

District Townships and Settlements Development Plan Amendment

Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council - Summary and Response to Agency Submissions, February 2015

Report on each submission received (including summary, comments and action take in response)

| No. | Name and Address | Submission Summary | Comment | Council Response |
|-----|--|---|---------|------------------|
| 1. | ElectraNet | ElectraNet advised that its assets are not impacted upon by the proposed changes to the Development Plan – and therefore has no objection to the DPA. | Noted | No change |
| 2. | Department of State Development (Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division) | <p>The Department of State Development advised that the Central Archive, which includes the Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects (the Register), administered by the Department of the State Development, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division, has no entries for Aboriginal sites within the affected area.</p> <p>Advised Council of its obligations under the Aboriginal Heritage Act.</p> <p>Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details.</p> | Noted | No change |
| 3. | SA Tourism Commission | <p>The SATC advised of its general support for the DPA.</p> <p>In particular, the SATC support the protection of the caravan park at Auburn via the rezoning to Recreation Zone, and the urban design policy approach in proximity to trails.</p> <p>Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details.</p> | Noted | No change |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|---|---|
| 4. | DPTI (Policy Branch) | Rural Living Zone - Armagh Asked Council to confirm the number of allotments affected by the zoning extension (within the area of Hayward Heights, south of Blyth Road) and advise how many of these 16 allotments have already been developed for rural living purposes. | 15 of the 16 lots have already been developed. | Clarification provided. No change. |
| | | Rural Living Auburn Land identified for rezoning at Auburn comprises approximately 32 hectares with 67 existing allotments. Council has advised that of these approximately 30 have been developed with housing and associated buildings. DPTI noted the area proposed for rezoning is not well connected to the existing Auburn township – and asked Council to provide comment on the potential demand for improved service provision, including social services, that the zoning change may create and how this may be addressed. | The area affected is located on the fringe of the township of Auburn and has good interconnectivity and access to community services at Auburn and also other nearby townships. This area was also highlighted in the Strategic Directions Report, which was the subject of consultation. | Clarification provided. No change. |
| | | Rural Living Mintaro The area at Mintaro comprises 4 vacant allotments located within the State Heritage Area (Mintaro), Township Fringe (Mintaro) Policy Area 9. Council is seeking to rezone the allotments to the Rural Living (Mintaro) Policy Area 8 and is seeking to amend existing policy to remove the minimum allotment size. Council should provide details on what impact, if any, the proposed zoning and policy amendments may have on the development potential over the whole of Policy Area 8. Council should also provide advice on the potential impact of further development on the heritage character of Mintaro. | Council seeks an amendment to the Procedural Matters Table for the State Heritage Area (Mintaro) Zone, as it relates to the Rural Living (Policy Area 8) – whereby Council seeks to remove the non-complying exception as it applies to Policy Area 8, meaning that detached dwellings would be assessed on merit. This affects only 3 vacant lots of less than 1.7 hectares – these 3 lots are each of 1.52 hectares offering large expansive design and siting options for future dwellings. Council has researched the Statement | Clarification provided. No change. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>of Investigations for the Mintaro DPA, 2007, where it can find no rationale for the non-complying clause for Policy Area 8, except that it was to restrict the further 'division of land' for lots less than 1.7 hectares.</p> <p>Council has also had regard to the original land survey plan for Mintaro, where it notes that the original land division pattern (as it affects the north western sector of the policy area) with a minimum lot size of 1.52 hectares, remains intact. Given the nature and size of land holdings within Policy Area 8, the Development Plan's aim to promote 'detached dwellings set amongst small scale agricultural and viticultural activity and associated outbuildings, and some small scale tourist accommodation....', is readily achievable.</p> <p>Importantly, no change is proposed to the land division non-complying trigger for lots of 1.7 hectares or greater.</p> | |
