

Yorke Peninsula Council



South Australian Government Region: Yorke Mid North

Date: February 2015

This document has been developed by the Department of Planning and Local Government (DPLG) and is intended to assist councils in preparing and submitting a Strategic Directions Report, as required under section 30 of the *Development Act 1993* (the Act).

Disclaimer

While every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that this document is correct at the time of publication, the Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, the State of South Australia, its agencies, instrumentalities, employees and contractors disclaim any and all liability to any person in respect to anything or the consequence of anything done or omitted to be done in reliance upon the whole or any part of this document.

© Government of South Australia. Published 2011. All rights reserved.

About this template

The template has been designed to assist councils in preparing and submitting a Strategic Directions Report (SDR) by simplifying the process and focusing on achieving the policies and targets of the South Australian Planning Strategy.

Please refer to DPLG's *Guide to preparing Strategic Directions Reports* for reporting requirements and background information.

Completed SDRs should be submitted to the Director, Strategic Policy Division, Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure.

By hand: Level 4
136 North Terrace
Adelaide SA 5000

By mail: GPO Box 1815
Adelaide SA 5001

By email: malcolm.govett@sa.gov.au

For further information, please telephone the Strategic Policy Division on 08 8303 0600.

1. Previous reviews under Section 30 of the Act

Has the council previously undertaken a Section 30 review?	Yes
If yes, on what date was the previous review approved by the relevant Minister?	<p>Latest review was officially approved on 13/10/1998.</p> <p>A review was undertaken in 2006 and a report was submitted to the Minister pursuant to Section 30 of the Development Act 1993, however, no approval has been received.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the majority of the recommendations from the 2006 review have been completed as evidenced below.</p>
What amendments did the council subsequently make to the Development Plan?	<p>The following DPAs have occurred as a consequence of the recommendations of the 2006 review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ardrossan Rural Living DPA (Consolidated 7 October 2010)- Better Development Plan and General DPA (Consolidated 22 November 2012)- Port Vincent DPA (Consolidated 6 February 2014)- Four Towns (Maitland, Minlaton, Yorketown and Warooka) DPA (Consolidated 6 February 2014)- Edithburgh Town and Surrounds DPA, to be submitted for approval <p>Note additional amendments by Council and the Minister have also been made since 2006.</p>

2. Responding to Planning Strategy policies/targets

Councils are expected to indicate how and where they intend to achieve alignment of their area Development Plan with the South Australia Planning Strategy. Please include a description of how each policy or target will be achieved and the rationale.

Yorke Peninsula Regional Land Use Framework

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
Objective 1: Recognise and protect the Region's environmental assets		
1. Prevent adverse impacts of land use and development on the quality and functioning of water eco-systems, including dryland salinity, erosion of river banks, overuse of resources and pollution	Addressed by existing policy	Natural Resources policy within the General section of the Development Plan largely addresses these issues.
2. Retain natural drainage patterns and design housing, roads and open space around watercourses and natural contours, and make provision for buffers	Addressed by existing policy	Existing policy seeks to preserve natural drainage systems and requires development to provide a buffer of at least 20 metres wide from the top of existing banks on each side of a watercourse.
4. Establish Coastal Zones and manage development to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise the impact of development and land uses, including cumulative impacts, on natural processes and systems • Limit development in areas of natural coasts of high conservation or landscape value unless the proposal has a neutral or beneficial effect • Prevent disturbance of natural coastal habitats and native vegetation • Provide buffer areas of sufficient width to separate new development from the foreshore and sensitive coastal features, accommodating long term physical coastal processes (i.e. that 	Addressed by existing policy	<p>Outside of townships the coastal margins within the Council area are located within Coastal Conservation zone. In this zone, development is restricted and policy seeks principally to conserve the natural features of the coastal environment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged, that further work needs to be done with regard to vulnerable shack sites to ensure impacts of sea level rise and erosion are suitably managed.</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
may result in the movement of the coastline)		
5. Developments such as marinas and port facilities should be considered as special cases which require specific and detailed studies, including environmental impact assessments	Addressed by existing policy	Development Plan contains policy relating to Marinas and Maritime structures. Issues to be addressed at the Development Assessment stage The Plan also contains various policy relating to environmental protection particularly in coastal areas
6. Locate and design development to prevent further loss, degradation and fragmentation of native vegetation, on public and private land, including within townships	Addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan contains policy which requires development to be designed and sited to minimise clearance of native vegetation. In addition, any clearance of native vegetation is dealt with under the Native Vegetation Act.
9. Preserve areas of high landscape and amenity value and areas forming an attractive background or entrance to towns or tourist developments, and along the coast	Addressed by existing policy	High landscape areas are principally held within the Coastal Conservation, Coastal Open Space and Primary Production zones where development is restricted. In addition Siting and Visibility provisions require development to be designed and sited to protect scenically attractive areas, particularly natural, rural and coastal landscapes.
10. Prevent or design development to retain high quality landscapes that can be viewed from tourist routes, walking trails or the sea, including by addressing the location, height, material and colour of buildings	Addressed by existing policy	Refer above

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
Objective 2: Ensure efficient use of water and energy		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate efficient use of water into the design and planning of residential and industrial developments and clusters/subdivisions, including innovative water capture, treatment, storage and re-use practices 2. Maximise the use of rainwater, treated wastewater and stormwater in industrial, commercial, residential and recreation developments 3. Reduce energy requirements of industrial and residential buildings and estates by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring energy efficient design to ensure buildings are cooler in summer and warmer in winter • Actively supporting the use of renewable energy options in building designs and subdivisions • Consolidating townships and strengthening the role and function of centres to reduce the need to travel, support regional passenger transport networks, and enable people to undertake a number of activities in one location • Strategically clustering and locating export industries in locations with high proximity to freight corridors, ports and intermodals to increase the efficiency of freight movement • Providing for walking and cycling within townships through the provision of safe and convenient linkages and bicycle parking facilities 	<p>Addressed by existing policy</p>	<p>Existing policy within the Development Plan addresses these provisions particularly the Energy Efficiency module and Land Division policy which requires the design of subdivisions to promote energy efficient building orientation and linkages to open space areas.</p> <p>The Development Plan also contains policy encouraging Water Sensitive Urban Design and the capture and reuse of stormwater.</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
Objective 3: Protect people, property and the environment from exposure to hazards		
<p>1. Design and plan for development in accordance with the risk management hierarchy of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance: avoiding permanent development within and adjacent to areas at risk from hazards • Adaptation: designing buildings and infrastructure to minimise risk in the long term • Protection: the establishment of protection works to protect existing development or facilitate major development <p>2. Plan development to prevent the creation of hazards - including through erosion, site contamination, air and noise pollution, disturbing or mobilising acid sulphate soils, diversion of water courses or impeding the flow of flood waters</p>	<p>Existing policy largely addresses hazards, however, one outstanding issue relates to impact of sea level rise. The following recommendation is proposed to address this.</p> <p>Continue the review of vulnerable shack sites in conjunction with DEWNR and once complete, use the findings to assist identify those sites at risk of sea level rise and introduce policy to manage and guide development on those sites.</p>	<p>Provisions are contained within the Development Plan pertaining to hazards. These provisions cater for all of the issues mentioned in goal 3.2.</p> <p>As discussed, one issue that requires attention is the impact of sea level rise on existing vulnerable shack sites. DEWNR is currently assessing shack sites in the Council area and subject to the outcomes of the assessment, additional policy may need to be introduced to assist manage development of vulnerable shack site in the future.</p>
Objective 4: Effectively manage waste, wastewater and stormwater		

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
<p>1. Manage waste in accordance with the principles of reducing, recovering and recycling, by ensuring settlements and developments incorporate appropriate space, facilities, access and construction methods</p> <p>2. Manage stormwater to reduce risk of flood and pollution, improve water quality, and maximise opportunities for reuse</p> <p>3. Plan for effective wastewater disposal through mains sewer and Community Wastewater Management Systems (CWMS), and maximise reuse opportunities</p>	Addressed by existing policy	<p>The Development Plan contains policy encouraging Water Sensitive Urban Design and the capture and reuse of stormwater.</p> <p>The plan also contains the Waste module which seeks to reduce, reuse and recycle waste and provides siting and design guidelines for wastewater treatment systems.</p>
Objective 5: Identify and protect places of heritage and cultural Significance		
<p>1. Protect and conserve place of heritage and cultural value, including local and registered (State and National) sites</p>	<p>Largely addressed by existing policy, however, whilst not considered at priority at the moment, a Local Heritage DPA may need to be undertaken in the future to identify local heritage places within the Council area</p>	<p>The conservation of heritage places is largely dealt with by the existing Heritage provisions in the Development Plan and Table YoP/6 lists the State Heritage Place found within the Council Area.</p> <p>It is noted that existing BDP policy refers to local heritage places, however, no local heritage places are identified within the Council area. For relevance sake reference to local heritage places within the Development Plan may need to be removed, until Council undertakes a Local Heritage DPA.</p>
<p>2. Involve Aboriginal people and the State Government's Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division early in the planning or development process, to assist in identifying</p>	Continue to adhere to the ILUA agreement	<p>The ILUA agreement between Council and the Narrunga Nation Aboriginal Corporation established policies for consultation with local Aboriginal people in relation to development</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
and protecting sites of cultural significance and for guidance in relation to Native Title and Indigenous Land Use Agreement requirements		proposals.
Objective 6: Protect and build on the Region's strategic freight transport, storage and processing infrastructure		
1. Cluster primary production, processing and storage activities in strategic locations, particularly key freight transport nodes, to maximise transport efficiencies	Addressed by existing policy	Key transport and storage infrastructure within the Council area is appropriately held within the Bulk Handling zones and all of which are conveniently located adjacent ports or arterial roads.
2. Provide for future expansion of industry clusters and establish appropriate buffers to protect strategic infrastructure from encroachment by sensitive uses	To be considered as part of future DPAs	Issues to be investigated as part of the rezoning process when new or expansions of existing Industry zones are proposed.
3. Manage interfaces with residential areas and other sensitive uses	Addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan contains policy specifically oriented to deal with interface issues, which takes into account buffers.
4. Provide for the development of small scale value-adding (processing and storage) activities that complement local agriculture, livestock, aquaculture, fishing, and mining activities	Addressed by existing policy	The Primary Production zone allows for smaller scale agricultural support industries within the zone.
Objective 7: Provide serviced and well-sited industrial land to meet projected demand		
1. Provide a supply of well-sited and serviced industrial land within Kadina, Balaklava, Blyth and Ardrossan and encourage clustering of related industries	Addressed by existing zoning	Ardrossan currently contains an Industry and Light Industry zone. A large percentage of both zones are undeveloped, thus short-medium demand can be accommodated within the existing zones.

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
2. Ensure an adequate supply of appropriately located industrial land to provide opportunities for small scale and home-based industries within townships across the region	Issue investigated as part of previous DPAs	Home Industry zones have been removed recently from the Development Plan as the zones failed to develop as envisaged.
3. Site and locate industrial land to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management of interfaces with residential areas and protection from encroachment - provision for future expansion - accordance with Environmental Protection Authority requirements and guidelines - an efficient road freight network and impacts of freight movements on neighbouring areas are minimised 	To be considered as part of future DPAs	All issues to be considered if new industrial areas are proposed as part of future rezoning proposals.
4. Use on-site generation of alternative energy and/or water resources where energy or water infrastructure is the limiting factor to development	Addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan contains sufficient policies relating to onsite energy generation and the reuse of stormwater as an onsite water source.
Objective 9: Retain and strengthen the economic potential of high quality agricultural land		
1. Prevent loss of productive agricultural land to other uses and through potential conflict with incompatible uses by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focusing housing (including rural living) and industrial development within townships and industrial estates, unless directly related to primary industry • preventing fragmentation of agricultural land • managing interfaces with residential areas 	Addressed by existing policy	<p>Primary production is the basis of the economic activity in the Yorke Peninsula region and the protection of existing operations is paramount.</p> <p>Current policy in the Primary Production zone is very strong in ensuring agricultural land is retained for primary production purposes and land use conflicts are avoided.</p> <p>For example, dwellings are non-complying and land division is limited by not permitting allotments less than 40ha in size, therefore existing policy</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
		seeks to minimise encroachment from sensitive land uses and the fragmentation of agricultural land.
Objective 11: Strengthen local aquaculture and fishing industries		
1. Provide for land-based processing clusters at Wallaroo, Port Broughton, Port Giles , Ardrossan and Stansbury , in accordance with environmental requirements including provisions for land-based waste disposal facilities	Addressed by existing zoning and policy	<p>An Aquaculture zone has been established at Stansbury. The intent of this zone is to accommodate land based development in support of off shore aquaculture activities.</p> <p>No specific zone is provided at Ardrossan or Port Giles, however, land based processing development would be an appropriate land use within the existing Industry and/or Light Industry zones at Ardrossan and a large amount vacant land currently exist within these zones. </p> <p>In addition, the Development Plan contains general policies relating to land based and marine based aquaculture developments.</p> <p>Based on the level of demand for aquaculture development within the Council area. The existing policy is considered to be appropriate to manage and support the aquaculture and fishing industries</p>
2. Locate commercial boat launching facilities in areas adjoining townships or in locations that support marine aquaculture licenses and discourage boat launching across the beach	Continual review of existing infrastructure to ensure it is appropriate to support the commercial aquaculture/fishing industry.	Council has provided boat ramps at the majority of coastal townships including Stansbury and Edithburgh which are key towns associated with marine aquaculture. The location of future boat launching facilities will be reviewed on a

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
		continuous/needs basis.
Objective 12: Safeguard mineral resources and encourage further exploration and mining		
<p>1. Establish and maintain buffers around mines and mineral resources to prevent encroachment by housing and other development which may affect the viability of extracting the resource</p>	<p>Addressed by existing policy</p> <p>Consider outcomes of the Resource Area Management and Planning Project being undertaken by DMITRE in conjunction with DPTI, to ascertain whether further amendments/additions to existing policy is required.</p>	<p>The approval and establishment of mines is principally dealt with under the Mining Act</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Development Plan contains policy which specifically relates to mineral extraction activities and considers issues such as buffers and interface issues.</p> <p>In addition, the plan includes a Mineral Extraction zone accommodating various existing extraction operations throughout the Council area.</p> <p>Council will likely adopt any new policy that is added to the SAPPL as a result of the Resource Area Management and Planning Project.</p>
Objective 13: Reinforce Yorke Peninsula as a preferred coastal and nature-based tourist destination		
<p>1. Protect, enhance and promote those qualities of the Region that attract tourists and are of value to the community, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coastal landscapes, marine environment, foreshore, jetties and boat ramps • open space, trails networks, scenic tourist drives • natural and rural landscapes • heritage, cultural and/or built character of towns, including town approaches • seafront caravan parks and campsites, including provisions for motorhomes (e.g. large 	<p>Addressed by existing policy</p>	<p>Reinforcing the Yorke Peninsula as a coastal /natural based tourist destination is achieved by existing policy which seeks to protect the assets of the Council area that attract people to the region in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high quality landscape and natural areas are principally held within the Coastal Conservation, Coastal Open space and Primary Production zone where development is restricted.

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
recreational vehicles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Siting and Visibility provisions require development to be designed and sited to protect scenically attractive areas, particularly natural, rural and coastal landscapes. - Heritage Places policy promote the retention of historic buildings, particularly, State heritage places which are identified within the plan - The desired character statement of the Town Centre zone reinforces the historical character of various townships, by encouraging the design and siting of new buildings to be consistent with historical buildings in the zone. - Caravan parks are held within dedicated zones - A variety of tourism development is envisaged in various zones and specific policy relating to Tourism Development is contained within the Development Plan.
<p>Reinforce the desired roles of various towns and locations in the Yorke Peninsula tourist experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ardrossan as the visitor gateway to Yorke Peninsula, and Minlaton as the visitor gateway to southern Yorke Peninsula • Edithburgh, Wallaroo and Moonta-Port Hughes as potential overnight stays for large bus groups • The west coast and foot of the Peninsula for adventure, Aboriginal, nature-based and eco-tourism experiences • Showcasing built, marine, Cornish and mining heritage elements of Moonta, Kadina, Wallaroo, Port Wakefield, Minlaton, Maitland and 	Addressed by existing zoning, however, subject to further review as part of future Section 30 review	Existing zoning of the various township nominated within this principle allows each town to provide services as desired. The role and function of each town will continue to be reviewed to ensure sufficient and appropriate zoned land is available to accommodate demand for development/services in relation to the tourism industry.

