

Deputation: The North Adelaide Society Inc, Elbert Brooks, Chairperson

Thank you for the opportunity to make a deputation to the Committee about Item 6.1.
I will address the two key questions stated in the agenda.

Key Qn 1 Principles for collaborating with the State Government on a review of
catalyst site policy

We say:

Agreement: There is rude agreement that the current “catalyst site” policies and
criteria are not fit for purpose and warrant review.

- Council does not support catalyst site policies within residential localities and
adjacent main street/s. - Resolution 31/1/2023
- Community does not support catalyst site policies.
- Community survey summary in CoA submission p49 to expert panel
- Council’s submission to the Expert Panel reflects the 31 Jan. resolution and that
stronger design quality and transition policy is required. - Submission pages 14 & 52
- Expert Panel does not support current catalyst site policies.
- Recommendation 23 at Report page 85
- Government does not support current catalyst site policies.
- Response to expert panel report, March 2024.

Consistency: There is consistency between Council’s resolution of 31 January 2023;
the rationale of the Expert Panel for its Recommendation 23 (report page 85); and the
Government’s response.

Approach: The issue is the approach to be taken by Council. The State
Government has already agreed to the review by the State Planning Commission. The
Government requires the SPC to do so in collaboration with the CoA. We note the
Administration’s efforts to get the ball rolling.

We say the Council’s approach to the review recommended by the Expert Panel can
simply be based on 3 key sources:

First and foremost, it should accord with Council’s 31 Jan. 2023 resolution
*“in so far as catalyst sites are concerned ... Council’s view [is that] they should
not be permitted within or adjacent to residential areas, including from main
streets or business zones within the wider residential locality”*

Second, it should be consistent with Council’s submission to the Expert Panel,
which included the 31 January resolution and that policy improvements *“are
needed to address community concerns so that new development is designed
to reflect its context [and that] current catalyst site policies are insufficient to
manage the transition in height and scale of development across the city.”*

Third, it should adopt the Expert Panel’s expressly stated views and considerations
about its Recommendation 23 (i.e., Report p. 85, March 2023). That includes
design parameters, community participation, certainty, and appeal rights.

Briefly (from p. 85):

- *current policies applying to catalyst sites in the Code are more representative of strategic sites*
- *the requisite site size is not so large as to make it 'catalytic'*
- *minimum size of catalyst sites needs to be dramatically increased ... ensure the policy applies only to those truly catalytic sites*
- *Size ... [to be considered in the] review*
- *opportunity [for] additional criteria*
- *include, but is not limited to, considering the merits of:*
 - > *additional policy through both planning and non-planning mechanisms to encourage the creation of catalyst sites;*
 - > *additional design parameters to ensure ... satisfactorily transition into the urban landscape;*
 - > *bringing the community into the conversation*
 - > *giving both the applicant and community certainty;*
 - > *guidance material and*
 - > *appeal rights.*

Comments: Agenda PowerPoint

Refers to "CBD"

- It does not delineate the "CBD" in the adjacent graphic.
- It has previously been clear in City of Adelaide development plans that had "Capital City Zone" & "Central Business Policy Area".
- The City Square Mile is not the CBD; there should be no misapprehension.
- Similarly, local main streets within residential localities are not the CBD.

Refers to "City Plan"

- That is a policy and strategic policy document of the CoA. It is not a planning policy document for the purposes of the PDI Act. There is no need to expressly refer to it because the Expert Panel does not preclude considering consistent matters.

Refers to "maximum height"

- It is a vexed phrase. If one asks when a "maximum" is not a maximum; the answer is when it is in the planning and design code.
- The ordinary meaning of "maximum" is the largest amount, quantity, value, or number allowed or possible. But planning does not use the ordinary meaning. Example: Catalyst site policies for Melbourne Street West state a building height limit of 6 storeys instead of the lower limits in the zone. That is how the Administration reads the prescription (see p.374, Cttee Agenda, 5/11/24). We agree that is what is written. But SCAP approved an application that obviously exceeds 6 storeys.
- We say it is fundamental that planning prescriptions and policies provide clarity and certainty and have express quantitative limits, and we support the Expert Panel's view for there to be appeal rights.

Key Qn 2: What are Council Members' views on a new Overlay as an option to investigate in collaboration with the State Government?

We say:

This is a consequential technical implementation matter.

It will depend on the content and proposals arising from the review and consideration of options about how the review outcome is implemented.

We cannot at this time make a useful comment about that.

We realise the Minister has all the power when it comes to determining the outcome. But we note the Government's pre-election policy included:

- *planning needs community voices*
- *without strong planning laws in place, we risk losing the character of our streets and neighbourhoods, and*
- *we must not compromise on the liveability of our city.*

We welcome implementation of that approach.

Council should have that in mind in its approach to this review.

We say the framework and principles for the Council's approach should be based on:

1. Council's 31 January 2023 resolution
2. Council's submission to the Expert Panel
3. Expert Panel's consideration at page 85 of its report.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and for your indulgence.