| | <p>Rural Living Zone – Policy 10</p> <p>Council is seeking the deletion of Policy 10 from the Rural Living Zone. The policy provides that a dwelling should have an allotment area of at least 1.5 hectares and a frontage to a public road not less than 25 metres.</p> <p>Policy 12 states that land division should create allotments with an area of at least 1.5 hectares and a frontage to a public road not less than 25 metres.</p> <p>DPTI noted that Council has argued that Policy 10 is to be</p> | <p>Having considered the feedback of DPTI, Council considers it would be wise to retain current PDC 10 of the Rural Living Zone relating to guidelines for site areas for dwellings.</p> <p>Therefore – to reinstate PDC 10 of the Rural Living Zone.</p> | <p>Delete existing Amendment 16 of the Amendment Instruction Table, in order for PDC 10 to be retained in the Rural Living Zone.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>deleted as it confuses criteria for dwellings with criteria relating to land division that is already appropriately covered by the same criteria in Policy 12.</p> <p>It is unclear however how this may affect dwelling development potential on existing allotments of less than 1.5 hectares and the potential impact this may have on amenity and infrastructure provision within the Rural Living Zone. Council should provide detail on the potential impact of this policy change on the number of potential additional dwellings that could be developed across the Rural Living Zone.</p> | | |
| | <p>Residential Mintaro</p> <p>Council has developed Concept Plans for Precincts 3 and 4 within the Residential (Mintaro) Policy Area 7 and is also seeking removal of the minimum allotment size. It is unclear if the proposed concept plans and removal of the minimum allotment size will increase or decrease the existing development potential in the area.</p> <p>It is also noted that Council proposes to delete the non-complying status for access within the State Heritage Area (Mintaro) 'Development with access to Burton Street in Precinct 3 Northern Residential'. It is unclear however what the reason behind this is.</p> | <p>Please refer to the Jensen Planning and Design Study and related investigations.</p> <p>The Concept Plan approach has been widely supported by the community, the Progress Association and the local Heritage Adviser.</p> <p>The State Heritage Branch has also been briefed and were supportive of the approach at both the pre-DPA and DPA consultation stage.</p> <p>Importantly, the land division policy and the non-complying trigger for land division remains as it relates to the Policy Area.</p> <p>Burton Street – Council considers there is no compelling reason for development fronting Burton Street to be non-complying and should be assessed on merit against the relevant Development Plan provisions and through the normal Schedule 8 referral</p> | <p>Clarification provided.</p> <p>No change.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | process. | |
| | <p>Residential – Riverton</p> <p>In response to an upgrade of the Community Wastewater Management System, two areas will be removed from the Riverton Low Density Housing Policy Area 4 and will fall under existing Residential Zone policies with a reduced allotment size.</p> <p>While the CWMS upgrade will provide for the more efficient use of residentially zoned land, Council has not indicated the development potential and the number of additional dwellings this may facilitate. Council has also noted that the Development Plan already provides substantial long-term growth opportunities at Riverton and in particular has considerable scope for in-fill housing.</p> <p>Council should provide details on the development potential as a result of the zoning change with regard to the number of additional dwellings that may be possible and how this will relate to overall supply.</p> <p>It is also noted that Council has removed policy 6, which relates to access from the Riverton Low Density Housing Policy Area 4. It is unclear why this has occurred along with the reason for reducing the minimum allotment frontage for the Residential Zone within the Riverton Township.</p> | <p>The removal of the two areas from the Low Density Policy Area (and inclusion in the Residential Zone) relates to approximately 38 hectares (20ha to east of town and 18ha to west) of land – under the Low Density provisions (4000m² lots) this area is likely to yield around 70 lots (also allowing for roads open space, site planning) and under the Residential Zone (700m² lots) is likely to yield around 250-300 lots (say ave of 10 lots/ha, less open space, lot range, roads etc).