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
<p>Edithburgh</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minlaton and Yorketown as service towns for tourists • Port Broughton, Port Vincent and Stansbury as key hubs for coastal tourism 		
Objective 14: Focus commercial development in key towns and ensure it is well sited and designed		
<p>1. Reinforce the primary commercial role of Kadina, the secondary commercial role of Ardrossan, Wallaroo, Maitland, Port Broughton and Balaklava, and the local commercial role of Minlaton and Yorketown, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • locate commercial uses in town centres or existing commercial zones • design development to be consistent with desired future character of town, or that part of town • prevent linear/ribbon development along major roads to support an efficient road network <p>3. In general, commercial facilities should be clustered in main streets and/or local/town centres</p>	<p>Addressed by existing policy and recently completed Four Towns DPA</p>	<p>The Development Plan focuses commercial development within the Town Centre zone which is found within all of the major townships within the Council area. This zone allows for a variety of commercial/retail development and typically these zones are located within the centre of the townships and along the main roads.</p> <p>It is noted that the recent Four Towns DPA reviewed the Town Centre zone of the four major inland service towns (Maitland, Minlaton, Yorketown and Warooka) to ensure sufficient land was available to accommodate future demand.</p>
Objective 15: Strategically plan for future waste management requirements and foster the resource recovery industry		
	<p>Objective addressed by existing policy</p>	<p>The Development Plan contains policies that specifically relate to the design and siting of Waste Management Facilities.</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
Objective 16: Foster sustainable alternative energy and water supply industries		
	Objective addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan contains Ministerial policies relating to wind farms and other renewable energy development.
Objective 17: Reinforce the role, functionality and vibrancy of towns and settlements		
2. Reinforce the supporting commercial and service roles of Ardrossan , Port Broughton, Balaklava, Wallaroo and Maitland , as the foci of secondary retail, commercial, administrative, education, health, justice and recreational developments in the region and build on Minlaton's role as the tourist gateway to southern Yorke Peninsula	Addressed by existing zoning and policy	The zoning and associated desired character and policy is generally consistent with the role and function of the various towns within the Council area nominated by this objective. As a result is it expected that each town will continue to function as envisaged.
3. Strengthen the local and visitor commercial/service role of Minlaton and Yorketown	Addressed by existing policy and recently completed Four Towns DPA	Refer to comments above
4. Build on Ardrossan's role as a tourist gateway to the Yorke Peninsula		Refer to comments above
7. Retain the cultural/heritage tourist focus of Moonta, Port Wakefield, Ardrossan , Edithburgh , Wallaroo, Minlaton and Maitland by strengthening heritage and township character	Addressed by existing policy	<p>The conservation of heritage places is largely dealt with by the existing Heritage provisions in the Development Plan and Table YoP/6 lists the State Heritage Place found within the Council Area.</p> <p>Historic buildings/area within these township are predominately found within the Town Centre zone. The Desired Character of the Town Centre zone acknowledges the historic character of the zone and requires buildings to be designed and sited</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
		with regard to the historic pattern and design of development within the zone.
8. Retain coastal living and holiday appeal of towns of Port Broughton, Wallaroo, Moonta Bay, Port Hughes, Port Wakefield, and townships between Ardrossan and Edithburgh	Addressed by existing zoning and policy	The smaller coastal settlements located on the eastern side of Peninsula between Ardrossan and Edithburgh are either located within the Settlement or Coastal Settlement zones. Policy within these zones envisaged low density residential development consistent with the existing character of development within the towns.
9. Limit expansion of towns on western coast of Peninsula, south of Port Hughes, to provide housing and nature-based/low-key tourist experiences – focussing development in existing townships of Point Turton, Corny Point, Marion Bay, Balgowan, Port Victoria, Port Rickaby and Hardwicke Bay	Address by proposed and future DPAs	Council is currently undertaking a review of Balgowan. There is currently no intention to expand any of the other listed town, however, issue to be considered as part of future rezoning proposals.
10. Provide additional aged care accommodation across the region, and retain existing facilities	Addressed by existing policy	Supported accommodation is an envisaged use within the Residential, Settlement and Community zones. Aged care accommodation (retirement villages, nursing homes etc) falls within this definition, thus existing policy supports this type of development
Objective 18: Strategically plan and manage township growth, with master planning for coastal areas a priority		
1. Focus development in existing towns and settlements based on role and function	Addressed by existing zoning and policy	The recent approach by Council to conduct a rolling review of its Development Plan has assisted to ensure land supply is adequate to accommodate demand in various townships within the Council area.

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
		<p>It is noted that development is principally focused within towns as current policy largely limits development outside of townships.</p>
<p>2. Base expansions of towns on clear and structured master planning that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports the role, function and desired character of the town • ensures new areas are continuous with and form compact extensions of existing built up areas • prevents linear development along the coast and arterial roads • does not encroach upon areas of importance to economic development • supports equitable access to health, community and education services and facilities, including future needs of the community taking into account projected demographic changes • supports cost-effective provision of infrastructure and services (e.g. health, education), including avoidance of unnecessary expansion or duplication of existing regional infrastructure and services • promotes strong linkages between all parts of the town, particularly between residential areas, town centres, sporting and recreational facilities, and open space • supports the provision of passenger/public transport within and between towns • in coastal settlements, retains public access to the coast, promotes strong linkages with the coast, and better defines 'coastal zones' (refer 	<p>Addressed as part of future rezonings</p>	<p>Issues raised by this objective are largely addressed as part of the DPA when rezoning and expansion of existing townships are being considered.</p> <p>The last point will be specifically considered as part of the recommended Rural Living DPA</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
<p>Objective 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protects places of heritage and cultural value, minimises adverse environmental and aesthetic impacts, and prevents exposure of people and property to risk of hazards (e.g. flooding, erosion) (see Objectives 1-5) • promotes development on existing vacant land and surplus government land prior to providing further broadacre/greenfield sites • locates land for rural living (large residential allotments) within townships in such a way that it retains opportunities for future town expansion 		
3. Cluster activities along the coast in distinctive and compact coastal towns, and strongly discourage linear development	Addressed by existing zoning	Land fronting the coast outside of existing townships is principally located within the Coastal Conservation zone. Development within this zone is largely restricted.
5. Development in areas remote from infrastructure should be self sufficient in energy, water supplies, and wastewater management	Addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan contains policy requiring development to be self sufficient where the associated infrastructure is not available
6. Discourage significant development along the western coast (south of Port Hughes) and foot of the peninsula, and focus future development in this area within the townships of Point Turton, Corny Point and Marion Bay, Balgowan, Port Victoria, Hardwicke Bay and Port Rickaby	Address by proposed and future DPAs	<p>An review of Port Victoria has recently occurred and the minor expansion of the Settlement zone at Balgowan is currently being considered by Council.</p> <p>It is noted that expansion of other towns along the western side of the peninsula have occurred recently (Parson Beach, Bluff Beach etc), however, these have generally been relative minor and only occur where infrastructure and service provision has been sufficient.</p>

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
8. Provide for limited compact expansion of Ardrossan , Port Wakefield, Port Vincent and Stansbury . For all other townships along the eastern coast of the Peninsula focus future development within existing townships	Addressed by the recent Port Vincent DPA. There are currently no plans to expand Ardrossan or Stansbury. Issue to consideration as part of the next Section 30 review	<p>The recently consolidated of the Port Vincent DPA provided a large expansion of the existing township to the west. The newly zoned area will provide a long term land supply for residential development.</p> <p>There is currently a sufficient amount of undeveloped land within Ardrossan and Stansbury to accommodate growth in the short to medium term. A review of the townships in respect to this principle will occur as part of the next Section 30 review in five years time.</p>
Objective 19: Design towns to provide safe, healthy, accessible and appealing environments		
2. Reinforce those elements (natural and built) that contribute to the unique character and identity of towns, including landscapes, building and streetscape design, and built heritage	Addressed by existing policy	Each zone within townships provides a desired character which clearly sets out the characteristics of development envisaged in that zone. Read in association with zone policy the Development Plan provides guidance for future development to retain those elements of the built form that contribute to the character of the locality.
3. Establish and retain distinct and attractive entrances to townships	Addressed by existing policy	In addition to zone provisions, Design and Appearance policies assist development along entrances to be appropriately designed and sited including the provision of landscaping to maintain/create attractive entrances to townships.
4. Retain town centres as the foci of retail, commercial, recreation, entertainment and civic	Addressed by existing policy	Town Centre zones are the focus for this type of land uses. Also the Community zones that

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
activities in accordance with role and function of the town		principally surround/adjoin towns centres are chief areas for recreation facilities within townships.
7. In coastal towns, provide strong linkage between town centres and the coast	Addressed by existing zoning and policy	The Town Centres of the main coastal townships of Ardrossan, Edithburgh, Port Vincent, Port Victoria and Stansbury immediately adjoin coastal land held within the Coastal Open Space zone. This arrangements provides a convenient transition from the build up areas to the coast, Other smaller coastal settlements also principally adjoin the coast allow for strong linkages.
8. Manage interfaces between residential, town centres and industrial areas to avoid potential conflicts	Addressed by existing policy	Interface issues can be addressed by existing zone and general policy. This issue is also a key consideration of any rezoning proposal.
9. Encourage active lifestyles and social opportunities for communities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing a range of open space and recreation facilities within towns and the Region in accordance with the Yorke Regional Recreation, Sport and Open Space Strategy (October 2004) • providing for walking and cycling within townships, giving consideration to the needs of people of different ages and physical and intellectual abilities 	Addressed by existing policy	Coastal Open Space and Community zones envisage a wide variety of recreation facilities and incorporate the open space areas within the various townships within the peninsula, including beaches and foreshore areas. All the main coastal townships contain both zones.
10. Develop safer towns by incorporating the principles set out in 'Designing Out Crime' guidelines (Planning SA 2004) and through consultation with South Australia Police,	Addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan contains the Crime Prevention module which includes policies which encourages design techniques to minimise the opportunity for criminal activity.

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
Barossa Yorke Local Service Area		
11. Design all developments – housing, holiday homes, commercial, industrial – so they are functional, attractive, contribute to the desired character of the area, and are sympathetic to cultural and landscape features	Addressed by existing policy	As discussed above, the Development Plan contains policy that provides guidance for development to be designed and sited in accordance with the associated desired character for that zone.
Objective 20: Provide residential land to enable a supply of diverse, affordable and sustainable housing to meet the needs of current and future residents and visitors		
1. Focus housing within townships, including ‘rural living’ (large residential allotments), to prevent encroachment on sensitive environments, agriculture, mining and industrial land, exposure to risks (e.g. flooding, bushfire, pollution) and to best utilise strategic infrastructure	Addressed by existing policy	Housing is focussed within townships as dwellings are principally restricted to Residential, Settlement, Mixed Use and Rural Living zones
2. Locate land for rural living within townships in such a way that it retains opportunities for future township expansion	Issue to be investigated as part of proposed Rural Living DPA	A Council wide review of the Rural Living zone will allow for this issue to be considered and addressed
3. Ensure housing is designed in accordance with desired character of the area	Addressed by existing policy	Policy requires development (including housing) to be consistent with the desired character of the zone
4. Ensure zoning promotes a range of housing types and densities to enable people to stay within their community as their housing needs change – young people, couples, families, older people	Addressed by existing policy	A range of dwelling types including affordable housing and supported accommodation are envisaged within the Residential zone. Whilst detached is the primary dwelling type

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
		<p>desired, policy provides opportunity for other dwelling types such as semi-detached, group, residential flat buildings etc, which are all consent uses in the zone.</p> <p>The Development Plan therefore contemplates a variety of dwellings type which will assist to accommodate people at the various stages of life as identified in the associated principle.</p>
5. Locate higher density housing near town centres of larger service towns	Addressed by existing policy	The Development Plan provides scope for higher density development within townships where appropriate infrastructure is provided. Also the desired character of the Residential zone contemplates infill development, subject to it complementing the form and scale of existing development.
6. Provide a range of accommodation for older people with a disability	Addressed by existing policy	Supported accommodation is an envisaged use in the Residential and Settlement zones
7. Ensure that Land is made available for public and social housing in towns with a service role	Addressed by existing zoning	There is currently sufficient land available within each of the main service towns and there is no policy inhibiting this type of housing being established.
9. Provide for 15% affordable housing, including a 5% component for high needs housing, in all significant new housing developments	Addressed by existing policy	The Residential zone envisaged a range of dwelling types including a minimum of 15 percent affordable housing.
10. Actively involve Aboriginal people and newly arrived overseas migrants in planning for housing supply to ensure needs are met	Achieved by Council consultant polices and statutory consultation procedures as part of strategic planning processes such as Section 30	Narrunga Nations and the public generally are appropriate consulted on Section 30 review, DPAs and other major development proposal.

<i>Policy/target</i>	<i>How will the policy/target be achieved?</i>	<i>Rationale for response to the policy/target</i>
	Review and DPAs	This principle is more a process issue rather than policy issue affecting the Development Plan.
11.Retain caravan parks, and support a proportion of parks being used to provide affordable rental housing opportunities, particularly for temporary accommodation	Addressed by existing policy	Council's Development Plan includes the Caravan and Tourist Park zone and Residential Park zone. Development envisaged in these zones would provide affordable rental and temporary housing opportunities.
12.Ensure housing is designed to maximise energy and water efficiency, and minimise adverse impacts on the local environment	Addressed by existing policy	As previously discussed, the Development Plan contains policy which promotes energy and water efficiency and seeks to minimise impact on the environment and amenity of the locality.

3. Development Plan Amendment program

The council's Development Plan Amendment (DPA) program should indicate:

- (a) a summary of the scope of each proposed DPA
- (b) the broad timing to complete each proposed DPA.

DPA program	
Type of land use: Rural Living	
Scope	Timing
<p>The DPA will review the Rural Living zone to ensure existing/new areas are appropriately located with respect to retaining opportunities for future township expansion and are sufficient to accommodate future demand.</p> <p>A review of the existing land division policy relating to minimum allotment area requirements will be undertaken to determine if more intensive development (reduced minimum allotment areas) may be appropriate in certain areas, based on demand, land and infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>The DPA also provides the opportunity to update the Development Plan in line with the latest version of the SA Planning Policy Library.</p>	2015-2016

DPA program	
Type of land use: Coastal Area	
Scope	Timing
<p>Consider the DEWNR review of vulnerable shack sites and use the findings to assist identify those sites at risk of sea level rise and introduce policy to manage and guide development on those sites and other coastal areas.</p>	2016-2017 (<i>Subject to the completion of the DEWNR study</i>)

4. Consultation

Public consultation

Councils must undertake formal public consultation on a Strategic Directions Report for a period of eight weeks and accept written submissions from the public during the same period (pursuant to section 30 (3) of the *Development Act 1993*).

Please indicate which public consultation activities were undertaken in relation to the drafting of the SDR and the results of that consultation.

Public consultation period:	21 July 2014 to 19 September 2014
Number of written submissions received:	23

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Len Easter LJ Hooker Port Vincent/Ardrossan 5 Main Street Port Vincent SA 5581	<p>Provided a summary of land supply and development history for various towns along the eastern side of the peninsula and recommended a number of zoning amendments which are summarised below.</p> <p>Ardrossan Recommended land to the north west of the town fronting Tiddy Widdy Beach Road be rezoned Residential</p>	Land is already zoned Residential.	No action required
	<p>Stansbury Noted that there is sufficient residential land available</p>	Noted	No action required
	<p>Point Turton</p>	Noted	No action required

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	Noted that there is sufficient residential land available		
	<p>Port Vincent</p> <p>Recommended land to the south of the town, west of Young Avenue be rezoned Residential</p> <p>Recommended Sec 67 & Lot144 located to the south west of the town be rezoned Rural Living</p>	<p>Not considered a priority given the recent Port Vincent DPA which provided a long term land supply of Residential land to the immediate west of the township.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the large amount Residential land available within the township, there is currently no Rural Living land at Port Vincent. For future consideration as part of a council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>	Demand for a Rural Living zone at Port Vincent to be considered as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA
	<p>Rouges Point</p> <p>Recommended land on the southern side of Rogues Point Road be rezoned a combination of Residential and Rural Living</p>	Rezoning the land in this locality is considered to be a low priority given the amount of land available for development within the Settlement and Deferred Urban zones	No action required
	<p>Pine Point</p> <p>Recommended that land fronting Main Coast Road be rezoned a combination of Residential (including the expansion of the Caravan Park) and Rural Living</p>	It is noted that there is limited land available within the township for development and some consideration may need to be given to providing additional residential land and possibly some Rural Living land, but not at the rear of the settlement which is presently farmed and would create interface issues. It would also require residents to cross the	No action required at this point in time.

