

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|--|--|
| <p>City of Mitcham – State Heritage Area (Colonel Light Gardens)</p> <p>Authorised: 4/5/00</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a State Heritage Area over the suburb of Colonel Light Gardens. • Introduces objectives for development that preserve and reinforce the heritage value of the suburb, and encourages new development in a manner that will maintain the amenity and character of the area. • Introduces PDC that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. encourage detached dwellings only; 2. allows only one dwelling per allotment; 3. prevents land division; 4. encourages additions and extensions, carports and garages and telecommunications infrastructure to be located so the appearance of the dwelling from the street remains substantially unaltered; and 5. ensure streets, street trees, reserves and public places are developed and retained in a complementary manner to the heritage value of the suburb. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitcham (City) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Small Scale Tourist Accommodation in Rural Areas of the Mount Lofty Ranges</p> <p>Authorised: 21/9/00</p> | <p>Introduces the following policies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage small to medium scale tourist accommodation developments, which may include: guesthouses, boutique hotels, nature retreats, and bed and breakfast accommodation in appropriate locations with accommodation for up to 55 guests in the Primary Production Area and for up to 30 persons in heritage buildings in the Watershed Area. • Promote the re-use of heritage buildings to preserve and further enhance the cultural features of the Region. • Enable development in the Watershed which is focused primarily on heritage buildings provided it is located away from water sensitive areas to protect the water resources of the region. • Ensure that tourist accommodation is located in a manner and form that is compatible with the surrounding rural uses. • Discourage forms of development which may result in pressure for land uses which are likely to be incompatible with rural uses in the future. • Allow the development of ancillary uses in keeping with the number of guests being catered for. • Include strict performance criteria for development in the Watershed to ensure that it is located away from water sensitive areas to protect the water resource. • Amend Bed and Breakfast policies to clarify their intent and allow for non-hosted forms of Bed and Breakfast Accommodation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Hills Council • Alexandrina Council • Barossa (DC) • Happy Valley (City) • Mount Barker (DC) • Mount Pleasant (DC) • Playford (City) • Tea Tree Gully (City) • Victor Harbor (DC) • Yankalilla (DC) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Small-Scale Rural/ Agricultural and Home Based Industries</p> <p>Authorised: 21/9/00</p> | <p>The PAR introduces policies in the Mount Lofty Ranges that promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural industries which assist in supporting the strategies for primary industry and rural uses in the region, while potentially providing a stimulus to tourism. • Development which increases the viability of primary industries through on farm production and sale of agricultural produce. • Location of agricultural industries which could comfortably be established within existing infrastructure in rural areas. • Re-use of existing buildings and heritage buildings as an important commercial opportunity. • Conservation and enhancement of the specific characteristics of the region. • Adherence to strict performance criteria for all development to ensure that it is located away from water sensitive areas to protect the water resources of the region. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexandrina Council • Barossa (DC) • Happy Valley (City) • Mount Barker (DC) • Mount Pleasant (DC) • Playford (City) • Tea Tree Gully (City) • Victor Harbor (DC) • Yankalilla (DC) |
| <p>Metropolitan Adelaide – Significant Tree Control</p> <p>Interim Operation: 20/4/00</p> <p>Authorised: 21/12/00</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces an Objective and 5 PDC to provide guidance when assessing development applications involving tree damaging activities affecting significant trees. • PDC provide guidance on the need to protect trees from trunk or root damage, or other actions that may affect the health of the tree, including ground works in close proximity to the tree. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Metropolitan Development Plans |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|---|--|
| <p>South Australian Ports (Disposal of Maritime Assets) Act 2000 (No. 93 of 2000)</p> <p>Commencement: 25/1/01</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Act which provided for the disposal of assets of the South Australian Ports Corporation, repealed the S.A. Ports Corporation Act 1994 and made amendments to the Development Plan (Schedule 2 of Act). • Various policy details inserted into affected coastal Development Plans relating to ports and port activities, including changes to public notification categories. Policies inserted to protect the ongoing operation and development of existing port facilities. • In Port Adelaide Enfield Development Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of the Industry (Deferred Port) Zone • Replacement of the policy content of the Industry (Port) Zone • Changes to the MOSS (Conservation) Zone and the MOSS (Buffer) Zone • Replacement of affected zone maps | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ceduna (DC) • Land Not Within a Council Area (Coastal Waters) • Land Not Within a Council Area (Metropolitan) • Port Adelaide Enfield (City) • Port Lincoln (City) • Port Pirie (City) • Wallaroo (CT) • Yorketown (DC) |