</p> <p>These figures are consistent with the findings and recommendations of the Strategic Directions Report and terms of the Statement of Intent.</p> <p>Policy 6 of the Riverton Low Density Housing Policy Area 4 has been removed, as it references streets off Torrens Road – there are no streets off of Torrens Road that relate. Therefore this appears to be an error/anomaly in the current Development Plan and is now rectified by the DPA – notwithstanding, this matter is also now better addressed by the proposed Concept Plans.</p> <p>A frontage criteria of 15 metres is considered more appropriate and less restrictive towards modern day residential development than the current 20 metre provision – and is a guiding principle only.</p> | <p>Clarification provided.</p> <p>No change.</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <p>Residential – Auburn</p> <p>Two areas at Auburn are proposed for rezoning to Residential to the north and south of the township and will provide for approximately 70 additional allotments.</p> <p>Council has argued that residential land at Auburn is predominately developed with the exception of limited infill opportunities and undeveloped pockets of land. Council has not clearly identified the overall land supply situation however.</p> <p>Council should provide detail on the number of existing vacant allotments together with the number of allotments available for development with regard to development limitations due to configuration or ownership etc. and how the proposed rezoning will affect this situation.</p> | <p>Council identified through a thorough Strategic Directions Review which land at Auburn was most suitable for rezoning – this had regard to community input, consultation and consideration of site suitability and demand/supply factors.</p> <p>The areas to be rezoned are fully consistent with the population and spatial analysis outlined in the Strategic Directions Report, DPA and Statement of Intent.</p> <p>Further, consistent research and investigations were provided in the detailed public submission by Master Plan in relation demand and supply.</p> <p>Council has not supported any additional requests for rezoning of land at Auburn (refer public submissions made during DPA consultation).</p> | <p>Clarification provided. No change.</p> |
| | <p>Residential and Deferred Urban – Saddleworth</p> <p>Land proposed for rezoning at Saddleworth comprises approximately 7.3 hectares as Residential and 25 hectares to Deferred Urban.</p> <p>It is noted that the land proposed for Deferred Urban is located over four allotments and provisions within the Zone accommodate construction of a detached dwelling on existing allotments and could therefore provide for the construction of 4 additional dwellings. Aerial photography would indicate there may already be three existing dwellings however.</p> <p>Council should provide detail on the potential for additional</p> | <p>The area to be rezoned to Deferred Urban is consistent with the Strategic Directions Report, DPA and Statement of Intent.</p> <p>The Strategic Direction for Saddleworth was based on a clear and careful analysis by Council.</p> <p>The land has been identified by Council as a 'strategic site'. The land is located in close proximity to the town centre and directly adjoins the school and community facilities – although there is no immediate demand for the land to</p> | <p>Clarification provided. No change.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>dwellings, if any, within the Deferred Urban Zone as a result of the proposed amendment.</p> | <p>be rezoned, Council seeks to recognise the findings of the Strategic Directions Report by having the land set-aside as Deferred Urban for potential future urban purposes. A Deferred Urban Zone would prevent the land from being fragmented in advance of need for urban purposes – in the meantime the land would retain its use rights for farming purposes. A watercourse traverses through the subject land and as identified on flood mapping, part of the land is subject to inundation – this would reduce the available area of land for possible future urban purposes, but also offers urban design opportunities for open space, landscape and natural features, interconnectivity within the land and also linking to the township centre.</p> <p>The potential for future dwellings would be highly dependent on the scope/nature of a future development and future separate DPA – the intent of the Deferred Urban Zone is clearly that the zone is not for housing alone, but to offer a future range (subject to future rezoning) of community, educational, open space and broader urban purposes – this is outlined in the Strategic Directions Report and also described in the Desired Character Statement for the Deferred Urban Zone.</p> | |