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
		<p>highway to access the beach. A site of the eastern side of the highway is favoured over and extension to the west of the town.</p> <p>Issues include; need, (is there adequate demand for land), infrastructure constraints (particularly water) and potential issues with additional properties fronting and taking access from the Highway.</p> <p>Not a high priority at present.</p>	
	<p>Black Point Noted that there is sufficient residential land available. However, noted opportunity for future expansion of the caravan & boat trailer park and rezoning the cliff top land west of the boat ramp for residential purposes</p>	<p>The Caravan Park and Tourist zone includes approximately 3 hectares of vacant land on the western side of Black Point Drive thus any expansion can easily be accommodated within the existing zone. That said there has been no moves to redevelop the caravan park since the last zone changes were made at Black Point, which brings into question the relevance of this zoning.</p> <p>At the present time additional residential land at Black Point is unwarranted and could be shifted to Pine Point (refer above) if required.</p>	No action required
	<p>Port Julia Recommended land west of Osprey Street be rezoned Holiday Settlement and allow expansion of camping ground</p>	<p>Rezoning the land is considered to be a low priority given the extent of land available for development within the Settlement zone.</p>	No action required

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Sheoak Flat Recommended rezoning land to the south of the settlement a combination of Holiday Settlement & Rural Living</p>	<p>This land is currently being considered for rezoning by Council via a developer funded DPA. An SOI has recently been submitted to DPTI for approval.</p>	<p>Land being considered as part of current DPA.</p>
<p>Nathan Franklin MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Super G Developments Pty Ltd – Owner of 106 Sultana Point Road, Edithburgh</p>	<p>Recommended that the minimum allotment requirements for the Rural Living land to the south of the Edithburgh bound by Sultana Point Road, Wattle Bay Road and Hilsea Road be reduced from 2 hectares to 2,500m².</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, issues to be considered and addressed as part of the Edithburgh Town and Surrounds DPA.</p> <p>The respondent has advised that they will provide a submission as part of the Edithburgh DPA.</p>	<p>Issues to be considered as part of the current Edithburgh DPA.</p>
<p>Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of James Honner Nominees Pty Ltd – Owner of the Stansbury Holiday Motel</p>	<p>Noted that the land is located within the Caravan and Tourist Park zone.</p> <p>Advised that the subject land contains areas which are vacant and/or utilised and there is intention to redevelop/expand the motel with additional units and divide surplus land fronting Adelaide and Bayview roads for residential allotments (as depicted on concept plan).</p> <p>Noted that changes to zone policy as a result of the BDP DPA impacted development potential for the site as land division and dwellings are now non-complying. Both were merit forms of development within the previous Tourist Accommodation zone.</p>	<p>Policy relating to dwellings and land division in the Caravan and Tourist Park zone is standard SAPPL policy which was adopted as part of the BDP DPA.</p> <p>It is however noted that the development on the land is not a caravan or tourist park but is a motel, a use that is equally suitable in the residential zone. The main purpose of the Caravan and Tourist Park zone was to preserve land for low cost accommodation and most obviously for short term tourist accommodation. It was a policy initiative intended to stop caravan parks from being subdivided and thus retain the land primarily for tourist use.</p>	<p>No further action at this time but could be the subject of a Developer Funded DPA.</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Noted that the above policy relating to dwellings is contradictory to zone objective 2 which envisages <i>cabins, serviced apartment and transportable dwellings</i>.</p> <p>Also notes the decision of the Supreme Court (<i>Paradise Development v DC York Peninsula</i>) which found that tourist accommodation in the form of self contained accommodation was in fact a dwelling. Noted that if this interpretation was applied it would be at odds with the zone.</p> <p>Recommended that the above issues be amended in the following manner as a priority in the next DPA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusion of a Policy Area of Precinct within the Caravan and Tourist Park Zone, specifically relating to the subject land 2. The Policy Area or Precinct allowing for land division and dwellings to be considered on merit. 3. Amended terminology to ensure that serviced apartments can be developed on merit and they are not interpreted as dwellings. 	<p>There is already a large caravan/tourist park to the south of Stansbury which has better access to a suitable beach than the subject land. That said, there is a shortage of good quality motel accommodation that should not be lost if the subject land was allowed to be redeveloped for residential use.</p> <p>I agree that the present Caravan and Tourist Park zone is probably not the most suitable zoning for the land given its present use and consider that better use could be made of the land subject to at least a significant proportion of it still being available for motel accommodation.</p>	
John Outhred Outhred English Associates Pty Ltd PO Box 20	Submission relates to Allotment 20 & 21 Klein Point Road, Stansbury, currently zone Rural Living.	There is certainly merit to the proposal given it allows the opportunity for additional Rural Living development without extending the current zone boundary.	To be considered as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
<p>North Adelaide SA 5006</p> <p>On behalf of Trevor & Jacqueline Boerth and Graeme & Tania Heinrich</p>	<p>Noted that each allotment comprises an area of 1.2 hectares and current policy restricts land division to 1 hectare allotments.</p> <p>Requested that the minimum allotment requirements be reduced to 6,000m².</p> <p>Noted that the amount of Rural Living land at Stansbury is limited and the above would allow the potential for 16 additional allotments being created within the existing zone.</p>	<p>The present Rural Living zones in the Council Development Plan have not been comprehensively reviewed and it would appear that present policies are resulting in allotments that are too large for Rural Living purposes, particularly by (often) part time residents and given the vast majority are not used for any rural activity.</p> <p>There is a latent demand for larger allotments, some for lifestyle reasons, others because people want large sheds for boats and other recreational vehicles that can't be accommodated in the Residential zone.</p> <p>Subject to further investigations in relation to demand for rural living land in Stansbury, infrastructure requirements etc, issues raised are worth considering as part of a future Council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>	
<p>Trevor and Christine Carbins 100 Adelaide Road Stansbury SA 5582</p>	<p>Recommended extending the township boundary on the eastern side of Adelaide Road from Mills Gully Lookout Road to McIntrye's Lane and allow allotments with a minimum area of 5000m².</p> <p>Noted the following benefits of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forms a compact extension of the town - Enhance the entrance to the town 	<p>The subject land consists of four allotments zoned Coastal Conservation.</p> <p>The allotment range in area of 0.8-2.6 hectares, front a coastal reserve and each contain a dwelling.</p> <p>The allotments are each about 180m in depth. To allow 5000m² allotment areas would result in lots that are only 27m wide.</p>	<p>To be considered as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assist to manage feral plant species on the property and reduce fire risk - Land is well above land likely to be impacted by sea level rise 	<p>Generally the linear expansion of townships along the coast is not supported, however, given the existing use and character of the land, rezoning the properties to Rural Living might be appropriate.</p> <p>However, given its coastal location any increase to the density of development would need to be restricted (i.e. larger minimum allotment areas or no further division) in order to minimise potential impacts to the coast.</p> <p>It is recommended that the above issues be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>	
Allan McIntyre	<p>Supports the submission from Trevor and Christine Carbins (above).</p> <p>Noted the following benefits of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent speed limits - Economic benefits <p>Also raised issues in regards to crab licensing and associated environmental and tourism impacts</p>	<p>Comments noted, refer to response above.</p> <p>Issues raised in regard to crab licensing is not a relevant planning issue.</p>	Refer to comments above
Pat & Bernard Connerton	Supports the submission from Trevor and Christine Carbins (Submission 5).	Comments noted, refer to response above	Refer to comments above

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Veronica Brundell	Supports the submissions from Trevor & Jacqueline Boerth and Graeme & Tania Heinrich (submission 4) and Trevor and Christine Carbins (Submission 5).	Comments noted, refer to responses above	Refer to comments above
Kath Young PO Box 62 Eden Valley SA 5235	<p>Submission related to Lot 436 Lehman Road, Edithburgh.</p> <p>The allotment is 2.2 hectares and is located within the Rural Living zone. Current policy restricts land division to 2 hectares.</p> <p>Seeks to divide the land into two allotments; one to contain the existing dwelling and the other vacant.</p> <p>Considers the proposed allotment sizes would be more suitable and manageable given the semi-rural locality and the land's proximity to the town.</p>	<p>This land is proposed to be rezoned Primary Production as part of the Edithburgh DPA as it forms part of the large Rural Living zone to the South of the town which has remained largely undeveloped for a considerable period and continues to be principally used for farming.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, issues raised are being considered as part of the Edithburgh DPA.</p>	Issues to be considered as part of the current Edithburgh DPA.
P.G. Vigar 260 Lake Fowler Road Coobowie SA 5589	<p>Requests that Section 120, 122, 405, 448 & 449 at Edithburgh be rezoned from Primary Production to Residential/Rural Living.</p> <p>Noted that the land is surrounded by small residential allotment and the difficulty of farming the land with modern day OH&S requirements in a semi built up area.</p>	<p>It is noted that the land is located outside of the investigation area that forms the Edithburgh DPA and is currently zoned Primary Production.</p> <p>The land is well separated from the town and therefore is unlikely to be considered for rezoning. However, the issues raised will be considered as part of the Edithburgh DPA</p>	Issues to be considered as part of the Edithburgh DPA.
Richard Hawkins, Glen	Submission related to zoning amendments for	The further expansion of the township is not	Not considered a priority,

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Barclay & Roger Collins	<p>four properties at Corny Point.</p> <p>Section 115 Hundred of Carribie,</p> <p>Requests that 18.1 hectares of the 143 hectare property be rezoned from Primary Production to Rural Living.</p> <p>Land affected fronts Rockleigh Road and the proposal would allow the creation of 12-14 allotments of approximately 1 hectare. Advised that the land contains native vegetation and revegetation and pest plant control activities have occurred on the site.</p> <p>Noted that the Native Vegetation Management Unit has advised that they do not object to the proposal providing future house, access tracks are located in clear areas and minimal clearance is require for boundary fences.</p>	<p>supported particularly with regard to amount of residential land available for development and constraints associated with electricity supply to the township which require a 1 million dollar (at 2008 figures) investment to upgrade supply .</p> <p>Also the proposal results in ‘strip’ development along Rockleigh Road which further extends the settlement to the south west and increases interface issues with adjoining farmland. It is noted that the settlement has already been developed in a somewhat ad hoc/widespread manner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the large amount residential land available within the township, there is currently no Rural Living land at Corny Point. Therefore consideration to whether a Rural Living zone at Corny Point may be warranted as part of a Council wide Rural living DPA is supported.</p>	<p>however, issue of Rural Living land at Corny Point can be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>
	<p>Lot 103 Lighthouse Road</p> <p>Requests that 7 acres of the subject land be rezoned from Coastal Protection to Holiday Settlement.</p> <p>Noted that the proposal is located adjacent the Dunn Point shacks and the land owner is willing to provide land for wastewater treatment for the</p>	<p>It is noted that the subject land is located inland immediately behind the existing shacks. The proposal would represent a compact extension of the existing settlement zone and also provides the opportunity to improve wastewater management for the existing shacks, which is supported. It might also allow for the relocation of the existing shacks back from the low cliff edge that</p>	<p>Subject to land owner providing more justification a developer funded DPA may be considered for this land in the future. However, it otherwise a low priority on the schedule of future DPAs.</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>existing shacks and future development on the affected land.</p> <p>Advised that the Coast Protection Board have provided in principle support for the proposal.</p>	<p>fronts the shack sites and thus address the coastal erosion issues that are affecting the shacks at the present time.</p> <p>The land is zoned Coast Conservation; however the land at the rear of the coastal dunes is cleared farmland. The dunes would need to be retained in the Coast Conservation zone but there is some merit in considering an extension to the zone over the cleared farmland if coastal erosion issues relevant to the existing shack sites can be addressed as well.</p> <p>Whilst the above is considered to be a low priority, subject to the land owner providing more justification, reviewing the land as part of a developer funded DPA may be warranted in the future.</p>	
	<p>Lot 794 Marion Bay Road</p> <p>Requests that 36 acres of the above property be rezoned from Primary Production to Rural Living.</p>	<p>The further expansion of the township is not supported particularly with regard to amount of residential land available for development and constraints associated with electricity supply.</p> <p>Also the proposal would further extend the settlement away from the existing built up area, which has already been developed in an ad hoc manner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the large amount residential</p>	<p>Not considered a priority, however, issue of Rural Living land at Corny Point can be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Lot 2 in FP 11157 Corny Point Road</p> <p>Requests that portion of the allotment (2.5 acres) be rezoned from Primary Production to Industry.</p> <p>Noted that the land is adjacent to the Optus telecommunication tower.</p> <p>Noted that there are several industrial activities that require a suitable zone within the township and a buffer to residential land such as tree screening will be established.</p>	<p>land available within the township, there is currently no Rural Living land at Corny Point. Therefore consideration to whether a Rural Living zone at Corny Point may be warranted as part of a Council wide Rural living DPA is supported.</p> <p>There is concern whether there would be sufficient demand to warrant a dedicated industry zone at Corny Point. It is noted that Light Industry is a consent form of development within the Settlement zone and there is ample vacant land available for future development.</p> <p>In addition, it is considered that industrial development would be better suited on the land around the existing hall and CFS building given the characteristic of the land and access to infrastructure, compared to the subject land.</p> <p>With regard to the above the proposal is not supported.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
Heather Drury Corny Point Progress Association	Supports the above submission	Noted, refer to comments above	No action required.
Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street	Requested that the subject land be rezoned from Primary Production to Mixed Use.	This land was rezoned Primary Production as part of the Four Towns DPA. The allotments were previously located in the Light Industry	No action required

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
<p>Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Ivan and Carlene McMahon – Owners of Allotments 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10 Depot Road, Minlaton</p>	<p>Noted that the land is better suited to the proposed zoning as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The allotments range in areas from 815m²-936m², thus inappropriate for primary production activities - The land abuts the existing Mixed Use zone - Separate titles could be obtained for each allotment without the need for a land division or any approval of Council - The land has frontage to a public road (currently unmade) - The allotments were previously zoned Light industry 	<p>zone- Home Industry Policy Area.</p> <p>The reasoning for the rezoning as outlined in the DPA was that the allotments to the east and west of Depot Road are held in common ownership with the adjoining farming land to the west and are all currently used for farming purposes. These allotments were created a considerable time ago and have not been developed despite the previous zoning. It is also noted that the development of these allotments is restricted by the need to extend Depot Road, which would have to be undertaken at Councils cost.</p> <p>Current zoning is considered to be appropriate.</p>	
<p>Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Jason Newbold – Owner of Sections 175, 176, 182 and 183, Hundred of Minlacowie, Minlaton</p>	<p>Requests that the land be considered to be rezoned Rural Living in a future DPA</p> <p>Recommends policies of the Primary Production Zone be reviewed to provide greater flexibility for on merit assessment of dwellings within the zone. Noted that current policy requires the need for extensive justification through a non-complying application process for a dwelling to be erected on any farming property.</p> <p>Also noted other Council's where flexibility for a dwelling to be considered on merit within the Primary Production Zone.</p>	<p>There is a considerable amount of Rural Living land to the south of the township.</p> <p>The proposal would require the land between the subject land and the township to be considered for Rural Living too; otherwise it would result in an isolated Rural Living zone surrounded by Primary Production land.</p> <p>Whilst considered a low priority, issues raised can be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.</p> <p>Concerns in regards to current policy relating</p>	<p>To be consider as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
		to dwellings within the Primary Production zone have been addressed in detail below in response to submission 17.	
<p>Sue and Mike Liebelt MoselSteed 6 Graves Street Kadina SA 5554</p>	<p>Noted the following infrastructure issues which continue to limit development potential in the following towns:</p> <p>Port Victoria This settlement is isolated from a local substation thus growth is limited due to high cost of upgrading the power infrastructure</p> <p>Ardrossan Longstanding need for water augmentation. Noted infrastructure spending in the area is still to reflect the funds that have been collected from private developer during this time frame</p> <p>Port Clinton, Pine Point, Point Turton Noted water augmentation charges are yet to be implemented by SA Water in these areas. However, application for a service off an existing main results in a request to reduce the existing supply to a restricted meter to allow an additional water meter to be approved.</p> <p>Raised concerns with the state of the main access routes to the Peninsula affecting tourism potential of the area and safety of local residents.</p>	<p>Infrastructure supply limitations are noted and recognised as being a constraint to development. The Council has previously undertaken a review of water supply to the main towns on the Peninsula to identify a priority of augmentation. Council has also been proactive in considering alternative options for water supply including</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Limited supply, where water supply is restricted to not more than 5 litres per minute, which requires on site storage and reticulation as a means of reducing draw down on the main at times of peak demand. 2 Dry allotments, where no mains water is provided and the land use must rely on storage of rain water. <p>These options are not always supported by SA Water.</p> <p>Power is also a limiting factor, with infrastructure augmentation charges for upgrading supply a significant constraint to development.</p> <p>Concerns with the state of the road are noted.</p>	<p>The Councils Development Plan already seeks to provide alternative solutions to water supply limitations. Power supplies and investment in road infrastructure are more problematic, the latter largely reliant on State and Federal Government funding.</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Supports the Council wide review of the Rural Living zone (as recommended in the discussion paper) particularly in appropriate areas on the outskirts of townships where there is potential demand for rural living allotments</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Undertake a Council wide review of the Rural Living zone</p>
	<p>Raised concerns in regards to the application of the guideline and intent of the Development Plan with the physical implementation of construction and engineering design criteria. Noted the example where modern and energy efficient subdivision design's integrity can be challenged by the physical requirement of designing for oversized garbage trucks or other infrastructure that could be dealt within an alternative way that would improve the ambience and attractiveness of the area and thus better reflect the intent of the Development Plan.</p>	<p>It is noted that each subdivision is assessed on its merits and where possible the Council seeks to ensure that road networks provide through links wherever possible and thus avoid the need for cul de sac turning heads. It is nonetheless Council policy for service vehicles to be able to make a U-turn at the end of dead end roads based on staff and pedestrian safety requirements</p>	<p>Noted, for consideration by Councils Works Department.</p>
<p>Black Point Progress Association Inc</p>	<p>Requested that the 'Black Point Shack Site Relocation Protocol' should be referenced where appropriate in the Black Point sections of the Development Plan</p> <p>Coastal Open Space Zone Recommended a new policy section for Precinct 1 Black Point similar to Settlement Zone, Black Point Policy Area 3 including new Design Guidelines</p> <p>Noted that previously policies relating to dwellings, alteration and extension on Crown</p>	<p>Noted, and whilst it is desirable that the relocation protocol be a referral document in the Development Plan, the Development Act only allows a limited range of referral documents. These are listed in Regulation 14 of the Development Control Regulations 2008.</p> <p>It is not necessary to include the relocation protocol in the Development Plan as it will form or forms part of the deed of agreement between the Minister and Shack Owner. It is however noted that parts of the shack</p>	<p>Black Point Progress Association Inc</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>site have been removed from the Development Plan, however, it appears some are still valid. Also noted that alterations to some dwellings appear to have been made recently as complying development.</p> <p>Recommended that the following previous complying conditions be reinstated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The enclosure of a lawfully developed carport, verandah or shed which existed on the land on 17 November 1996 and which adjoins an existing habitable dwelling, except where the enclosure would occur on the northern (seaward) side of the dwelling. - The incorporation of a lawfully developed garage into, and to form part of, an existing habitable dwelling provided the garage existed on the land on 17 November 1996 and abuts the existing dwelling, and excludes any garage located on the northern (seaward) side of the existing dwelling - Alterations to carports, verandahs or pergola attached to the dwelling, and extending an extension to an existing dwelling, in order to comply with health authorities, for the purposes of building a toilet with a maximum floor area of two square metres, or a bathroom/shower, laundry with maximum floor area or five square metres. 	<p>relocation protocol could be incorporated as policy in the Development Plan. Given the inclusion of the Protocol in the Deed, it is not considered a priority to include parts of the Protocol in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Those provisions relating to the expansion of existing crown Lease Shacks at Black Point were dropped as the intention of policy generally for Black Point is the relocation of these shacks off the beach, and policies that allow for the expansion of the living areas of the shacks will only encourage their retention.</p> <p>As for recent developments that have occurred through the rebuilding/replacement of shacks, this has occurred as a consequence of the application of complying development provision in the Development Act and Regulations that over-ride those provisions in the Development Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the Council has written to the Minister seeking changes to the complying development provisions in areas such as coastal locations, where their application will only serve to entrench development that is inappropriate and/or at risk from coastal erosion.</p> <p>In relation to seawall maintenance, I note the</p>	