| <p>Adelaide Airport</p> <p>Approved: 24/5/01</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces a new Adelaide Airport Zone in the West Torrens and Henley & Grange Development Plans with objectives and principles of development control over Commonwealth airport land. • The new Adelaide Airport Zone replaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Torrens (City) - the Airport Industry Zone and the Recreation (Deferred Aviation) Policy Area 24. • Henley and Grange (City) – the Recreation (Deferred Aviation) Area (Area 3) <p>Amends Table WeTo/1 in the West Torrens (City) Development Plan by deleting reference to and conditions associated with the Airport Industry Zone.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Torrens (City) • Henley and Grange (City) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed</p> <p>Approved: 28/6/01</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces Principles of Development Control covering the whole of the Watershed to exclude a variety of land use activities from non-complying where able to meet performance criteria set out by the PAR. These include extensions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing wineries • spring water plants • small scale rural agricultural and home based industries in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed. • For example: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policies will allow extensions to 10 existing wineries (identified by listing in Development Plans) where able to meet stringent environmental performance criteria. 2. Allows development of spring water facilities across the Watershed (bottling facilities outside the highly sensitive area of the Watershed). 3. Allows development of small-scale agricultural industries for processing of primary produce on the farm. <p>Contains controls to ensure that water quality is protected.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Hills Council • Alexandrina Council • District Council of Barossa • City of Happy Valley • City of Playford • City of Tea Tree Gully • District Council of Mount Barker • District Council of Mount Pleasant • District Council of Victor Harbour • District Council of Yankalilla |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Hills Face Zone Amendment</p> <p>Interim Operation: 17/8/00</p> <p>Approved: 16/8/01</p> | <p>Introduces policies to clearly designate particular types of development as either non-complying or consent. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most forms of horticulture - to remain a <i>consent</i> use to be assessed on their merits based on assessment against new policies setting out environmental and other design and siting requirements. • Olive orchards - to be deemed a <i>non-complying</i> form of development. • Commercial forestry – to be deemed a <i>consent use</i> to be assessed on its merits; • Dairies and associated activities - to be properly assessed as a <i>consent use</i>. • Horse keeping (other than as an ancillary use) - to be properly assessed as a <i>consent use</i>. • Group dwellings and more than one dwelling or building capable of habitation as a dwelling on an allotment - to be deemed a <i>non-complying</i> form of development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Hills Council • Burnside [City] • Campbelltown [City] • Happy Valley [City] • Marion [City] • Mitcham [City] • Noarlunga [City] • Playford [City] • Salisbury [City] • Tea Tree Gully [City] • Willunga [D.C] |
| <p>Telecommunications Facilities Statewide Policy Framework</p> <p>Interim Operation: 31/8/00</p> <p>Approved: 30/8/01</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inserts a number of general Objectives and Principles of Development Control into the Council wide section of all Development Plans to provide guidance when assessing development applications involving the construction of new telecommunications facilities (except where exempt under Commonwealth or State legislation). • The PAR encourages the location of telecommunication facilities into preferred areas, such as industrial, centre and commercial zones, while making establishment of facilities in more sensitive areas (such as residential areas) subject to greater scrutiny. • Changes to Schedule 9 of the Development Regulations have included telecommunications facilities as Category 1 to encourage location in preferred areas, such as industrial and commercial zones, provided a threshold height is not exceeded. In country areas, telecommunications facilities are identified as Category 2 provided a threshold height is not exceeded. In other more sensitive zones, telecommunications facilities will default to Category 3. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Development Plans |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Bushfire Management</p> <p>Approved: 6/9/01</p> | <p>The Plan Amendment, the Minister's Specification and complementary amendments to the Development Regulations result in the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of the policies relating to development within the Bushfire Prone Area. • Deletion of technical building requirements from Development Plan' policies and inclusion in Minister's Specification SA 78. • New mapping which clearly delineates the Bushfire Prone Area. • Revision of the contents of Schedule 18 of the Development Regulations and retaining the Schedule for Building Code - Bushfire Prone Areas. • Complimentary amendments to Schedule 8 of the Development Regulations to require mandatory referral of development applications, within a defined referral area, to the CFS for comment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angaston [D.C.] • Barossa [D.C.] • Burnside [City], • Campbelltown [City] • Happy Valley [City] • Kapunda [D.C.] • Light (Outer Metropolitan) [D.C.] • Marion [City] • Mitcham [City] • Mount Barker [D.C.] • Mount Pleasant [D.C.] • Noarlunga [City] • Playford (City) • Tanunda [D.C.] • Tea Tree Gully [City] • Victor Harbor [D.C.] • Willunga [D.C.] • Yankalilla [D.C.]. |