|--|---|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>Supply and Demand</p> <p>Council undertook an analysis of supply and demand, where land is proposed to be rezoned for urban purposes at Auburn, Riverton and Saddleworth.</p> <p>Analysis concluded that Council's growth targets were achievable in terms of available zoned land and land identified for rezoning with in fact an over-supply of land to 2030. Council has argued that in the context of promoting and stimulating well managed development within townships, that this is appropriate.</p> <p>It is unclear however what the total number of allotments available for development is currently and what will be as a result of Council's proposed amendments with respect to rural living and residential land use across the Council area and areas subject to zoning changes.</p> <p>Council should provide information on what the total number of allotments available for residential and rural living development is currently and what will be available as a result of the proposed amendments. Council should also provide detail on what the anticipated development capacity will be as a result of the zoning amendments and how this will affect anticipated demand.</p> | <p>Council considers that this has been provided in detail in the DPA investigations and in the Strategic Directions Report – there is a detailed population and demand/supply analysis in both documents.</p> <p>The investigations are consistent with the detailed research undertaken as part of the recent Strategic Directions Report, adopted by Council and the Minister.</p> <p>The DPA is also consistent with the areas outlined for rezoning in the Statement of Intent.</p> <p>The areas for rezoning are totally consistent with the Strategic Directions Report and the Statement of Intent.</p> <p>Council has not supported any additional requests for rezoning of land (refer public submissions made during DPA consultation), except for the two minor boundary anomalies outlined in the SCPA report.</p> <p>The oversupply scenario that exists at Riverton is by virtue of the existing Development Plan (not the proposed DPA) – the Council has not sought to introduce any new additional urban zoned land at Riverton (only to introduce better and more forward thinking planning, backed up by soundly researched concept planning, generated by leading urban design planners), consistent with the Strategic</p> | <p>Clarification provided. No change.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Directions Report and Statement of Intent.</p> <p>No rezoning of Deferred Urban land at Riverton has been proposed.</p> <p>Council is confident that the DPA balances the need to foster, promote and welcome economic development in small rural townships – meeting a range of key local and state objectives, with sound and well developed urban planning strategies.</p> | |
| | <p>Technical comments - Policy 9, Page 78</p> <p>The BCA has minimum requirements and heights for sub-floor ventilation for transportable buildings. The requirement to solidly enclose conflicts with the ventilation requirements.</p> <p>The BCA also calls up Australian Standard AS 3660.1 which prescribes the minimum inspection height above the ground to the under floor level for suspended floors for the purposes of termite management.</p> | <p>Noted – Policy 9 was developed in consultation with DPTI staff and is for visual amenity/planning reasons.</p> <p>Regard would need to be had to the terms of a Planning Consent and any related conditions by a Building Certifier at the Building Rules stage, with regard to Building Rules compliance – also bushfire provisions often require enclosure of sub-floor areas.</p> | No change. |
| | <p>Mapping</p> <p>Council is requested to note comments for minor amendments to mapping.</p> | <p>Agree – amend:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Index Map – to reflect zone changes • Zone Index Map CGV/1 – to reflect zone changes • Overlay Index Map CGV/1 – re trails • Concept Plan Map CGV/3 – to renumber to Map 2. | <p>Agree – these amendments do not relate to any zone changes – and are minor formatting type amendments.</p> <p>Council to liaise with DPTI mapping branch on the required changes.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details. | - | - |