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Suggested that the new Design Guidelines recommended above include policy relating to seawall maintenance and development.</p> <p>Settlement Zone – Black Point policy Area 3 Recommends that Black Point Policy Area 3 should extend to the western end of the units on lots 151-153A.</p> <p>Supports the reference to not more than one dwelling per allotment within the Desired Character, however, raised concerns that this has not been applied on a consistent basis with the approval of dwellings containing a number of self-contained living areas.</p> <p>Recommends the last paragraph of the Desired Character should reference the Black Point</p>	<p>Protocol includes a series of design guides (as plans) showing how seawalls should be maintained in various scenarios. Whilst the option of including these diagrams in a modified Design Guidelines Table is supported, it presupposes an agreed location for future protection works for Black Point which have not yet been agreed to or identified.</p> <p>A more appropriate solution in my view is for the Minister to complete the Black Point Coast Protection Management Plan, which could incorporate the diagrams from the Protocol and which would then become a referral document for the purposes of the Development Act.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. It is also noted that no development has occurred in the Caravan and Tourist Park zone located at the northern end of Black Point. Consideration should be given to the ongoing relevance of this zone and whether it will lead to any worthwhile development.</p> <p>Noted, much of the development referred to appears to have occurred without approval. It may be appropriate for a dwelling, other than a detached dwelling to be added to the list of non-complying development in the Policy Area.</p>	

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Shack Site Relocation Protocol.</p> <p>Recommended appropriate zoning is required to protect the native vegetation along the NE Boundary of Lot 3003.</p> <p>Recommended the following amendments to table YoP/5.</p> <p>Guideline 1.1 – Add ‘Removal is to be in accordance with the Black Point Shack Site Relocation Protocol.</p> <p>Guideline 5.1 & 5.2 – Delete. Noted the above have not been consistently implemented for many years</p> <p>Guideline 5.4 – add ‘open’ before vehicle. Noted current wording suggest that no ground floor can be used for vehicle or boat parking, however, some approved dwelling comprises enclosed garages.</p> <p>Guideline 6.9 – Suggests amendments to allow greater than 15m² for decks and balconies, subject to style and location of dwellings and decking.</p> <p>Guideline 16.1 – Add the following after (coastal reserve). Rear (access road) fencing to properties with a direct frontage to the beach should generally be</p>	<p>Noted, refer comments above.</p> <p>The native vegetation is already protected to the extent that the Native Vegetation Management Act applies.</p> <p>Refer comments re the Protocol above.</p> <p>Noted and acknowledged. For consideration.</p> <p>Noted and acknowledged. For consideration</p> <p>Noted and acknowledged. For consideration</p> <p>Fencing is not development except in certain</p>	

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>minimised. Gates or road access must be incorporated into any rear fencing design.</p> <p>Guideline 16.3 & 16.4 – Remove and replace with: Fences, where necessary, should be of materials and style of the dwelling and surrounding, and should be the minimum necessary to impede unwanted access and protect privacy.</p> <p>Guideline 16.5 – Replaced with; High solid fencing should be avoided where possible.</p>	<p>circumstances. Fencing at Black Point is controlled under the terms of the Land Management Agreement that applies to the properties.</p> <p>Refer comments above.</p> <p>Refer comments above</p>	
<p>Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Sue and Anthony Honner</p>	<p>Raised concerns with regard to existing policy relating to dwellings in the Primary Production zone.</p> <p>Noted current policy does not provide sufficient flexibility for dwellings for retiring farmers on a small portion of an existing farm.</p> <p>Noted the land owners are nearing retirement and are considering developing a new dwelling on their large farming property. However, are faced with a non-complying application</p> <p>Considers the current policy overly restrictive and inappropriate to address all circumstances in which a dwelling may be appropriate on a Primary Production allotment.</p>	<p>The primary intent of the zone is to accommodate primary production activities which is reflected in the intent of the current policy relating to dwellings.</p> <p>Additional housing in the Primary Production zone is discouraged because it can lead to land use conflicts, with farming activities due to noise and odour impacts, spray drift, dust and the like. Housing unrelated to a farm can similarly introduce impacts that affect farm properties such as dogs (attacking stock) and poor land management practices (lack of control of pest plants) that can increase the cost of farming to a neighbouring land owner.</p> <p>From an economic point of view conversion</p>	<p>No further action at this time.</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Note zone Principle 5 anticipates dwellings directly connected to farming, however, the procedural matters list dwelling as non-complying with some exceptions.</p> <p>Considers the current policy is inconsistent with South Australian Planning Policy Library (SAPPL) which anticipates dwellings in the zone subject to Council specifying minimum allotment requirements.</p> <p>Also noted other Council's where flexibility for a dwelling to be considered on merit within the Primary Production Zone.</p> <p>Requested that policies relating to the construction of dwellings within the Primary Production zone be reviewed as a matter of priority.</p>	<p>of rural properties to essentially rural living uses inflates the value of the land by endowing it with a residential or rural residential value rather than rural land values, and this will have an impact on farmers seeking to expand their rural holdings.</p> <p>Given that there is ample Residential or Rural Living zoned land that can accommodate the required development, there can be no justification for weakening of policies relating to houses in the Primary Production zone.</p> <p>Comments noted in regards to the existing policy being inconsistent with the SAPPL, however, this policy was approved by the Minister as part of the BDP DPA and thus deemed to be appropriate with respect to the SAPPL.</p> <p>Simply assigning a minimum allotment area as an exception within the non-complying table (consistent with the examples given) does not address the issues as any housing within the zone, regardless of the size of the allotment will reduce/impact the viability of the land for farming activities in some way, which is inconsistent with the intent of the zone.</p> <p>It is noted that the current policy is restrictive</p>	

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
		<p>in term of the development assessment process for dwellings. However, the non-complying process does allow for a dwelling to be approved where circumstances warrant and suitable justification is provided, particularly with regard to Principle 5.</p>	
<p>Sue Liebelt Mosel Steed 6 Graves Street Kadina SA</p> <p>On behalf of Andrew Clift Owner of Lot 136 St Vincent Highway, Pine Point.</p>	<p>Request that land (Lot 136) adjacent to the Pine Point settlement be considered for rezoning.</p> <p>Noted that the land is ideally located for the purposes of extending Pine Point as it abuts the western boundary of the town and is setback from the coast.</p> <p>Noted that the land's proximity to the Hillside mine provides opportunity to accommodate demand for residential development and the associated infrastructure upgrades for the mine will likely benefit the future development of the site.</p>	<p>Expansion of Pine Point is not considered a priority at this stage however, subject to further justification a review of the settlement may be warranted in the future.</p> <p>In addition, rezoning the land based on the development of the Rex mine is considered to be premature at this point in time.</p>	<p>No further action at this time.</p>
<p>Graham Burns MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Andrew Clift and John Eden owners of Lot 177 Rogues Point Road, Rogues Point and Lot 3</p>	<p>Requested that the subject land be rezoned to accommodate the expansion of Rogue Point and James Well.</p> <p>Noted that the subject land formed the Rogues Point James Well DPA (a recommendation of the previous Section 30 Review). A Statement of Intent was submitted to the Minister in 2009, however, no response was provided to a request for additional information from the Minister and</p>	<p>Issue raised by the Department previously still remain. Concerns related to the appropriateness of the DPA against the objectives of the Yorke Peninsula Land Use Framework, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact upon areas of economic important (farming land) and environmental importance (coastal 	<p>Reinstating the developer funded DPA may be warranted, subject to further justification is provided from the developers in relation to addressing the issue formerly raised by the Department.</p> <p>If the DPA does proceed, it is recommended that it be</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
James Well Road, James Well	<p>thus the DPA did not proceed.</p> <p>Noted that it is timely to reactive the DPA considering the approval of the nearby Hillside Mine.</p>	<p>land)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand for expansion of the settlement given the amount of vacant land within the extensive Deferred Urban zone - Demonstrate a strategic approach to the expansion of the township as a whole, including master planning of coastal areas and the provision of infrastructure, service and facilities for the significantly expanded population <p>Rezoning the land is considered to be a low priority given the extent of land available for development within the settlements and in particularly within the Deferred Urban zone which adjoins the towns. Further justification would need to be provided in order to progress the SOI.</p>	considered as a low priority on the schedule of future DPAs.
TD Bray Contracting C/- TD & DL Bray PO Box 227 Port Victoria SA 5573	<p>Recommended 3 parcels of land (section 126, 127 & 142) adjacent the existing Industry zone at Port Victoria be rezoned from Primary Production to Industry.</p> <p>Noted limited opportunity for industrial development within the township due to size of existing zone.</p> <p>Noted a transport business located within the Residential zone approached Council about</p>	<p>The existing zone is held in 3 large allotments and approximately 5 hectares of land is available for development if the land was subdivided. (noted minimum allotments - 2500m²)</p> <p>Also current electricity supply issues experienced within Port Victoria hinder justification for additional industry land.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that land within zone may</p>	No further action at this time.

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>relocating to the subject land, however, the project was not supported due to current zoning.</p> <p>Advised that there is potential for relocating their existing engineering business which is located within the Primary Production to the expanded Industry zone.</p> <p>Noted the land has been for sale for a considerable period and suggests rezoning the land may create more interest from potential buyers.</p>	<p>not have been made available for development, based on the above it is consider premature to provide additional industry land at Port Victoria.</p>	
<p>Brenton & Sue Davey Amelia Downs RMD Pine Point SA 5571</p>	<p>Noted the importance of the agricultural industry and raised concerns about impact of mining and wind farms.</p> <p>Recommended the Council region be focused on agriculture and not mining.</p> <p>Noted the comment within the Discussion Paper in regards to potential upgrades to electricity infrastructure as a result of the Hillside Mine.</p> <p>Noted that any infrastructure upgrades as a result on the Rex mine would be the responsibility of the Rex Minerals and not Council. Therefore this information is irrelevant for the Discussion Paper.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, the approval of mines is outside the control of Council and is approved by the relevant Minister under the requirements of the Mining Act.</p> <p>Council Development Plan particularly the Primary Production zone which covers the majority of the Council area is strongly directed towards protecting and promoting primary production activities.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
<p>Jim Mullen Point Turton Progress</p>	<p>Recommended that an area be set aside for various emergency services.</p>	<p>Comments noted, sufficient land is available within the township to accommodate</p>	<p>Not a high priority but for discussion with the developer to</p>

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Association Inc		<p>development associated with any of the emergency services. It is noted this type of development would be a consent form of development within the Settlement zone.</p> <p>That said, there have been discussions with the land owner previously about the provision of some industrial land at Point Turton in the area around the effluent treatment plant and there is some recognition that the Local Centre zone could be enlarged to accommodate emergency services facilities.</p>	determine if a Developer Funded DPA is warranted.
Council Staff	<p>Recommended the following issues be considered:</p> <p>Dwellings non-complying in the Light Industry zone at Ardrossan.</p>	<p>Current policy relating to dwellings in the Light Industry zone is standard BDP Policy. It is noted that the primary intent of the zone is to allow for light industrial activities. The establishment of dwellings in the zone creates potential interface issues and may inhibit industrial development and thus the existing policy is supported.</p> <p>It is noted that a number of dwellings exist within the zone at Ardrossan, particularly fronting Bowman Road; however, these were established under previous zoning/policy. They have existing use rights and can be replaced, added to and extended as a consent use under the current and now long standing application of the law relevant to existing non-complying development.</p>	No action required

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	Review zoning for wind farms developments to go in locations that would be more appropriate	Comments noted, however, policy relating to wind farms is adopted as ministerial policy which generally provides little opportunity for Council to alter.	No action required
	Rezone residential land resulting from land division 544/D035/2005 (southern half of Captain Hutchinson Drive Point Turton) from Deferred Urban to Settlement	<p>Noted and agreed. The land has been divided and partially developed. Rezoning the land to Settlement simply reflects the current use of the land.</p> <p>It is noted that a detached dwelling is a consent form of development in the Deferred Urban zone, therefore current zoning should not impede development in the interim and on this basis any rezoning it not considered to be a high priority.</p>	Land to be considered for rezoning as part of a future DPA
	Reinstate exception in non-complying development lists in Primary Production, Coastal Conservation, Water Protection zones, to allow dwellings on allotments with existing LMAs stipulating building envelopes to be treated as merit developments	Noted and agreed. This policy was removed inadvertently as part of the BDP conversion DPA. This should be the subject of a section 29 request to the Minister	Make application for a section 29 amendment to the Development Plan to have the provision re-instated.
	Reword reference to dwellings within the Settlement zone non complying table in relation to sharing a common boundary with coastal zoned land (i.e. a two storey dwelling on properties from 39-59 Corny Point Road, Corny Point is non-complying, even though the properties are some 300m back from the coast, as the land front the Coastal Conservation	<p>The intent of the policy is to protect the views of the coast from properties located to the rear of coastal fronted allotments within Settlement zone.</p> <p>It is noted that two storey dwellings on the properties mentioned at Corny Point would be regarded as a consent form of</p>	No change recommended

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	zone).	<p>development because the land to the south is not located within the Settlement zone.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, there are likely to be instances where an application is non-complying, however, there will be little impact as a result of the two storey design considering the characteristics of the site and locality. In these circumstances Council is likely to proceed with the non-complying application.</p>	
	Include provisions of Council Policy P010 – Caravans Annexes in Caravan Parks (or reference to policy document) in the Caravan and Tourist Park zone.	<p>It is noted the design guidelines within the Council Policy are largely addressed under the building code and Council being the owners of the majority of Caravans Parks within the district, have control on the design of annexes as part of the approval process with regard to the existing Council Policy P010.</p> <p>On this basis, additional policy within the Development Plan to guide the construction of annexes is not considered to be warranted.</p>	No action required
	Setbacks distances from primary road frontage differ for single storey dwellings in the Residential zone between the zone policy and Table YoP/2 Building Setback s from Road Boundaries.	Noted and agreed.	Issue to be considered as part of Council's next DPA.