| <p>Industry (Gawler Belt) Zone</p> <p>Approved: 13/12/01</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends the existing Industry (Gawler Belt) Zone and establishes two policy areas in the proposed Zone to differentiate between land intended for large scale industries, particularly those which support the wider region's wine industry, and additional land for light industry/commercial uses in the southern part of the Zone to accommodate anticipated growth in wine related industries generally. • Introduces public notification policies in the Industry (Gawler Belt) Zone and the Rural Zone that reflect the policy intentions of the relevant zones. • Introduces additional policies in the Council wide section of the Development Plan which identify the need to protect all industrial land from encroachment of conflicting land uses, identify the preferred locations for large scale industry and additional policies to discourage new residential or other sensitive development from establishing too | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light Regional Council, Light DC, (Outer Metropolitan) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|--|--|
| | <p style="text-align: center;">close to the proposed Industry (Gawler Belt) Policy Area 7. Amends and introduces illustrative, zone and policy area mapping to reflect the above policy amendments.</p> | |
| <p>Demolition Policy</p> <p>Interim Operation: 29/6/01</p> <p>Approved: 27/6/02</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces policies to link approval of an application for demolition of a dwelling to the prior approval of a replacement dwelling. In some cases this has required a policy change amending the status of dwelling from complying status to merit. • Inserts a council wide Objective and council wide Principle of Development Control creating a link between demolition approval and approval of a replacement dwelling; • Changes the status of dwellings in affected residential zones from complying (currently) to merit. • Inserts figures identifying the designated areas where the demolition control applies (in cases where only part of the Development Plan area is designated.) <p>The PAR affected the Development Plans of Councils that were granted demolition control on 29 June 2001 for a period of two years, under the Minister's Good Residential Design Package released in February 2001.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campbelltown • Henley and Grange • Hindmarsh Woodville • Norwood • Payneham • St Peters • West Torrens |
| <p>Industry Buffer (SAMAG) PAR</p> <p>Interim Operation: 18/1/02</p> <p>Approved: 22/8/02</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces a new Council-wide Objective and Principle of Development Control in both Development Plans relating to the encroachment of sensitive land uses to industry operation on industrial land. • Amends the Rural and Coastal Zones in the Mount Remarkable (DC) Development Plan to incorporate non-complying provisions, aimed at preventing inappropriate development within the buffer area surrounding the SAMAG Major Development site. • Introduces a new Policy Area map to identify the buffer area to which the additional provisions for the Rural and Coastal Zones for Mount Remarkable will apply. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Pirie (DC) • Mount Remarkable (DC) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends the Rural and Rural Coastal Policy Areas in the Pirie (DC) Development Plan to incorporate non-complying provisions, aimed at preventing inappropriate development within the buffer area surrounding the SAMAG Major Development site. • Introducing policy and figures into the Rural and Rural Coastal Policy Areas for the Pirie (DC) Development Plan to identify the buffer area to which the additional provisions will apply. | |
| <p>Stormwater in Urban Areas</p> <p>Approved: 12/11/02</p> | <p>Amends all council Development Plans in the Patawalonga and Torrens catchments. Improves the quality of Development Plans in providing a development assessment framework that reflects catchment water management principles for stormwater. Introduces general Objectives and Principles of Development Control to improve water quality and guide stormwater management in urban council areas.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC Adelaide • Adelaide Hills Council • The Barossa Council • CC Burnside • CC Campbelltown • CC Happy Valley • CC Henley & Grange • CC Hindmarsh & Woodville • CC Holdfast Bay • CC Kensington & Norwood • CC Marion • CC Mitcham • CC Payneham • Cc Port Adelaide Enfield • CC Prospect • CC St Peters • CC Tea Tree Gully • CC Unley • CT Walkerville • CC West Torrens |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Adelaide Hills Council – State Heritage Area (Mount Torrens)</p> <p>Approved: 5/12/02</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces a State Heritage Area over the urban centre or “Heritage Core” of Mount Torrens township. • Identifies individual buildings of heritage value within the State Heritage Area. • Introduces Objectives and Principles of Development Control to guide development proposals within the State Heritage Area to ensure new development is sympathetic to the town’s heritage and provide for the retention and restoration of heritage buildings. • Provides for the retention of an area considered to be of heritage significance to South Australia. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Hills Council |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Organic Waste Processing (Composting)</p> <p>Interim Operation: 20/12/01</p> <p>Approved: 5/12/02</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaces existing council-wide Objectives and Principles of Development Control on solid waste landfill facilities with new policy statements to address landfill facilities and organic waste processing facilities in order to provide an improved development assessment policy framework. • Introduces variation of current non-complying Principle of Development Control within appropriate broad acre land use zones (eg Rural, General Farming, Primary Production, Horticulture and Water Protection) to enable consideration of proposals for organic waste processing development on merit where specified criteria (i.e. slope, separation distances to water bodies, airports and sensitive receptors) can be met. • Amends or deletes existing policy that may conflict with either of the above. • Includes “organic waste processing facility” as a non-complying development in zones where it would be an inappropriate development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Hills • Alexandrina • Angaston • Barossa • Beachport • Berri Barmera • Clare & Gilbert Valleys • Coorong • Goyder • Grant • Kapunda • Karoonda-East Murray • Kingston • Light (Outer Metropolitan) • Loxton Waikerie • Mallala • Mid Murray • Millicent • Mount Barker • Mount Pleasant • Murray Bridge • Naracoorte Lucindale • Penola • Renmark Paringa • Robe • Southern Mallee • Tanunda • Tatiara • Victor Harbor • Wakefield Regional • Yankalilla |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Metropolitan Urban Boundary</p> <p>Interim Operation: 22/3/02</p> <p>Approved: 20/3/03</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces zoning changes to the northern and southern fringes of metropolitan Adelaide to achieve consistency with the “urban growth boundary” as introduced by the Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide. • Deletes ‘deferred development’ zoning, excluding a portion of the Rural A Zone at Evanston South, Evanston Gardens and Hillier in the Gawler Council area. The future of this area requires further consideration. • Removes ‘deferred development’ zoning in Playford and Onkaparinga Council areas. • Introduces zoning and policies on the inside of the urban boundary that clearly envisage this land for urban uses. • Introduces zoning and policies beyond the urban boundary that reserve land for rural uses and activities. • Introduces policies that promote the establishment of suitable buffer treatments along both sides of the urban boundary. • Introduces policies and plans that encourage orderly development within the urban area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gawler (CT) • Playford (City) • Onkaparinga (City) |
| <p>Port Adelaide Enfield (City) and Salisbury (City) – Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway)</p> <p>Approved: 5/6/03</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amendment affects the former abattoirs and stock yards in the Gepps Cross/ Pooraka area. • Creation of a new Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone to replace the Special Uses (Abattoir) Zone and the adjoining Local Commercial Zone fronting Main North Road. • Inserts new objectives and principles of development control to guide development in the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone and promote compatibility and integration with adjoining zones and industrial areas. • Providing a concept plan reflecting key desired elements for the zone. • Rezoning of the District Commercial Zone (south of the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone) as a Commercial Zone and introducing new objectives and principles of development control. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Adelaide Enfield (City) • Salisbury (City) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning of the Market C Zone (north of the Industry (Gepps Cross Gateway) Zone) to Industry – Pooraka Industrial Area and introducing a concept plan and new principles of development control. | |
| <p>Land Not Within A Council Area (Coastal Waters) – Lower Eyre Peninsula Aquaculture</p> <p>Interim Operation: 12/9/02</p> <p>Approved: 24/7/03</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of a separate Aquaculture (Finfish/ Port Lincoln) Zone with objectives and principles of development control additional to those applicable to the whole of the area applying to Coastal Waters. Inclusion of a zone map, Map LNWCA (CW)/1, to designate the new Aquaculture (Finfish/ Port Lincoln) Zone | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Not Within A Council Area (Coastal Waters) Development Plan |
| <p>Wind Farms</p> <p>Interim Operation: 1/8/02</p> <p>Approved: 24/7/03</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inserts a number of Objectives and Principles of Development Control into the 'Council Wide' section of all the State's Development Plans (including Out Of Council Development Plans) to provide additional guidance when assessing development applications involving the construction of renewable energy facilities, particularly wind farms. Provides a broad policy direction that reinforces the importance of the development of renewable sources of energy in appropriate locations. Introduces policies relating to key wind farm issues, such as visual impact, noise, bird migration/strike, disturbance to native vegetation, location and design and cumulative impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan Amendment applies to <u>all</u> Development Plans throughout the State. |