| 5. | DPTI (Transport division) | <p>Riverton</p> <p>Transport SA does not object to the rezoning of the affected areas to accommodate smaller lot sizes, nor to the inclusion of Concept Plans CGV/4 and 5 in the Development Plan.</p> <p>However it advises that the final location and design of a single junction with Washington Road/Riverton Road is subject to the outcomes of a TIA at a land division stage.</p> <p>The location of the "connector (collector) street" shown on Concept Plans CGV/4 and CGV/5 is generally consistent with the location of the previously agreed junction. In line with this, DPTI - Transport is prepared to consider the installation of a single junction only serving the affected area. Direct property access will not be contemplated – requires the removal of the dashed lines that extend south from Washington Road/Riverton Road as these imply additional access locations, and the placement of a bold line along Washington Road/Riverton Road that makes it explicit that individual property accesses are not envisaged.</p> | <p>Agree to amend Concept Plan Map CGV/4 and CGV/5 to remove the dashed lines that extend south from Washington Road/Riverton Road, and to show a bold line along Washington Road/Riverton Road showing that individual property accesses are not envisaged.</p> <p>However, given the extent of the zoned land area, the vast length of road and the clear sight distances, it is not reasonable (in a sound planning sense) to limit the number of interconnection points to Washington Road/Riverton Road to one (1) point only – the Concept Plans have been developed by leading Urban Design planners having regard to planning and infrastructure requirements.</p> | <p>To amend Concept Plan Map CGV/4 and CGV/5 to remove the dashed lines that extend south from Washington Road/Riverton Road, and to show a bold line along Washington Road/Riverton Road showing that individual property accesses are not envisaged.</p> |
| | | <p>Auburn</p> <p>Concept Plan Map CGV/3 delineates the anticipated locations of the road reserves within the subject land. The proposed connection to Horrocks Highway/Main North Road falls within a section of road that has w-beam barrier along the western side. Given that this barrier was installed for road safety reasons, DPTI does not support a junction at this location and requests that no connection to Horrocks Highway/Main North Road be shown at this location.</p> <p>The land at the southern extremity of Auburn has limited frontage to Horrocks Highway and should be accessed solely via South Street.</p> | <p>Agree to amend Concept Plan Map CGV/3 to remove the delineation of a proposed road connection to Horrocks Highway/Main North Road, Auburn.</p> <p>Noted – no change required.</p> | <p>To amend Concept Plan Map CGV/3 to remove the delineation of a proposed road connection to Horrocks Highway/Main North Road, Auburn.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Deferred Urban Land | <p>DPTI - Transport notes the proposal to rezone land to the north of Saddleworth as Deferred Urban. DPTI - Transport recommends that any rezoning of the land for urban development be accompanied by a TIA and that the creation of new junctions with the Barrier Highway be avoided.</p> | <p>Noted – Council considers this is not required for Deferred Urban zoning. However, this is for consideration at the time of a future DPA that might contemplate the rezoning of the land from Deferred Urban to Residential or some other form of Urban Development Zone.</p> | No change. |
| | Industry Zone - Saddleworth | <p>DPTI - Transport does not object in-principle to the expansion of the Industry Zone in Saddleworth (Zone Map CGV/13). However, the rationale for the Zone straddling the arterial road is unclear and, as a general rule, should be avoided. Council should seek to understand the impacts of increased heavy vehicle movements on the junctions with Marrabel Road as part of any future development of the land. This will require the applicant to produce a Traffic Impact Assessment, with all costs associated with any required upgrades being borne by the developer.</p> | <p>Noted – the rezoning seeks to recognise the existing approved land use of the AW Vater development.</p> <p>However, in light of the various submissions in opposition to the rezoning of land on the north western corner of Crawfords Road and Behns Road, and having regard to the option recommended by the EPA in the Agency Response Summary (that a Light Industry Zone be favoured in preference to an Industry Zone), Council proposes to rezone the land to 'Light Industry' instead of 'Industry'.</p> <p>In response to this submission and a related land owner submission, Council also agrees to alter the zoning of Lot 440 Ashton Road, Saddleworth, from proposed Industry Zone to Primary Production Zone.</p> | <p>To amend Map CGV/13 (as it affects the existing proposed Industry Zone on the north western corner of Crawfords Road and Behns Road) to alter the zoning to Light Industry – and to insert a new Light Industry Zone from the SA Planning Policy Library accordingly.