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	Land on the northern side of the Port Victoria Caravan Park has been divided into Community Title allotments to allow for dwellings to be developed, however, the land is zoned Caravan and Tourist Park which identifies dwellings as non-complying	<p>Noted, the land was divided in 2006 for tourist accommodation purposes</p> <p>Clause 4.1 of the associated Scheme Description states that allotments are to be used for short term tourist accommodation and short term residential purposes.</p> <p>With regard to the above, the current zoning is considered to be appropriate, unless amendments are made to the Community Scheme Description.</p>	No action required
	Location Map YoP/52 and Zone Map YoP/52 are Point Moorowie instead of Port Moorowie	Noted	Issue to be rectified as part of Council's next DPA.
	Consider creating a Local Centre zone in Port Moorowie.	<p>Not considered to a high priority as large areas of the township are yet to be developed and there is concerns whether demand warrants a Local Centre zone given the current size of the settlement.</p> <p>It is noted that a shop under 250m² is an envisaged use in the zone which would likely be sufficient to accommodate demand.</p> <p>In addition the settlement is conveniently located approximately 20 kilometres from Edithburgh which provides a wide range of services.</p>	No action required
	Consider creating a Local Centre zone at Point	There is already a Local Centre zone at Point	No action required

Submissions received from:	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	Turton	Turton. The zone is currently vacant and comprises an area of approximately 5500m ² which sufficient to accommodate additional shops etc of an adequate size to service the settlement.	

Other public engagement activities

Please provide details about any other communications and consultation activities undertaken in relation to the SDR preparation.

Communication options	
1. Public notices in local or state-wide newspapers, newsletters, etc	Yorke Peninsula Country Times and The Advertiser Media release provided to the Yorke Peninsula Country Times
2. Community information brochure	A Discussion Paper was prepared and made available for review during the consultation period.
3. Letter-box drops	Letter and emails were sent to 45 companies and groups associated with development in the region, including progress associations, real estate agents, surveyors, planning consultant and the Narrunga Nation Aboriginal Corporation
4. Web site	A notice and copy of the Discussion Paper was provided on Council's website
5. Telephone access line	Council planning staff details were provided to answer any questions from public and government agencies and organisations.
Consultation options	
1. Meetings with elected members and staff	A workshop was undertaken with elected members and staff early in the process, to assist identify key issues in the region and to formulate a consultation strategy
2. Community forums and meetings	A public meetings was held in Maitland

Consultation with state government and other bodies

Please indicate which state government departments, agencies and other relevant bodies were consulted during the drafting of the SDR and the results of that consultation.

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Department of Education and Child Development	No comment	Noted	No action required
Electranet Pty Ltd	<p>Agrees with the Discussion Paper's reference to power supply within the Council area.</p> <p>Supports the intention of updating Council's Development Plan in line with Version 6 of the SA Planning Policy Library (SAPPL).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	Update Council's Development Plan in line with Version 6 of the Planning Policy Library when the next DPA is undertaken.
Department for Environment Water and Natural Resources	<p>Coastal Issues</p> <p>Noted DEWNR previously provided advice in relation to establishing coastal zones over land with sensitive coastal features and unaddressed coastal hazards which is not specifically addressed in the Discussion Paper. Advised that DEWNR could provide mapping to assist with further analysis of this issue.</p> <p>Notes discrepancies between the Coastal Areas Principle 20 within the current SA Planning Policy Library (SAPPL) and Principle 20 within Council's Development Plan, particularly the reference to <i>Table YoP/1Coastal Areas: Site/Building Floor Levels</i>.</p>	Issues raised to be consider as part of the review of vulnerable shacks currently undertaken by DEWNR and any subsequent DPA's.	Continue the review of vulnerable shack sites in conjunction with DEWNR and once complete, use the findings to assist identify those sites at risk of sea level rise and introduce policy to manage and guide development on those sites and other coastal areas.

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>DEWNR raised the following concerns with the use of Table YoP/1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It might be interpreted that minimum site and floor levels do not apply outside those places listed in the table - The geographic extent of the listed areas are not exactly defined so the extent of the area subject to the levels is uncertain - The listed levels may not apply across all of area to which they are allocated <p>To address the above, it is recommended that Principle 20 revert to the SAPPL wording, remove table YoP/1 and only apply specific floor and site levels within the zone where it is known that those levels apply across the whole zone. Sites in other areas would need to be subject to site specific assessment.</p> <p>Notes an alternative interim approach to the above would be to revert Principle 20 to the SAPPL wording, retain Table YoP/1 and inset a new PDC within the Coastal Areas module specifically referring to the table</p> <p>Advised of further recommended changes to the standard Principle 20 to avoid the need for site filling in appropriate areas. As a result development would only be required to provide elevated floor levels. Noted that this variation</p>		

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>maybe best undertaken in consultation with DPTI via an amendment to the SAPPL. Advises it would be best to apply the amended provision only to specific, identified settlements.</p> <p>Noted that this issue can be considered as part of the vulnerability assessment currently being undertaken by the DEWNR</p>		
	<p>Heritage</p> <p>Notes that the Development Plan does not identify local heritage places, thus a Local Heritage DPA may need to be considered in the future.</p> <p>Advised that in order to undertake a DPA a new heritage survey by a suitably qualified architect/consultant would be needed, given the previous survey is over 15 years old.</p>	<p>Currently Council's prior is towards coastal planning issues and managing demand and growth within selected coastal township. A Local Heritage DPA is likely to be considered once these priors have been addressed.</p> <p>The Development Plan contains existing heritage policy which is considered to be sufficient in the interim to manage heritage related issues.</p>	No action required at this time
	<p>Marine Parks</p> <p>Notes that the Discussion Paper states that the previous comments provided in regards to Marine Parks will be considered as part of the SDR. DEWNR considers this a reasonable approach.</p>	Noted	No action required

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Native Vegetation and Biodiversity Conservation</p> <p>Notes the extensive clearance of native vegetation within the Council area and hence the significance of the remainder</p> <p>Recommends that Council considers the inclusion of mapping within the Development Plan which identifies areas of intact native vegetation. Such mapping would ensure that development within 20 metres of such vegetation is referred to the Native Vegetation Council for direction as per item 26 of Schedule 8 of the Development Regulations</p>	<p>It is noted that areas of native vegetation are primarily located within Primary Production, Water Protection and Coastal Conservation zones. Development in these zones is largely restricted and uses envisaged are unlikely to create impacts with native vegetation, unless clearance is proposed which requires approval under the Native Vegetation Act.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Plan contains policy which promotes the retention of native vegetation and requires development to be designed and sited to minimise disturbance of native vegetation.</p> <p>With regard to the above current policy is considered to be sufficient to suitably protect native vegetation within the Council area.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
	<p>Natural Resources Management</p> <p>Recommended Council should have regard to the Northern and Yorke Regional Natural Resources Management Plan, in particular Volume D. Regulatory and Policy Framework, section 3</p>	<p>The review has had regard to Volume D and no significant discrepancies that warrant attention between Council's Development Plan and the relevant policy within NRM Plan were identified.</p>	<p>No action required</p>

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
SA Water	Requested more information in regards to the statements made in the first paragraph under the Water Supply heading within the discussion paper.	<p>Paragraph 1 reads: <i>The Peninsula has been affected by water connection and pressure issues for many years, and is a continuing issue. This is particularly the case in the summer months, where higher demand on the Peninsula exists due to the holiday period attracting high numbers of tourists.</i></p> <p>The above is largely anecdotal and is based on historical knowledge in regards to water issues associated with development on the Peninsula. This statement has little impact on the outcomes/recommendations of the SDR and merely identifies a potential constraint for future development proposals.</p>	No action required
	<p>Advised that SA Water will continue to review the performance of the supply network and upgrade infrastructure as required.</p> <p>Advised that SA Water is currently preparing a submission for ESCOSA with respects to future augmentation works for the Warooka and Point Turton system.</p>	Comments noted issues to be considered as part of any future rezoning/large scale development proposals.	No action required
	<p>Provided the general comments applying to new developments or redevelopments in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA Water planning 	Comments noted, issues to be considered as part of any future rezoning/large scale development proposals.	No action required

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protection of source water - Provision of infrastructure - Trade waste discharge agreements 		
Department of State Development	<p>Supports existing Energy Efficiency policy relating to land division with the Development Plan.</p> <p>Notes that additional policy specific to each allotment orientation could be incorporated from the Planning Guide: ‘Land division – how best practice land division can contribute to household energy efficiency’</p>	<p>Noted,</p> <p>Noted however, Council's Development Plan incorporates standard BDP policy, further policy adopted from the land division planning guide is not warranted.</p>	No action required
SA Power Networks	<p>Requested that Council and prospective developer ensure that power is available before any land division takes place.</p> <p>Provided a list of significant SA Power Network property interests in the Council Area.</p> <p>Provide general comments in relation electricity infrastructure and future load growth.</p>	<p>Comments are general in nature and the issues raised are more appropriately addressed at the development stage and not part of this strategic review.</p>	No action required
Environment Protection Authority	<p>Water Quality Recommends that stormwater management in relation to infrastructure planning be considered within the SDR. In particular, consider including a commitment to the preparation of Stormwater Management Plans</p>	<p>Comments in respect to stormwater managements plans are noted, however, issues in relation to the Local Government Act are outside the scope of this review process which is undertaken pursuant to the</p>	No action required

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>in accordance with the Local Government Act.</p> <p>Notes that a key objective of the Stormwater Management Plan is to manage the environmental impacts of stormwater as a conveyor of pollution, which is of particular importance given parts of the Council area is within the Para Wurlie, Carribie and Marion Water Protection Area, as proclaimed under the Environment Protection Act.</p> <p>In addition, the Management Plans should consider Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)</p>	<p>Development Act and focuses on the appropriateness of Council's Development Plan</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Council Development Plan incorporates the standard modules of SAPPL which includes policy specifically addressing stormwater management and WSUD.</p> <p>In addition, Council does require stormwater management plans as part of larger scale land divisions and stormwater management is key consideration of all rezoning proposals.</p>	
	<p>Site Contamination Recommends that site contamination be specifically address in the SDR.</p> <p>Notes that Council have a responsibility to consider site contamination when rezoning and redeveloping land.</p> <p>Encourages Council to identify sites that may be contaminated through previous land uses and to keep and update a register for planning purposes.</p>	<p>Council's Development Plan contains Site Contamination policy adopted from the SAPPL.</p> <p>Issues with respect to site contamination are required to be investigated as part of the rezoning process.</p> <p>Noted, Council already has a database of potentially contaminated sites.</p>	No action required
	<p>Landfills Noted the environment and health risks</p>	<p>The proximity of landfills and their potential impacts has become a</p>	No action required

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>associated with landfills.</p> <p>Advised of EPA policy which recommends a minimum separation distance of 500m between development and a landfill boundary, including historic, existing and future site.</p> <p>Recommended that any development within the separation distance should be assessed and determined as suitable and compatible.</p>	<p>key/standard consideration as part of any DPA.</p> <p>It is noted that many townships within the Council area contain landfills, principally historic, within 500m of their boundaries. Previous assessments of a number of landfills within the Council Area have been undertaken as part of rezoning proposals. Generally the historic landfills within the region are considered to be low risk given the size, age and previous management activities (i.e. burning rubbish) and Council has not experienced any issues in the past with respect to landfill gas.</p> <p>Assessing any development within the 500m buffer from a landfill, particularly historic sites, is considered to be superfluous and would likely severely constraint development in many townships.</p> <p>Council's Development Plan contains the standard BDP Policy in relation to interface issues and separate distances from landfills. If this existing policy is not considered to be sufficient to address this issue then updates to the modules in the SAPPL may be required, as a</p>	

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>Interface between Land Uses</p> <p>Noted that the creation of residential and rural living zones adjacent non-residential areas can result in interface issues.</p> <p>Recommended that the SDR consider interface issues to ensure conflicts are prevented through careful planning and design.</p> <p>Provided principles for consideration relating to management of air and noise emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Control at source - Separation of source and receiver - Control at receiver 	<p>result of discussions/investigations between DPTI and the EPA.</p> <p>Noted, assessing interface issues is a standard investigation that occurs as part of any DPA. Thus any rezoning will unlikely proceed unless potential interface issues can be suitably managed</p> <p>Also Council's Development Plan contains standard policy that address interface issues including the assessment and management of noise generating activities (see Interface between Land Uses PDC 7-10)..</p>	<p>No action required</p>
	<p>Wastewater Management</p> <p>Notes EPA's preference for CWMS over on-site system.</p> <p>Recommends that as part of the SDR, Council focuses future residential growth into towns with CWMS capacity in preference to those areas that rely on on-site systems.</p> <p>Where growth is contemplated in other areas, the EPA recommends that minimum allotment</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, issues largely to be considered as part of any future rezoning proposals.</p>	<p>No action required</p>

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
	<p>sizes should be determined, based on climate, topography, soil and hydrologic factors and the need to prevent cumulative impacts on surface and groundwater resources.</p> <p>Recommends that Council review the Wardang and Orontes aquatic ecosystem reports which outline pressures and management responses for the region, including issues arising from onsite wastewater management systems.</p>	<p>Noted, however, all onsite systems are required to be designed in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements which consider and minimise associated environmental impacts.</p>	
	<p>South Australian Planning Policy Library Recommends the Development Plan be updated to Version 6 of the SAPPL</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Update the development Plan in line with the latest version of the Planning Policy Library.</p>
<p>Department of Premier and Cabinet Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division</p>	<p>Notes that Council has an agreement with the Narrunga Nations Aboriginal Corporation to refer major development proposal to them, however, their local archive would not list the same heritage sites found within the central archive which is administered by the Department.</p> <p>Strongly recommended that Council consider instigating a referral process for an Aboriginal heritage site search to be conducted by the Department for ground disturbing activities or major projects.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, there is no mechanism in the Development Act to initiate a referral as part of the assessment of development applications; however, referral to the Department is conducted as part of rezoning proposals (DPAs).</p> <p>All other issues raised in the submission are largely addressed by the Aboriginal Heritage Act.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
<p>Department of Planning,</p>	<p>Initial comments provided prior to the</p>	<p>Comments addressed in Discussion</p>	<p>No action required</p>

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Transport and Infrastructure – Planning Division	preparation of the discussion paper	Paper (Appendix B)	
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure – Transport Division	No comments received		
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology	No comments received		
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	No comments received		
Department of Health and Ageing	No comments received		
Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy	Initial comments provided prior to the preparation of the discussion paper	Comments addressed in Discussion Paper (Appendix B)	No action required
Department of Primary Industries and Regions	No comments received		
South Australian Tourism Commission	No comments received		
Country Fire Service	No comments received		

Department/agency consulted	Summary of comments	Response to issues	Proposed Development Plan response
Mr Steven Griffiths – Member for Goyder	No comments received		
District Council of Copper Coast	No comments received		
District Council of Barunga West	No comments received		
Wakefield Regional Council	No comments received		
Northern and Yorke NRM Board	No comments received		
Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North	No comments received		

5. Documents consulted

Councils are invited to indicate which documents they reviewed or referred to while preparing the SDR.

Documents consulted
Yorke Peninsula Land Use Framework
South Australian Strategic Plan
Northern and Yorke Regional Natural Resources Management Plan
The Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia – Regional Overview
Yorke Peninsula Council Strategic Plan 2012-2015
South Australian Transmission Annual Planning Report. ElectraNet June 2013
Distribution Annual Planning Report. SA Power Networks, 1 November 2013
SA Water's Long Term Plan for Yorke Peninsula
Yorke Peninsula Destination Action Plan 2012-2015. South Australian Tourism Commission and Yorke Peninsula Tourism.
Department of Planning and Local Government, Population Projections by Local Government Area, 2006-2026

6. Documents provided

Please list and attach (or provide a web link to) any documents prepared during the SDR process, such as background papers, investigation reports, structure plans, public engagement documents and GIS layers.

