

132 Mead Street
Peterhead 5016
November 6th 2007

To Development Assessment Commission – Port Waterfront

Thank you for the opportunity for public comment on Stage 2B of the Newport Quays development.

As a non-planner I am not able to assess the claims made by the developers e.g. about the amount of open space provided, and would have greatly appreciated access to information beyond that provided by the proponents. I would like to recommend that the community have access to any submissions by Planning SA, the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and the City of Port Adelaide Enfield Urban Design Review Panel.

The manner in which small areas of the development are submitted for approval does not inspire confidence in the developers or the planning system. The developers have completely disregarded the height limits proposed for area 2B. They are suggesting, in the diagrams provided, plans for the adjoining area of 2C as though we were to regard these plans for Stage 2C as having some validity. Until Stage 2C is submitted for formal approval then the designs provide no guarantees of the developers' intentions. There were due to be 2x12 story buildings in area 2C and now there are 5 in Stages 2B and 2C. Will there be more by the time Stage 2C is submitted to DAC? Are we meant to be grateful that there are only 2 x 12 story buildings in Stage 2C and accept 3 where there were due to be none?

My overwhelming impression of Stage 2B is that it is seeking to maximise commercial returns by providing high rise blocks with waterfront views, further marina berths and retail activities that have access to a 'public' square. The development is inconsistent with its surrounding location, with mass and density that will be incongruous. A promenade around the waterfront of the development and the square adjoining the promenade will provide very limited opportunities for public activity. Since it can be uncomfortable for people to linger before people's private properties, it seems particularly unlikely that the promenade and jetty near Building E will be effective public space. The development of Stages 2B and 2C, like the areas developed before them, seem to be actively designed as enclaves remote from the adjoining neighbourhoods.

It has been apparent in the promotion by the developers that they are benefiting commercially from the Port's natural attributes e.g. the dolphins that come into the inner harbour and the maritime heritage of the Port, when the development is actively diminishing those assets e.g. affecting the feeding grounds of the dolphins with marinas and neglecting or demolishing evidence of the Port as a working port.

The sustainability of the development requires further consideration e.g. the orientation of Buildings D and G principally east west as large glass structures, the uncertain extent of rain water capture and reuse and the potential difficulty of noise from the adjoining marinas.

The developers pursuit of their commercial objectives e.g. with threats to sue the Council, and the proposals for Stage 2B continue a process of alienation of many in the local community. Substantial reworking of the plans and effective community engagement, with real commitments that benefit the Port and its residents, while maintaining its heritage and beauty, would be welcome.

Yours sincerely

Catherine McMahon