</p> <p>To amend Map CGV/13 to alter the zoning of Lot 440 Ashton Road, Saddleworth, from proposed Industry Zone to Primary Production Zone.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>Mapping</p> <p>Overlay Map - Transport – to show Jolly Way/Burton Street from Horrocks Highway/Main North Road, Sevenhill to Leasingham Road, Mintaro as an arterial road.</p> <p>The term "Primary and Secondary Arterial" shown in the Overlay Maps should be replaced with the terminology used within the "Functional Hierarchy for South Australia's Land Transport Network document", which can be located on the web via the following link: www.sa.gov.au/transport/corridors. For example, Horrocks Highway and Barrier Highway are Freight and Direct Tourist Routes, Barrier Highway is also a Major Traffic Route.</p> <p>It is further advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The railway line from Hamley Bridge to Burra, while currently dormant, is privately-owned and therefore could be reactivated in the future. This rail line should be shown on Overlay Map CGV/1 Transport. • Concept Plan Map CGV/4 Riverton Residential Areas shows a rail line branching off the above railway that runs through Riverton and heading west towards Rhynie. This line has been closed - it's now part of the Rattler Trail - and therefore should be removed from this map or delineated as 'Rattler Trail', consistent with the overlay maps. • Overlay Map CGV/15 Transport (for Riverton) should show the existing railway than runs through the township and heads north to Burra. | <p>Agree.</p> <p>In liaison with DPTI Policy Branch, this is not required as is not DPA drafting convention.</p> <p>Details sought from DPTI – pending.</p> <p>Agree – amend accordingly.</p> <p>Details sought from DPTI – pending.</p> | <p>To liaise with DPTI mapping branch accordingly.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>To liaise with DPTI mapping branch accordingly.</p> <p>To amend Concept Plan Map CGV/4 Riverton Residential Areas to show the old rail line branching westwards off of the main Hamley Bridge/Burra line as part of the Rattler Trail.</p> <p>To liaise with DPTI mapping branch accordingly.</p> |
| | <p>Flood Risk / Mapping</p> <p>Transport SA commends Council for undertaking detailed flood mapping.</p> | Agree. | To amend Concept Plan Maps CGV/7 so that the |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| | | However, recommends Concept Plan Maps CGV/7 be amended so that the references to "flood free" are replaced with "outside of the 1:100 year ARI flood plain". | | references to "flood free" are replaced with "outside of the 1:100 year ARI flood plain". |
| | | Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details. | | |
| 6. | Department of State Development (Strategic Economic and Policy Division) | <p>The Department of State Development supports the employment and economic development outcomes envisaged by rezoning of land at Riverton and Saddleworth for commercial/industry development.</p> <p>The submission also related to various general comments supporting (and seeking additional provisions) on the heading of energy efficiency and solar access.</p> <p>Further comments related to existing townships or policy matters outside of the scope of this DPA. Also raised query relating to development on land surrounding the Moomba to Adelaide high pressure pipe line.</p> <p>Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Development Plan contains SA Planning Policy Library core text, adopted at a cross-government agency approach in relation to energy efficiency and solar access.</p> <p>No rezoning of land is proposed on land surrounding the Moomba to Adelaide high pressure pipe line.</p> | No change. |
| 7. | SA Water | <p>The submission provided general comments relating to SA Water planning, water source protection, infrastructure provision and trade waste.</p> <p>Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details.</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| 8. | EPA | <p>The EPA was pleased that investigations informing the DPA have considered the majority of issues within the scope of the objects of the Environment Protection Act 1993.</p> <p>At the DPA stage, the EPA works to ensure that appropriate planning policy is included in the Development Plan to allow</p> | Noted. | - |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| | | <p>proper assessment at the development application stage.</p> <p>The EPA may also provide advice to assist with preparation and assessment of subsequent development proposals.</p> | | |