Documents provided
Yorke Peninsula Council Section 30 Review Discussion Paper (Attachment A)
Public Notice (Attachment B)
Targeted groups consultation letter (Attachment C)

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Agency Submission Summary

No.	Agency	Summary of Comments	Response to Issues	Recommendation
1	Myles Somers ElectraNet	<p>Agrees with the Discussion Paper's reference to power supply within the Council area.</p> <p>Supports the intention of updating Council's Development Plan in line with Version 6 of the SA Planning Policy Library (SAPPL).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	Update Council's Development Plan in line with Version 6 of the Planning Policy Library when the next DPA is undertaken.
2	Vince Dimasi Department for Education and Child Development	No comment	Noted	No action required
3	Alex Ward Department of Environment Water and Natural Resources	<p>Coastal Issues</p> <p>Noted DEWNR previously provided advice in relation to establishing coastal zones over land with sensitive coastal features and unaddressed coastal hazards which is not specifically addressed in the Discussion Paper. Advised that DEWNR could provide mapping to assist with further analysis of this issue.</p> <p>Notes discrepancies between the Coastal Areas Principle 20 within the current SA Planning Policy Library (SAPPL) and Principle 20 within Council's Development Plan, particularly the reference to <i>Table YoP/1 Coastal Areas: Site/Building Floor Levels</i>.</p> <p>DEWNR raised the following concerns with the use of Table YoP/1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It might be interpreted that minimum site and floor levels do not apply outside those places listed in the table - The geographic extent of the listed areas are not exactly defined so the extent of the area subject to the 	Issues raised to be consider as part of the review of vulnerable shacks currently undertaken by DEWNR and any subsequent DPA's.	Continue the review of vulnerable shack sites in conjunction with DEWNR and once complete, use the findings to assist identify those sites at risk of sea level rise and introduce policy to manage and guide development on those sites and other coastal areas.

		<p>levels is uncertain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The listed levels may not apply across all of area to which they are allocated <p>To address the above, it is recommended that Principle 20 revert to the SAPPL wording, remove table YoP/1 and only apply specific floor and site levels within the zone where it is know that those levels apply across the whole zone. Sites in other areas would need to be subject to site specific assessment.</p> <p>Notes an alternative interim approach to the above would be to revert Principle 20 to the SAPPL wording, retain Table YoP/1 and inset a new PDC within the Coastal Areas module specifically referring to the table</p> <p>Advised of further recommended changes to the standard Principle 20 to avoid the need for site filling in appropriate areas. As a result development would only be required to provide elevated floor levels. Noted that this variation maybe best undertaken in consultation with DPTI via an amendment to the SAPPL. Advises it would be best to apply the amended provision only to specific, identified settlements.</p> <p>Noted that this issue can be considered as part of the vulnerability assessment currently being undertaken by the DEWNR</p>		
		<p>Heritage</p> <p>Notes that the Development Plan does not</p>	<p>Currently Council's prior is towards coastal planning issues and managing demand and</p>	<p>No action required at this time</p>

	<p>identify local heritage places, thus a Local Heritage DPA may need to be considered in the future.</p> <p>Advised that in order to undertake a DPA a new heritage survey by a suitably qualified architect/consultant would be needed, given the previous survey is over 15 years old.</p>	<p>growth within selected coastal township. A Local Heritage DPA is likely to be considered once these priors have been addressed.</p> <p>The Development Plan contains existing heritage policy which is considered to be sufficient in the interim to manage heritage related issues.</p>	
	<p>Marine Parks</p> <p>Notes that the Discussion Paper states that the previous comments provided in regards to Marine Parks will be considered as part of the SDR. DEWNR considers this a reasonable approach.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action required</p>
	<p>Native Vegetation and Biodiversity Conservation</p> <p>Notes the extensive clearance of native vegetation within the Council area and hence the significance of the remainder</p> <p>Recommends that Council considers the inclusion of mapping within the Development Plan which identifies areas of intact native vegetation. Such mapping would ensure that development within 20 metres of such vegetation is referred to the Native Vegetation Council for direction as per item 26 of Schedule 8 of the Development Regulations</p>	<p>It is noted that areas of native vegetation are primarily located within Primary Production, Water Protection and Coastal Conservation zones. Development in these zones is largely restricted and uses envisaged are unlikely to create impacts with native vegetation, unless clearance is proposed which requires approval under the Native Vegetation Act.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Plan contains policy which promotes the retention of native vegetation and requires development to be designed and sited to minimise disturbance of native vegetation.</p> <p>With regard to the above current policy is considered to be sufficient to suitably protect native vegetation within the Council area.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
	<p>Natural Resources Management</p>	<p>The review has had regard to Volume D and no significant discrepancies that</p>	<p>No action required</p>

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Agency Submission Summary

		Recommended Council should have regard to the Northern and Yorke Regional Natural Resources Management Plan, in particular Volume D. Regulatory and Policy Framework, section 3	warrant attention between Council's Development Plan and the relevant policy within NRM Plan were identified.	
4	Paul Feronas SA Water	Requested more information in regards to the statements made in the first paragraph under the Water Supply heading within the discussion paper	Paragraph 1 reads: <i>The Peninsula has been affected by water connection and pressure issues for many years, and is a continuing issue. This is particularly the case in the summer months, where higher demand on the Peninsula exists due to the holiday period attracting high numbers of tourists.</i> The above is largely anecdotal and is based on historical knowledge in regards to water issues associated with development on the Peninsula. This statement has little impact on the outcomes/recommendations of the SDR and merely identifies a potential constraint for future development proposals.	No action required
		Advised that SA Water will continue to review the performance of the supply network and upgrade infrastructure as required. Advised that SA Water is currently preparing a submission for ESCOSA with respects to future augmentation works for the Warooka and Point Turton system.	Comments noted issues to be considered as part of any future rezoning/large scale development proposals.	No action required
		Provided the general comments applying to new developments or redevelopments in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA Water planning - Protection of source water - Provision of infrastructure - Trade waste discharge agreements 	Comments noted, issues to be considered as part of any future rezoning/large scale development proposals.	No action required

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Agency Submission Summary

5	Martin Carter Department of State Development	<p>Supports existing Energy Efficiency policy relating to land division with the Development Plan.</p> <p>Notes that additional policy specific to each allotment orientation could be incorporated from the Planning Guide: 'Land division – how best practice land division can contribute to household energy efficiency'</p>	<p>Noted,</p> <p>Noted however, Council's Development Plan incorporates standard BDP policy, further policy adopted from the land division planning guide is not warranted.</p>	No action required
6	Jane Jusup SA Power Networks	<p>Requested that Council and prospective developer ensure that power is available before any land division takes place.</p> <p>Provided a list of significant SA Power Network property interests in the Council Area.</p> <p>Provide general comments in relation electricity infrastructure and future load growth.</p>	<p>Comments are general in nature and the issues raised are more appropriately addressed at the development stage and not part of this strategic review.</p>	No action required
7	Geoff Bradford EPA	<p>Water Quality Recommends that stormwater management in relation to infrastructure planning be considered within the SDR. In particular, consider including a commitment to the preparation of Stormwater Management Plans in accordance with the Local Government Act.</p> <p>Notes that a key objective of the Stormwater Management Plan is to manage the environmental impacts of stormwater as a conveyor of pollution, which is of particular importance given parts of the Council area is within the Para Wurlie, Carribe and Marion Water Protection Area, as proclaimed under the Environment Protection Act.</p>	<p>Comments in respect to stormwater managements plans are noted, however, issues in relation to the Local Government Act are outside the scope of this review process which is undertaken pursuant to the Development Act and focuses on the appropriateness of Council's Development Plan</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Council Development Plan incorporates the standard modules of SAPPL which includes policy specifically addressing stormwater management and WSUD.</p> <p>In addition, Council does require stormwater management plans as part of</p>	No action required

		<p>In addition, the Management Plans should consider Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)</p>	<p>larger scale land divisions and stormwater management is key consideration of all rezoning proposals.</p>	
		<p>Site Contamination Recommends that site contamination be specifically address in the SDR.</p> <p>Notes that Council have a responsibility to consider site contamination when rezoning and redeveloping land.</p> <p>Encourages Council to identify sites that may be contaminated through previous land uses and to keep and update a register for planning purposes.</p>	<p>Council's Development Plan contains Site Contamination policy adopted from the SAPPL.</p> <p>Issues with respect to site contamination are required to be investigated as part of the rezoning process.</p> <p>Noted, Council already has a database of potentially contaminated sites.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
		<p>Landfills Noted the environment and health risks associated with landfills.</p> <p>Advised of EPA policy which recommends a minimum separation distance of 500m between development and a landfill boundary, including historic, existing and future site.</p> <p>Recommended that any development within the separation distance should be assessed and determined as suitable and compatible.</p>	<p>The proximity of landfills and their potential impacts has become a key/standard consideration as part of any DPA.</p> <p>It is noted that many townships within the Council area contain landfills, principally historic, within 500m of their boundaries. Previous assessments of a number of landfills within the Council Area have been undertaken as part of rezoning proposals. Generally the historic landfills within the region are considered to be low risk given the size, age and previous management activities (i.e. burning rubbish) and Council has not experienced any issues in the past with respect to landfill gas.</p> <p>Assessing any development within the 500m buffer from a landfill, particularly historic sites, is considered to be superfluous and would likely severely constraint development in many townships.</p>	<p>No action required</p>

			<p>Council's Development Plan contains the standard BDP Policy in relation to interface issues and separate distances from landfills. If this existing policy is not considered to be sufficient to address this issue then updates to the modules in the SAPPL may be required, as a result of discussions/investigations between DPTI and the EPA.</p>	
		<p>Interface between Land Uses</p> <p>Noted that the creation of residential and rural living zones adjacent non-residential areas can result in interface issues.</p> <p>Recommended that the SDR consider interface issues to ensure conflicts are prevented through careful planning and design.</p> <p>Provided principles for consideration relating to management of air and noise emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Control at source - Separation of source and receiver - Control at receiver 	<p>Noted, assessing interface issues is a standard investigation that occurs as part of any DPA. Thus any rezoning will unlikely proceed unless potential interface issues can be suitably managed</p> <p>Also Council's Development Plan contains standard policy that address interface issues including the assessment and management of noise generating activities (see Interface between Land Uses PDC 7-10)..</p>	<p>No action required</p>
		<p>Wastewater Management</p> <p>Notes EPA's preference for CWMS over on-site system.</p> <p>Recommends that as part of the SDR, Council focuses future residential growth into towns with CWMS capacity in preference to those areas that rely on on-site systems.</p> <p>Where growth is contemplated in other areas, the EPA recommends that minimum allotment sizes should be determined, based</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, issues largely to be considered as part of any future rezoning proposals.</p>	<p>No action required</p>

		<p>on climate, topography, soil and hydrologic factors and the need to prevent cumulative impacts on surface and groundwater resources.</p> <p>Recommends that Council review the Wardang and Orontes aquatic ecosystem reports which outline pressures and management responses for the region, including issues arising from onsite wastewater management systems.</p>	<p>Noted, however, all onsite systems are required to be designed in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements which consider and minimise associated environmental impacts.</p>	
		<p>South Australian Planning Policy Library Recommends the Development Plan be updated to Version 6 of the SAPPL</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Update the development Plan in line with the latest version of the Planning Policy Library.</p>
8	<p>Perry Langeberg Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Department for State Development</p>	<p>Notes that Council has an agreement with the Narrunga Nations Aboriginal Corporation to refer major development proposal to them, however, their local archive would not list the same heritage sites found within the central archive which is administered by the Department.</p> <p>Strongly recommended that Council consider instigating a referral process for an Aboriginal heritage site search to be conducted by the Department for ground disturbing activities or major projects.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, there is no mechanism in the Development Act to initiate a referral as part of the assessment of development applications; however, referral to the Department is conducted as part of rezoning proposals (DPAs).</p> <p>All other issues raised in the submission are largely addressed by the Aboriginal Heritage Act.</p>	<p>No action required</p>

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Response to Issues	Recommendation
1	Len Easterher LJ Hooker Port Vincent/Ardrossan 5 Main Street Port Vincent SA 5581	<p>Provided a summary of land supply and development history for various towns along the eastern side of the peninsula and recommended a number of zoning amendments which are summarised below.</p> <p>Ardrossan Recommended land to the north west of the town fronting Tiddy Widdy Beach Road be rezoned Residential</p>	Land is already zoned Residential.	No action required
		<p>Stansbury Noted that there is sufficient residential land available</p>	Noted	No action required
		<p>Point Turton Noted that there is sufficient residential land available</p>	Noted	No action required
		<p>Port Vincent Recommended land to the south of the town, west of Young Avenue be rezoned Residential</p> <p>Recommended Sec 67 & Lot144 located to the south west of the town be rezoned Rural Living</p>	<p>Not considered a priority given the recent Port Vincent DPA which provided a long term land supply of Residential land to the immediate west of the township.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the large amount Residential land available within the township, there is currently no Rural Living land at Port Vincent. For future consideration as part of a council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>	Demand for a Rural Living zone at Port Vincent to be considered as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA
		<p>Rouges Point Recommended land on the southern side of Rogues Point Road be rezoned a combination of Residential and Rural Living</p>	Rezoning the land in this locality is considered to be a low priority given the amount of land available for development within the Settlement and Deferred Urban zones	No action required

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

		<p>Pine Point Recommended that land fronting Main Coast Road be rezoned a combination of Residential (including the expansion of the Caravan Park) and Rural Living</p>	<p>It is noted that there is limited land available within the township for development and some consideration may need to be given to providing additional residential land and possibly some Rural Living land, but not at the rear of the settlement which is presently farmed and would create interface issues. It would also require residents to cross the highway to access the beach. A site of the eastern side of the highway is favoured over and extension to the west of the town.</p> <p>Issues include; need, (is there adequate demand for land), infrastructure constraints (particularly water) and potential issues with additional properties fronting and taking access from the Highway.</p> <p>Not a high priority at present.</p>	<p>No action required at this point in time.</p>
		<p>Black Point Noted that there is sufficient residential land available. However, noted opportunity for future expansion of the caravan & boat trailer park and rezoning the cliff top land west of the boat ramp for residential purposes</p>	<p>The Caravan Park and Tourist zone includes approximately 3 hectares of vacant land on the western side of Black Point Drive thus any expansion can easily be accommodated within the existing zone. That said there has been no moves to redevelop the caravan park since the last zone changes were made at Black Point, which brings into question the relevance of this zoning.</p> <p>At the present time additional residential land at Black Point is unwarranted and could be shifted to Pine Point (refer above) if required.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
		<p>Port Julia Recommended land west of Osprey Street be rezoned Holiday Settlement and allow expansion of camping ground</p>	<p>Rezoning the land is considered to be a low priority given the extent of land available for development within the Settlement zone.</p>	<p>No action required</p>
		<p>Sheoak Flat Recommended rezoning land to the south of</p>	<p>This land is currently being considered for rezoning by Council via a developer funded</p>	<p>Land being considered as part of current DPA.</p>

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

		the settlement a combination of Holiday Settlement & Rural Living	DPA. An SOI has recently been submitted to DPTI for approval.	
2	<p>Nathan Franklin MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Super G Developments Pty Ltd – Owner of 106 Sultana Point Road, Edithburgh</p>	<p>Recommended that the minimum allotment requirements for the Rural Living land to the south of the Edithburgh bound by Sultana Point Road, Wattle Bay Road and Hilsea Road be reduced from 2 hectares to 2,500m².</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, issues to be considered and addressed as part of the Edithburgh Town and Surrounds DPA.</p> <p>The respondent has advised that they will provide a submission as part of the Edithburgh DPA.</p>	<p>Issues to be considered as part of the current Edithburgh DPA.</p>
3	<p>Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of James Honner Nominees Pty Ltd – Owner of the Stansbury Holiday Motel</p>	<p>Noted that the land is located within the Caravan and Tourist Park zone.</p> <p>Advised that the subject land contains areas which are vacant and/or utilised and there is intention to redevelop/expand the motel with additional units and divide surplus land fronting Adelaide and Bayview roads for residential allotments (as depicted on concept plan).</p> <p>Noted that changes to zone policy as a result of the BDP DPA impacted development potential for the site as land division and dwellings are now non-complying. Both were merit forms of development within the previous Tourist Accommodation zone.</p> <p>Noted that the above policy relating to dwellings is contradictory to zone objective 2 which envisages <i>cabins, serviced apartment and transportable dwellings</i>.</p> <p>Also notes the decision of the Supreme Court (<i>Paradise Development v DC York Peninsula</i>) which found that tourist accommodation in the form of self contained accommodation was in fact a dwelling. Noted that if this interpretation</p>	<p>Policy relating to dwellings and land division in the Caravan and Tourist Park zone is standard SAPPL policy which was adopted as part of the BDP DPA.</p> <p>It is however noted that the development on the land is not a caravan or tourist park but is a motel, a use that is equally suitable in the residential zone. The main purpose of the Caravan and Tourist Park zone was to preserve land for low cost accommodation and most obviously for short term tourist accommodation. It was a policy initiative intended to stop caravan parks from being subdivided and thus retain the land primarily for tourist use.</p> <p>There is already a large caravan/tourist park to the south of Stansbury which has better access to a suitable beach than the subject land. That said, there is a shortage of good quality motel accommodation that should not be lost if the subject land was allowed to be redeveloped for residential use.</p> <p>I agree that the present Caravan and Tourist Park zone is probably not the most suitable</p>	<p>No further action at this time but could be the subject of a Developer Funded DPA.</p>