| <p>Barossa Rural B Zone (Concordia) – Waste Disposal Anomaly</p> <p>Interim Operation: 31/6/03</p> <p>Approved: 29/1/04</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends a principle of development control so as to make the establishment of a solid waste landfill depot a non-complying development. Currently, this type of development can be assessed on merit in the Zone. More specifically, the amendment will remove the existing words, the <i>"treatment, storage and transfer of waste"</i> from the principle that lists non-complying development and replace them with the words, <i>"reception, storage, treatment or disposal of waste"</i>. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Barossa Council |
| <p>Land Not Within A Council Area (Far North) – Innamincka Township and Environs</p> <p>Approved: 7/8/03</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces two zones into the Development Plan, the Country Township (Innamincka) Zone and Innamincka Environs Zone, each with their own Objectives and Principles of Development Control, Desired Future Character Statement, Concept Plan and zone maps to guide the development of Innamincka township and its surrounding environs along the Cooper Creek. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Not Within A Council Area (Far North) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDC seek to minimise environmental impacts and enhance the historic and “outback” character of the township. • Introduces design guidelines in relation to building design and heritage compatibility. | |
| Land Not Within A Council Area (Far North) – Petroleum Exploration Facilities Approved: 7/8/03 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies potential sites for a petroleum service camp or depot within the Far North region, taking into account a range of economic, social and environmental criteria. PDC provides sufficient flexibility to respond to the changing needs of the petroleum industry and to guide the development of a service camp or depot with respect to key infrastructure, service requirements and environmental protection measures. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Not Within A Council Area (Far North) |
| Mount Barker (DC) – Kanmantoo and Callington Industry PAR. Approved: 15/1/04 | The PAR incorporates policies aimed at providing suitable direction for industrial development within the Callington and Kanmantoo area. The amendment addressed the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing General Industry Zone at Callington. • Industrial/Commercial Zone at Callington. • Existing General Industry Zone at Kanmantoo. • Rural Kanmantoo Zone associated with the old Kanmantoo Mine Site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mount Barker (DC) |
| Port Waterfront Redevelopment PAR Approved: 22/9/04 | This PAR proposes to provide an appropriate and updated policy framework to better promote the revitalization of the Port Adelaide Centre and the Port Waterfront. It is proposed to create nine new and revised policy areas incorporating future development sites and existing areas associated with the Waterfront. The policy changes proposed by this Amendment are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Port Adelaide Centre Zone and Policy Areas 22, 25, 27, 28, 34 and 35 (note: Policy Area 36 whilst contained in the Development Plan text is not contained within the current Development Plan) • Review of General Industry (2) Zone; and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Adelaide Enfield (City) |

MINISTERIAL POLICIES IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS (2000-2004)

| PLAN AMENDMENT REPORT | POLICY DESCRIPTION AND INTENT | DEVELOPMENT PLANS AFFECTED |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of detailed objectives and principles of development control for the proposed development areas contained within the Policy Areas of the Port Adelaide Centre Zone. The Policy Areas affected are 27, 28, 34 (A, B, C, D and E), 35 and 36. | |
| <p>Port Adelaide Enfield – Industry (Resource Recovery) Zone</p> <p>Approved: 16/9/04</p> | <p>This PAR proposes to amend the Port Adelaide Enfield (City) Development Plan by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rezoning approximately 174 hectares of land from MFP to Industry (Resource Recovery); • introducing Objectives and principles of development control for the new Industry (Resource Recovery) Zone to specify the types of activities anticipated within the area and to guide development; • inclusion of a concept plan within the zone to identify land use areas for industry and areas potentially required for stormwater and environmental measures; • introducing Category 2 notification for uses appropriate in the new zone; and • amending the relevant maps to reflect the zoning changes mentioned above. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Adelaide Enfield (City) |
| <p>Pasadena High School (Partial Rezoning) PAR</p> <p>Approved: 9/9/04</p> | <p>This PAR proposes to amend the Mitcham (City) Development Plan by rezoning portion of the Pasadena High School from Institutional to the Residential (Central Plains) Zone. The affected area will fall within Policy Area 8. Specific PDC's have been introduced to address land division and built form to achieve sympathetic integration with development in the surrounding locality.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitcham (City) |