| | | <p>Site contamination</p> <p>Various commentary regarding site contamination and Site History Reports provided.</p> <p>Acknowledged the DPA proposes to introduce the Hazards module from the SAPPL which contains the most recent site contamination provisions. Whilst the EPA supports the adoption of this module, the following amendments are further recommended to ensure that where the preliminary site history reports prepared by AWE (July 2014) have identified localised intensive and higher risk agricultural activities where sensitive land uses are proposed, a site contamination audit report would be required at the development application stage. As such, the EPA recommends the following wording be adopted into the Desired Character Statement (DCS) of the proposed Residential Zone:</p> <p><i>Some parts of the residential zone in Auburn, Riverton and Saddleworth have historically been used for horticultural and intensive agricultural uses which may give rise to contamination. Development is expected to occur on a precautionary basis where the sites have been verified that they are suitable for the intended use, particularly where it involves sensitive uses like residential development.</i></p> | <p>Noted - agree.</p> | <p>Insert the text in the Desired Charterer Statement of the Residential Zone accordingly.</p> |
| | | <p>Water quality</p> <p>The EPA supports the intent of adopting the 1 in 100 ARI flood mapping into relevant Development Plan Constraints Overlays. The EPA congratulates Council in adopting the</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | <p>Overlay Development Constraint flood maps into its Development Plan.</p> <p>The EPA is supportive of the proposed Deferred Urban Zone given that it would be read in conjunction with the proposed Development Constraints Overlay Map CGV/12 (Saddleworth). However, future rezoning of this land to urban use would need to be cognisant of anticipated flood events and risks as identified in the proposed Overlay Map CGV/12. Future rezoning of this site should implement a concept plan or consider open space zoning that ensures development occurs outside of extreme flood event areas.</p> <p>The EPA recommends PDC 11 of the Township Zone also be amended to reference the townships of Manoora, Rhynie and Tarlee (not just Stockport) as follows:</p> <p><i>No development should be undertaken on land identified on Overlay Maps – Development Constraints CGV/10, CGV/14, CGV/18 and CGV/19 unless it is able to be appropriately sited, designed and undertaken in accordance with hazard and flood management provisions contained in the General Section – Hazards.</i></p> <p>It is noted that AW Vater site, currently located to the south east of Saddleworth, is proposed to be rezoned to an Industrial Zone. The northern portion of this proposed Industrial Zone is subject to high and extreme flooding events. Given industrial activities are associated with potentially polluting activities (i.e. chemical storage and processing of dangerous goods etc.), the EPA considers this rezoning may potentially introduce additional risks to water pollution particularly the Gilbert River floodplain. The site is proposed to be rezoned to industry to reflect approved activities undertaken by AW Vater, however the EPA concern is that if this use ceases, wishes to expand or the site on-sold it could be used for any form of industry including heavy and special industry. Stormwater runoff</p> | <p>Agree – noted. Any rezoning of this land to Residential or other Urban Zone would be the subject of future investigations at a separate DPA stage.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> | <p>No change.</p> <p>To alter Amendment 24 of the Amendment Instructions accordingly.</p> <p>To amend Map CGV/13 (as it affects the existing proposed Industry Zone on the north western corner of Crawfords Road and Behns Road, Saddleworth) to alter the zoning to Light Industry – and to insert a new Light Industry Zone from the SA Planning Policy Library accordingly.</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|--|---|--------|------------|
| | <p>from industrial land can contain a mixture of metals and metalloids, hydrocarbons, organic solvents, suspended solids and nutrients. The EPA considers any development and associated planning policy should ensure a neutral water quality impact be achieved. As outlined in the most recent version (version 6) of the SAPPL, the Light Industry Zone envisages land uses such as offices in association with and ancillary to industry, service industry, store and warehouse. The EPA considers these types of land uses to have a lower risk of creating water pollution when compared to those activities envisaged solely in an Industry Zone. In light of this concern the EPA recommends rezoning the affected area to 'Light Industry' instead of the proposed 'Industry Zone'.