		<p>was applied it would be at odds with the zone.</p> <p>Recommended that the above issues be amended in the following manner as a priority in the next DPA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusion of a Policy Area of Precinct within the Caravan and Tourist Park Zone, specifically relating to the subject land 2. The Policy Area or Precinct allowing for land division and dwellings to be considered on merit. 3. Amended terminology to ensure that serviced apartments can be developed on merit and they are not interpreted as dwellings. 	<p>zoning for the land given its present use and consider that better use could be made of the land subject to at least a significant proportion of it still being available for motel accommodation.</p>	
4	<p>John Outhred Outhred English Associates Pty Ltd PO Box 20 North Adelaide SA 5006</p> <p>On behalf of Trevor & Jacqueline Boerth and Graeme & Tania Heinrich</p>	<p>Submission relates to Allotment 20 & 21 Klein Point Road, Stansbury, currently zone Rural Living.</p> <p>Noted that each allotment comprises an area of 1.2 hectares and current policy restricts land division to 1 hectare allotments.</p> <p>Requested that the minimum allotment requirements be reduced to 6,000m².</p> <p>Noted that the amount of Rural Living land at Stansbury is limited and the above would allow the potential for 16 additional allotments being created within the existing zone.</p>	<p>There is certainly merit to the proposal given it allows the opportunity for additional Rural Living development without extending the current zone boundary.</p> <p>The present Rural Living zones in the Council Development Plan have not been comprehensively reviewed and it would appear that present policies are resulting in allotments that are too large for Rural Living purposes, particularly by (often) part time residents and given the vast majority are not used for any rural activity.</p> <p>There is a latent demand for larger allotments, some for lifestyle reasons, others because people want large sheds for boats and other recreational vehicles that can't be accommodated in the Residential zone.</p> <p>Subject to further investigations in relation to demand for rural living land in Stansbury,</p>	<p>To be considered as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA</p>

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

			infrastructure requirements etc, issues raised are worth considering as part of a future Council wide Rural Living DPA.	
5	Trevor and Christine Carbins 100 Adelaide Road Stansbury SA 5582	<p>Recommended extending the township boundary on the eastern side of Adelaide Road from Mills Gully Lookout Road to McIntrye's Lane and allow allotments with a minimum area of 5000m².</p> <p>Noted the following benefits of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forms a compact extension of the town - Enhance the entrance to the town - Assist to manage feral plant species on the property and reduce fire risk - Land is well above land likely to be impacted by sea level rise 	<p>The subject land consists of four allotments zoned Coastal Conservation.</p> <p>The allotment range in area of 0.8-2.6 hectares, front a coastal reserve and each contain a dwelling.</p> <p>The allotments are each about 180m in depth. To allow 5000m² allotment areas would result in lots that are only 27m wide.</p> <p>Generally the linear expansion of townships along the coast in not supported, however, given the existing use and character of the land, rezoning the properties to Rural Living might be appropriate.</p> <p>However, given its coastal location any increase to the density of development would need to be restricted (i.e. larger minimum allotment areas or no further division) in order to minimise potential impacts to the coast.</p> <p>It is recommended that the above issues be considering as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.</p>	To be considered as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA
6	Allan McIntrye	<p>Supports the submission from Trevor and Christine Carbins (above).</p> <p>Noted the following benefits of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent speed limits - Economic benefits <p>Also raised issues in regards to crab licensing and associated environmental and tourism impacts</p>	<p>Comments noted, refer to response above.</p> <p>Issues raised in regard to crab licensing is not a relevant planning issue.</p>	Refer to comments above

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

7	Pat & Bernard Connerton	Supports the submission from Trevor and Christine Carbins (Submission 5).	Comments noted, refer to response above	Refer to comments above
8	Veronica Brundell	Supports the submissions from Trevor & Jacqueline Boerth and Graeme & Tania Heinrich (submission 4) and Trevor and Christine Carbins (Submission 5).	Comments noted, refer to responses above	Refer to comments above
9	Kath Young PO Box 62 Eden Valley SA 5235	<p>Submission related to Lot 436 Lehman Road, Edithburgh.</p> <p>The allotment is 2.2 hectares and is located within the Rural Living zone. Current policy restricts land division to 2 hectares.</p> <p>Seeks to divide the land into two allotments; one to contain the existing dwelling and the other vacant.</p> <p>Considers the proposed allotment sizes would be more suitable and manageable given the semi-rural locality and the land's proximity to the town.</p>	<p>This land is proposed to be rezoned Primary Production as part of the Edithburgh DPA as it forms part of the large Rural Living zone to the South of the town which has remained largely undeveloped for a considerable period and continues to be principally used for farming.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, issues raised are being considered as part of the Edithburgh DPA.</p>	Issues to be considered as part of the current Edithburgh DPA.
10	P.G. Vigar 260 Lake Fowler Road Coobowie SA 5589	<p>Requests that Section 120, 122, 405, 448 & 449 at Edithburgh be rezoned from Primary Production to Residential/Rural Living.</p> <p>Noted that the land is surrounded by small residential allotment and the difficulty of farming the land with modern day OH&S requirements in a semi built up area.</p>	<p>It is noted that the land is located outside of the investigation area that forms the Edithburgh DPA and is currently zoned Primary Production.</p> <p>The land is well separated from the town and therefore is unlikely to be considered for rezoning. However, the issues raised will be considered as part of the Edithburgh DPA</p>	Issues to be considered as part of the Edithburgh DPA.
11	Richard Hawkins, Glen Barclay & Roger Collins	<p>Submission related to zoning amendments for four properties at Corny Point.</p> <p>Section 115 Hundred of Carribie,</p> <p>Requests that 18.1 hectares of the 143 hectare property be rezoned from Primary Production</p>	The further expansion of the township is not supported particularly with regard to amount of residential land available for development and constraints associated with electricity supply to the township which require a 1 million dollar (at 2008 figures) investment to upgrade supply .	Not considered a priority, however, issue of Rural Living land at Corny Point can be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.

		<p>to Rural Living.</p> <p>Land affected fronts Rockleigh Road and the proposal would allow the creation of 12-14 allotments of approximately 1 hectare. Advised that the land contains native vegetation and revegetation and pest plant control activities have occurred on the site.</p> <p>Noted that the Native Vegetation Management Unit has advised that they do not object to the proposal providing future house, access tracks are located in clear areas and minimal clearance is require for boundary fences.</p>	<p>Also the proposal results in ‘strip’ development along Rockleigh Road which further extends the settlement to the south west and increases interface issues with adjoining farmland. It is noted that the settlement has already been developed in a somewhat ad hoc/widespread manner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the large amount residential land available within the township, there is currently no Rural Living land at Corny Point. Therefore consideration to whether a Rural Living zone at Corny Point may be warranted as part of a Council wide Rural living DPA is supported.</p>	
		<p>Lot 103 Lighthouse Road</p> <p>Requests that 7 acres of the subject land be rezoned from Coastal Protection to Holiday Settlement.</p> <p>Noted that the proposal is located adjacent the Dunn Point shacks and the land owner is willing to provide land for wastewater treatment for the existing shacks and future development on the affected land.</p> <p>Advised that the Coast Protection Board have provided in principle support for the proposal.</p>	<p>It is noted that the subject land is located inland immediately behind the existing shacks. The proposal would represent a compact extension of the existing settlement zone and also provides the opportunity to improve wastewater management for the existing shacks, which is supported. It might also allow for the relocation of the existing shacks back from the low cliff edge that fronts the shack sites and thus address the coastal erosion issues that are affecting the shacks at the present time.</p> <p>The land is zoned Coast Conservation; however the land at the rear of the coastal dunes is cleared farmland. The dunes would need to be retained in the Coast Conservation zone but there is some merit in considering an extension to the zone over the cleared farmland if coastal erosion issues relevant to the existing shack sites can be addressed as well.</p>	<p>Subject to land owner providing more justification a developer funded DPA may be considered for this land in the future. However, it otherwise a low priority on the schedule of future DPAs.</p>

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

			Whilst the above is considered to be a low priority, subject to the land owner providing more justification, reviewing the land as part of a developer funded DPA may be warranted in the future.	
		<p>Lot 794 Marion Bay Road</p> <p>Requests that 36 acres of the above property be rezoned from Primary Production to Rural Living.</p>	<p>The further expansion of the township is not supported particularly with regard to amount of residential land available for development and constraints associated with electricity supply.</p> <p>Also the proposal would further extend the settlement away from the existing built up area, which has already been developed in an ad hoc manner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the large amount residential land available within the township, there is currently no Rural Living land at Corny Point. Therefore consideration to whether a Rural Living zone at Corny Point may be warranted as part of a Council wide Rural living DPA is supported.</p>	Not considered a priority, however, issue of Rural Living land at Corny Point can be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA.
		<p>Lot 2 in FP 11157 Corny Point Road</p> <p>Requests that portion of the allotment (2.5 acres) be rezoned from Primary Production to Industry.</p> <p>Noted that the land is adjacent to the Optus telecommunication tower.</p> <p>Noted that there are several industrial activities that require a suitable zone within the township and a buffer to residential land such as tree screening will be established.</p>	<p>There is concern whether there would be sufficient demand to warrant a dedicated industry zone at Corny Point. It is noted that Light Industry is a consent form of development within the Settlement zone and there is ample vacant land available for future development.</p> <p>In addition, it is considered that industrial development would be better suited on the land around the existing hall and CFS building given the characteristic of the land and access to infrastructure, compared to the subject land.</p> <p>With regard to the above the proposal is not</p>	No action required

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

			supported.	
12	Heather Drury Corny Point Progress Association	Supports the above submission	Noted, refer to comments above	No action required.
13	Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000 On behalf of Ivan and Carlene McMahon – Owners of Allotments 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10 Depot Road, Minlaton	Requested that the subject land be rezoned from Primary Production to Mixed Use. Noted that the land is better suited to the proposed zoning as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The allotments range in areas from 815m²-936m², thus inappropriate for primary production activities - The land abuts the existing Mixed Use zone - Separate titles could be obtained for each allotment without the need for a land division or any approval of Council - The land has frontage to a public road (currently unmade) - The allotments were previously zoned Light industry 	This land was rezoned Primary Production as part of the Four Towns DPA. The allotments were previously located in the Light Industry zone- Home Industry Policy Area. The reasoning for the rezoning as outlined in the DPA was that the allotments to the east and west of Depot Road are held in common ownership with the adjoining farming land to the west and are all currently used for farming purposes. These allotments were created a considerable time ago and have not been developed despite the previous zoning. It is also noted that the development of these allotments is restricted by the need to extend Depot Road, which would have to be undertaken at Councils cost. Current zoning is considered to be appropriate.	No action required
14	Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000 On behalf of Jason Newbold – Owner of Sections 175, 176, 182 and 183, Hundred of Minlacowie, Minlaton	Requests that the land be considered to be rezoned Rural Living in a future DPA Recommends policies of the Primary Production Zone be reviewed to provide greater flexibility for on merit assessment of dwellings within the zone. Noted that current policy requires the need for extensive justification through a non-complying application process for a dwelling to be erected on any farming property. Also noted other Council's where flexibility for a dwelling to be considered on merit within the Primary Production Zone.	There is a considerable amount of Rural Living land to the south of the township. The proposal would require the land between the subject land and the township to be considered for Rural Living too; otherwise it would result in an isolated Rural Living zone surrounded by Primary Production land. Whilst considered a low priority, issues raised can be considered as part of a Council wide Rural Living DPA. Concerns in regards to current policy relating to dwellings within the Primary Production	To be consider as part of future Council wide Rural Living DPA

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

			zone have been addressed in detail below in response to submission 17.	
15	Sue and Mike Liebelt MoselSteed 6 Graves Street Kadina SA 5554	<p>Noted the following infrastructure issues which continue to limit development potential in the following towns:</p> <p>Port Victoria This settlement is isolated from a local substation thus growth is limited due to high cost of upgrading the power infrastructure</p> <p>Ardrossan Longstanding need for water augmentation. Noted infrastructure spending in the area is still to reflect the funds that have been collected from private developer during this time frame</p> <p>Port Clinton, Pine Point, Point Turton Noted water augmentation charges are yet to be implemented by SA Water in these areas. However, application for a service off an existing main results in a request to reduce the existing supply to a restricted meter to allow an additional water meter to be approved.</p> <p>Raised concerns with the state of the main access routes to the Peninsula affecting tourism potential of the area and safety of local residents.</p>	<p>Infrastructure supply limitations are noted and recognised as being a constraint to development. The Council has previously undertaken a review of water supply to the main towns on the Peninsula to identify a priority of augmentation. Council has also been proactive in considering alternative options for water supply including</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Limited supply, where water supply is restricted to not more than 5 litres per minute, which requires on site storage and reticulation as a means of reducing draw down on the main at times of peak demand. 2 Dry allotments, where no mains water is provided and the land use must rely on storage of rain water. <p>These options are not always supported by SA Water.</p> <p>Power is also a limiting factor, with infrastructure augmentation charges for upgrading supply a significant constraint to development.</p> <p>Concerns with the state of the road are noted.</p>	<p>The Councils Development Plan already seeks to provide alternative solutions to water supply limitations. Power supplies and investment in road infrastructure are more problematic, the latter largely reliant on State and Federal Government funding.</p>
		Supports the Council wide review of the Rural Living zone (as recommended in the discussion paper) particularly in appropriate areas on the outskirts of townships where there is potential demand for rural living allotments	Noted	Undertake a Council wide review of the Rural Living zone
		Raised concerns in regards to the application of the guideline and intent of the Development Plan with the physical implementation of construction and engineering design criteria.	It is noted that each subdivision is assessed on its merits and where possible the Council seeks to ensure that road networks provide through links wherever possible and thus	Noted, for consideration by Councils Works Department.

