.
11. *Signage* – there was a difference of opinion between GR and DB on the appropriateness and location of the 9m high pylon sign in particular. GR considered it acceptable and DB did not.

GR maintained his support for the proposal and DB did not support it and their overall opinions remain as set out in their statements.



Djordje Rogic
12 May 2014



Dennis Batge
12 May 2014