</p> <p>The DPA states that Auburn, Armagh and Mintaro anticipate onsite wastewater disposal. The EPA has assessed the affected areas of these townships and acknowledges they are not located on land subject to flood inundation as identified in the proposed development constraints flood mapping. The EPA is satisfied these areas are located outside of flood prone areas.</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| | <p>Wastewater</p> <p>Given the proposed residential land uses within the townships of Auburn, Armagh and Mintaro are not located within a water protection area, nor subject to flood inundation (as discussed earlier) and have minimum allotment sizes ranging from 1200m² to 1.7 hectares, the EPA is satisfied these affected areas would be adequate for on – site wastewater disposal.</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| | <p>Interface between Land Uses</p> <p>The EPA is pleased the most recent 'interface between land uses' module will be adopted in the DPA to assist in mitigating potential noise and air quality impacts from primary production/agricultural type land uses.</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| | | | | |
|----|-------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>The proposed rezoning of existing rural living land to the south of Saddleworth would result in the expansion of an existing Industry Zone – abutting existing residential land to the north. The use of buffers in this instance is supported by the EPA and as such, it is recommended that a Concept Plan Map for Saddleworth also be implemented to ensure adequate mitigation measures would be implemented between the existing residential and proposed industrial interface. Where such a buffer cannot be created it may be necessary to control or minimise noise or air emissions through engineering solutions (e.g. acoustic barriers and attenuation mounds) at the source, where feasible, or through architectural design (e.g. control at the receiver through bedrooms and living spaces facing away from noise sources, external design and orientation of buildings to avoid stagnant air and promote turbulence thereby minimising pollutant build-up).</p> | <p>Agree, however, the DPA has already included a provision for a 25 metre minimum landscape buffer to the Residential Zone at Saddleworth via PDC 6 of the Industry Zone – a concept plan that replicates this PDC is not considered necessary.</p> | No change. |
| | | <p>Please refer to the copy of the written submission for further details.</p> | - | - |
| 9. | DEWNR | <p>Flood mapping and policy</p> <p>DEWNR supports the inclusion of the proposed flooding Development Constraints Overlay maps which are assumed to indicate the extent of the various levels of flood hazard (i.e. Low, Medium, High, Extreme, based on depth and velocity – if this is the case the Disclaimer on Overlay Map CGV/1 Development Constraints should be amended accordingly) in the Clare Gilbert Valleys Council during a 1 in 100 year ARI flood event. However, DEWNR notes that the proposed policy just states that future development in the respective areas should adequately address this issue in accordance with the (existing) General Hazards policies, the latter of which do not differentiate between how to address low, medium, high and extreme flooding hazards as indicated in the mapping.</p> | <p>Noted – Council considers the disclaimer is appropriate based on the work undertaken by Australian Water Environments and overlays prepared in liaison with DPTI mapping branch.</p> <p>Consideration of the Low, Medium, High, Extreme flood risk areas would be undertaken at a Development Application stage, where ordinarily the Council would require a hydrological report to be submitted as part of the assessment process with regard to the nature of the development and the nature of the flood hazard.</p> | No change - DPTI mapping branch to alter if required. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|
| | <p>Mintaro State Heritage Area</p> <p>DEWNR notes that the DPA proposes various amendments relating to Mintaro.</p> <p>The DPA introduces two new Concept Plan Maps CGV/7 & CGV/8. Concept Plan Map CGV/7 covers Precinct 3 of Residential (Mintaro) Policy Area 7 and specifies certain criteria for the siting of dwellings on allotments. The Unit is generally supportive of these proposed criteria.</p> <p>Seeks that the State Heritage Guidelines, recently released by DEWNR, be consistent with those contained in the Development Plan.</p> | <p>Noted the support of State Heritage on Concept Plan Maps CGV/7 & CGV/8.</p> <p>Any future review or inclusion of the revised DEWNR Guidelines would be considered via the Heritage DPA scheduled for 2017-18, for which DEWNR supports.</p> | No change. |
|--|--|--|------------|