		<p>Noted the example where modern and energy efficient subdivision design's integrity can be challenged by the physical requirement of designing for oversized garbage trucks or other infrastructure that could be dealt within an alternative way that would improve the ambience and attractiveness of the area and thus better reflect the intent of the Development Plan.</p>	<p>avoid the need for cul de sac turning heads. It is nonetheless Council policy for service vehicles to be able to make a U-turn at the end of dead end roads based on staff and pedestrian safety requirements</p>	
16	Black Point Progress Association Inc	<p>Requested that the 'Black Point Shack Site Relocation Protocol' should be referenced where appropriate in the Black Point sections of the Development Plan</p> <p>Coastal Open Space Zone Recommended a new policy section for Precinct 1 Black Point similar to Settlement Zone, Black Point Policy Area 3 including new Design Guidelines</p> <p>Noted that previously policies relating to dwellings, alteration and extension on Crown site have been removed from the Development Plan, however, it appears some are still valid. Also noted that alterations to some dwellings appear to have been made recently as complying development.</p> <p>Recommended that the following previous complying conditions be reinstated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The enclosure of a lawfully developed carport, verandah or shed which existed on the land on 17 November 1996 and which adjoins an existing habitable dwelling, except where the enclosure would occur on the northern (seaward) side of the dwelling. - The incorporation of a lawfully 	<p>Noted, and whilst it is desirable that the relocation protocol be a referral document in the Development Plan, the Development Act only allows a limited range of referral documents. These are listed in Regulation 14 of the Development Control Regulations 2008.</p> <p>It is not necessary to include the relocation protocol in the Development Plan as it will form or forms part of the deed of agreement between the Minister and Shack Owner. It is however noted that parts of the shack relocation protocol could be incorporated as policy in the Development Plan. Given the inclusion of the Protocol in the Deed, it is not considered a priority to include parts of the Protocol in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Those provisions relating to the expansion of existing crown Lease Shacks at Black Point were dropped as the intention of policy generally for Black Point is the relocation of these shacks off the beach, and policies that allow for the expansion of the living areas of the shacks will only encourage their retention.</p> <p>As for recent developments that have occurred through the rebuilding/replacement</p>	<p>The issues at Black Point are going to be best addressed by adopting a Coast Protection Management Plan for Black Point, which could include the elements of the Protocol and which could then become a referral document in the Development Plan. This will require agreement on the location and design of coast protection measures amongst other things. A draft of a Coast Protection Management Plan for Black Point was prepared some years ago but has never been completed.</p> <p>The issues around development at Black Point have been emerging for some years and there is a need to review the design guidelines and policies that apply to this area to bring them up to date with what has evolved since their inception. There is also the question as to whether Black Point should be singled out for its' own Policy Area provisions.</p> <p>Council should also re-affirm its request to the Minster for Planning to have coastal areas excluded from the complying development provisions in</p>

		<p>developed garage into, and to form part of, an existing habitable dwelling provided the garage existed on the land on 17 November 1996 and abuts the existing dwelling, and excludes any garage located on the northern (seaward) side of the existing dwelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alterations to carports, verandahs or pergola attached to the dwelling, and extending an extension to an existing dwelling, in order to comply with health authorities, for the purposes of building a toilet with a maximum floor area of two square metres, or a bathroom/shower, laundry with maximum floor area of five square metres. <p>Suggested that the new Design Guidelines recommended above include policy relating to seawall maintenance and development.</p> <p>Settlement Zone – Black Point policy Area 3 Recommends that Black Point Policy Area 3 should extend to the western end of the units on lots 151-153A.</p>	<p>of shacks, this has occurred as a consequence of the application of complying development provision in the Development Act and Regulations that over-ride those provisions in the Development Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the Council has written to the Minister seeking changes to the complying development provisions in areas such as coastal locations, where their application will only serve to entrench development that is inappropriate and/or at risk from coastal erosion.</p> <p>In relation to seawall maintenance, I note the Protocol includes a series of design guides (as plans) showing how seawalls should be maintained in various scenarios. Whilst the option of including these diagrams in a modified Design Guidelines Table is supported, it presupposes an agreed location for future protection works for Black Point which have not yet been agreed to or identified.</p> <p>A more appropriate solution in my view is for the Minister to complete the Black Point Coast Protection Management Plan, which could incorporate the diagrams from the Protocol and which would then become a referral document for the purposes of the Development Act.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. It is also noted that no development has occurred in the Caravan and Tourist Park zone located at the northern end of Black Point. Consideration should be given to the ongoing relevance of this zone and whether it will lead to any worthwhile</p>	<p>the Regulations, which would assist in overcoming the issues around the wholesale rebuilding of shack sites in inappropriate locations along the coast.</p> <p>Issues to be considered as part of review of vulnerable shack sites</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>Supports the reference to not more than one dwelling per allotment within the Desired Character, however, raised concerns that this has not been applied on a consistent basis with the approval of dwellings containing a number of self-contained living areas.</p> <p>Recommends the last paragraph of the Desired Character should reference the Black Point Shack Site Relocation Protocol.</p> <p>Recommended appropriate zoning is required to protect the native vegetation along the NE Boundary of Lot 3003.</p> <p>Recommended the following amendments to table YoP/5.</p> <p>Guideline 1.1 – Add ‘Removal is to be in accordance with the Black Point Shack Site Relocation Protocol.</p> <p>Guideline 5.1 & 5.2 – Delete. Noted the above have not been consistently implemented for many years</p> <p>Guideline 5.4 – add ‘open’ before vehicle. Noted current wording suggest that no ground floor can be used for vehicle or boat parking, however, some approved dwelling comprises enclosed garages.</p> <p>Guideline 6.9 – Suggests amendments to allow greater than 15m² for decks and balconies, subject to style and location of dwellings and decking.</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Noted, much of the development referred to appears to have occurred without approval. It may be appropriate for a dwelling, other than a detached dwelling to be added to the list of non-complying development in the Policy Area.</p> <p>Noted, refer comments above.</p> <p>The native vegetation is already protected to the extent that the Native Vegetation Management Act applies.</p> <p>Refer comments re the Protocol above.</p> <p>Noted and acknowledged. For consideration.</p> <p>Noted and acknowledged. For consideration</p> <p>Noted and acknowledged. For consideration</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Guideline 16.1 – Add the following after (coastal reserve). Rear (access road) fencing to properties with a direct frontage to the beach should generally be minimised. Gates or road access must be incorporated into any rear fencing design.</p> <p>Guideline 16.3 & 16.4 – Remove and replace with: Fences, where necessary, should be of materials and style of the dwelling and surrounding, and should be the minimum necessary to impede unwanted access and protect privacy.</p> <p>Guideline 16.5 – Replaced with; High solid fencing should be avoided where possible.</p>	<p>Fencing is not development except in certain circumstances. Fencing at Black Point is controlled under the terms of the Land Management Agreement that applies to the properties.</p> <p>Refer comments above.</p> <p>Refer comments above</p>	
17	<p>Julie Jansen MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000</p> <p>On behalf of Sue and Anthony Honner</p>	<p>Raised concerns with regard to existing policy relating to dwellings in the Primary Production zone.</p> <p>Noted current policy does not provide sufficient flexibility for dwellings for retiring farmers on a small portion of an existing farm.</p> <p>Noted the land owners are nearing retirement and are considering developing a new dwelling on their large farming property. However, are faced with a non-complying application</p> <p>Considers the current policy overly restrictive and inappropriate to address all circumstances in which a dwelling may be appropriate on a Primary Production allotment.</p> <p>Note zone Principle 5 anticipates dwellings directly connected to farming, however, the procedural matters list dwelling as non-complying with some exceptions.</p>	<p>The primary intent of the zone is to accommodate primary production activities which is reflected in the intent of the current policy relating to dwellings.</p> <p>Additional housing in the Primary Production zone is discouraged because it can lead to land use conflicts, with farming activities due to noise and odour impacts, spray drift, dust and the like. Housing unrelated to a farm can similarly introduce impacts that affect farm properties such as dogs (attacking stock) and poor land management practices (lack of control of pest plants) that can increase the cost of farming to a neighbouring land owner.</p> <p>From an economic point of view conversion of rural properties to essentially rural living uses inflates the value of the land by endowing it with a residential or rural residential value rather than rural land values, and this will have an impact on</p>	No further action at this time.

		<p>Considers the current policy is inconsistent with South Australian Planning Policy Library (SAPPL) which anticipates dwellings in the zone subject to Council specifying minimum allotment requirements.</p> <p>Also noted other Council's where flexibility for a dwelling to be considered on merit within the Primary Production Zone.</p> <p>Requested that policies relating to the construction of dwellings within the Primary Production zone be reviewed as a matter of priority.</p>	<p>farmers seeking to expand their rural holdings.</p> <p>Given that there is ample Residential or Rural Living zoned land that can accommodate the required development, there can be no justification for weakening of policies relating to houses in the Primary Production zone.</p> <p>Comments noted in regards to the existing policy being inconsistent with the SAPPL, however, this policy was approved by the Minister as part of the BDP DPA and thus deemed to be appropriate with respect to the SAPPL.</p> <p>Simply assigning a minimum allotment area as an exception within the non-complying table (consistent with the examples given) does not address the issues as any housing within the zone, regardless of the size of the allotment will reduce/impact the viability of the land for farming activities in some way, which is inconsistent with the intent of the zone.</p> <p>It is noted that the current policy is restrictive in term of the development assessment process for dwellings. However, the non-complying process does allow for a dwelling to be approved where circumstances warrant and suitable justification is provided, particularly with regard to Principle 5.</p>	
18	<p>Sue Liebelt Mosel Steed 6 Graves Street Kadina SA</p> <p>On behalf of Andrew</p>	<p>Request that land (Lot 136) adjacent to the Pine Point settlement be considered for rezoning.</p> <p>Noted that the land is ideally located for the purposes of extending Pine Point as it abuts</p>	<p>Expansion of Pine Point is not considered a priority at this stage however, subject to further justification a review of the settlement may be warranted in the future.</p> <p>In addition, rezoning the land based on the</p>	<p>No further action at this time.</p>

	Clift Owner of Lot 136 St Vincent Highway, Pine Point.	the western boundary of the town and is setback from the coast. Noted that the land's proximity to the Hillside mine provides opportunity to accommodate demand for residential development and the associated infrastructure upgrades for the mine will likely benefit the future development of the site.	development of the Rex mine is considered to be premature at this point in time.	
19	Graham Burns MasterPlan SA Pty Ltd 33 Carrington Street Adelaide SA 5000 On behalf of Andrew Clift and John Eden owners of Lot 177 Rogues Point Road, Rogues Point and Lot 3 James Well Road, James Well	Requested that the subject land be rezoned to accommodate the expansion of Rogue Point and James Well. Noted that the subject land formed the Rogues Point James Well DPA (a recommendation of the previous Section 30 Review). A Statement of Intent was submitted to the Minister in 2009, however, no response was provided to a request for additional information from the Minister and thus the DPA did not proceed. Noted that it is timely to reactive the DPA considering the approval of the nearby Hillside Mine.	Issue raised by the Department previously still remain. Concerns related to the appropriateness of the DPA against the objectives of the Yorke Peninsula Land Use Framework, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact upon areas of economic important (farming land) and environmental importance (coastal land) - Demand for expansion of the settlement given the amount of vacant land within the extensive Deferred Urban zone - Demonstrate a strategic approach to the expansion of the township as a whole, including master planning of coastal areas and the provision of infrastructure, service and facilities for the significantly expanded population Rezoning the land is considered to be a low priority given the extent of land available for development within the settlements and in particularly within the Deferred Urban zone which adjoins the towns. Further justification would need to be provided in order to	Reinstating the developer funded DPA may be warranted, subject to further justification is provided from the developers in relation to addressing the issue formerly raised by the Department. If the DPA does proceed, it is recommended that it be considered as a low priority on the schedule of future DPAs.

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

			progress the SOI.	
20	TD Bray Contracting C/- TD & DL Bray PO Box 227 Port Victoria SA 5573	<p>Recommended 3 parcels of land (section 126, 127 & 142) adjacent the existing Industry zone at Port Victoria be rezoned from Primary Production to Industry.</p> <p>Noted limited opportunity for industrial development within the township due to size of existing zone.</p> <p>Noted a transport business located within the Residential zone approached Council about relocating to the subject land, however, the project was not supported due to current zoning.</p> <p>Advised that there is potential for relocating their existing engineering business which is located within the Primary Production to the expanded Industry zone.</p> <p>Noted the land has been for sale for a considerable period and suggests rezoning the land may create more interest from potential buyers.</p>	<p>The existing zone is held in 3 large allotments and approximately 5 hectares of land is available for development if the land was subdivided. (noted minimum allotments - 2500m²)</p> <p>Also current electricity supply issues experienced within Port Victoria hinder justification for additional industry land.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that land within zone may not have been made available for development, based on the above it is consider premature to provide additional industry land at Port Victoria.</p>	No further action at this time.
21	Brenton & Sue Davey Amelia Downs RMD Pine Point SA 5571	<p>Noted the importance of the agricultural industry and raised concerns about impact of mining and wind farms.</p> <p>Recommended the Council region be focused on agriculture and not mining.</p> <p>Noted the comment within the Discussion Paper in regards to potential upgrades to electricity infrastructure as a result of the Hillside Mine.</p> <p>Noted that any infrastructure upgrades as a result on the Rex mine would be the</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, the approval of mines is outside the control of Council and is approved by the relevant Minister under the requirements of the Mining Act.</p> <p>Council Development Plan particularly the Primary Production zone which covers the majority of the Council area is strongly directed towards protecting and promoting primary production activities.</p>	No action required

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

		responsibility of the Rex Minerals and not Council. Therefore this information is irrelevant for the Discussion Paper.		
22	Jim Mullen Point Turton Progress Association Inc	Recommended that an area be set aside for various emergency services.	<p>Comments noted, sufficient land is available within the township to accommodate development associated with any of the emergency services. It is noted this type of development would be a consent form of development within the Settlement zone.</p> <p>That said, there have been discussions with the land owner previously about the provision of some industrial land at Point Turton in the area around the effluent treatment plant and there is some recognition that the Local Centre zone could be enlarged to accommodate emergency services facilities.</p>	Not a high priority but for discussion with the developer to determine if a Developer Funded DPA is warranted.
23	Council Staff	<p>Recommended the following issues be considered:</p> <p>Dwellings non-complying in the Light Industry zone at Ardrossan.</p>	<p>Current policy relating to dwellings in the Light Industry zone is standard BDP Policy. It is noted that the primary intent of the zone is to allow for light industrial activities. The establishment of dwellings in the zone creates potential interface issues and may inhibit industrial development and thus the existing policy is supported.</p> <p>It is noted that a number of dwellings exist within the zone at Ardrossan, particularly fronting Bowman Road; however, these were established under previous zoning/policy. They have existing use rights and can be replaced, added to and extended as a consent use under the current and now long standing application of the law relevant to existing non-complying development.</p>	No action required
		Review zoning for wind farms developments to go in locations that would be more appropriate	Comments noted, however, policy relating to wind farms is adopted as ministerial policy which generally provides little opportunity for Council to alter.	No action required

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

	Consider making allotments a more consistent size in the Rural Living zone	<p>Noted and agreed. This issue was identified as part of the preliminary investigations as outlined in the discussion paper.</p> <p>A Council wide review of the Rural Living zone is warranted given that such a review has not occurred in the past. Also a large number of submissions received have raised issues relating to Rural Living.</p>	To be considered as part of a future Council wide DPA
	Rezone residential land resulting from land division 544/D035/2005 (southern half of Captain Hutchinson Drive Point Turton) from Deferred Urban to Settlement	<p>Noted and agreed. The land has been divided and partially developed. Rezoning the land to Settlement simply reflects the current use of the land.</p> <p>It is noted that a detached dwelling is a consent form of development in the Deferred Urban zone, therefore current zoning should not impede development in the interim and on this basis any rezoning it not considered to be a high priority.</p>	Land to be considered for rezoning as part of a future DPA
	Reinstate exception in non-complying development lists in Primary Production, Coastal Conservation, Water Protection zones, to allow dwellings on allotments with existing LMAs stipulating building envelopes to be treated as merit developments	Noted and agreed. This policy was removed inadvertently as part of the BDP conversion DPA. This should be the subject of a section 29 request to the Minister	Make application for a section 29 amendment to the Development Plan to have the provision re-instated.
	Reword reference to dwellings within the Settlement zone non complying table in relation to sharing a common boundary with coastal zoned land (i.e. a two storey dwelling on properties from 39-59 Corny Point Road, Corny Point is non-complying, even though the properties are some 300m back from the coast, as the land front the Coastal Conservation zone).	<p>The intent of the policy is to protect the views of the coast from properties located to the rear of coastal fronted allotments within Settlement zone.</p> <p>It is noted that two storey dwellings on the properties mentioned at Corny Point would be regarded as a consent form of development because the land to the south is not located within the Settlement zone.</p>	No change recommended

			Notwithstanding the above, there are likely to be instances where an application is non-complying, however, there will be little impact as a result of the two storey design considering the characteristics of the site and locality. In these circumstances Council is likely to proceed with the non-complying application.	
		Include provisions of Council Policy P010 – Caravans Annexes in Caravan Parks (or reference to policy document) in the Caravan and Tourist Park zone.	It is noted the design guidelines within the Council Policy are largely addressed under the building code and Council being the owners of the majority of Caravans Parks within the district, have control on the design of annexes as part of the approval process with regard to the existing Council Policy P010. On this basis, additional policy within the Development Plan to guide the construction of annexes is not considered to be warranted.	No action required
		Setbacks distances from primary road frontage differ for single storey dwellings in the Residential zone between the zone policy and Table YoP/2 Building Setback s from Road Boundaries.	Noted and agreed.	Issue to be considered as part of Council's next DPA.
		Land on the northern side of the Port Victoria Caravan Park has been divided into Community Title allotments to allow for dwellings to be developed, however, the land is zoned Caravan and Tourist Park which identifies dwellings as non-complying	Noted, the land was divided in 2006 for tourist accommodation purposes Clause 4.1 of the associated Scheme Description states that allotments are to be used for short term tourist accommodation and short term residential purposes. With regard to the above, the current zoning is considered to be appropriate, unless amendments are made to the Community Scheme Description.	No action required

Yorke Peninsula Council – Section 30 Review
Public Submission Summary

		Location Map YoP/52 and Zone Map YoP/52 are Point Moorowie instead of Port Moorowie	Noted	Issue to be rectified as part of Council's next DPA.
		Consider creating a Local Centre zone in Port Moorowie.	<p>Not considered to a high priority as large areas of the township are yet to be developed and there is concerns whether demand warrants a Local Centre zone given the current size of the settlement.</p> <p>It is noted that a shop under 250m² is an envisaged use in the zone which would likely be sufficient to accommodate demand.</p> <p>In addition the settlement is conveniently located approximately 20 kilometres from Edithburgh which provides a wide range of services.</p>	No action required
		Consider creating a Local Centre zone at Point Turton	There is already a Local Centre zone at Point Turton. The zone is currently vacant and comprises an area of approximately 5500m ² which sufficient to accommodate additional shops etc of an adequate size to service the settlement.	No action required