

11 January 2007

The Secretary
Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Contact: Peter Jansen

Dear Sir

Re Inquiry into the Airports Amendment Bill 2006

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the proposed changes to the Airports Act 1996. The City of Salisbury believes there is a greater opportunity for better integrated planning and development of Parafield Airport, if additional changes were made to that proposed.

The amendments do not adequately recognise and incorporate State and Local Authorities in the development assessment process. It further reinforces the exclusion of Council in the consideration process and is not supported. Incorporation of these planning authorities in the assessment process for developments on airport land would facilitate the intent of the legislation changes to have regard for and be compatible with adjoining land uses to the airport.

The proposed reduced public consultation timeframes, and increase in construction cost threshold for major development plans will further reduce the ability of the public and government agencies to scrutinise the proposals to ensure consistency with the master plans. More importantly it negates the opportunity to consider the impacts of the proposed variations of major development plans and specific developments on the surrounding businesses. This will only increase the Airport lessee autonomy with regards land use development and reduce the opportunity for collaboration in growing the overall economic prosperity of the region.

The proposed amendments in the Airports Amendment Bill 2006 do require the airport to have regard to the area outside the airport to reduce the potential for conflict between incompatible uses and the need to demonstrate how airports have regard for public comment during the Master Planning and major development plan process. These are seen as positive steps towards better integration of the two planning frameworks. Further amendments are required to ensure that proposed developments on airport land provide the appropriate level of justification, investigation and scrutiny as required by other developments subject to State legislation.

It has been the perception of Council that its comments in relation to the Parafield Airport Master Plans and variations have been given cursory consideration by Adelaide Airport Ltd as opposed to looking for opportunities that could benefit both the operators of the airport and the Council. As an example I have enclosed a copy of the Council submission on the draft Minor Variation to the Parafield Airport Master Plan November 2004, and the response of Adelaide Airport Ltd.

You will note that Council indicates its support of appropriate economic development opportunities that provided shared benefits to the community, however the impacts of the proposed retail development on some existing centres is excessive, and a limit on the retail that is proposed is recommended.

The response to Council does not answer the issues raised, how the matter was regarded, or why the retail impact beyond the airport boundary was not overcome. Council acknowledges that the current

legislation only requires the airport to “state” that it has had due regard to the comments, and that the proposed changes require a “demonstration” of due regard, however, it is considered that this is still not sufficient. A considered argument for or against the submission is required, with justification for the position taken. As a comparison, under existing State legislation provisions a development such as being proposed by PAL would be either be refused or be subject to planning conditions that would limit the scope of development so as to manage its impacts.

In February 2003 Council made a submission on the Airports Act Review and also on the Draft Guidelines on Stakeholder Consultation for Airport Lessee Companies. The points raised in those submissions remain relevant for the proposed current amendments. The broader issues that were raised included:

1. The need for Commonwealth and State legislation to facilitate orderly and economic development and good urban design outcomes. This would be achieved through the integration and acknowledgement of the respective planning strategies and policy directions.
2. A development approval framework and process that would incorporate the relevant State and Local Planning Authority to ensure the Airport Lessees are supported in the assessment of development applications.

The City of Salisbury considers that amendments to the Airports Act 2006 need to also address the issues identified above so as to achieve better integration into the regional planning framework and the inclusion of State and Local Planning Authorities in the Development assessment process. The outcome would facilitate economic growth for the region and enhance the quality and design of developments in and around Parafield Airport.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Airports Amendment Bill 2006. Council supports any initiative to improve the consultation efforts of airport lessees and improve development outcomes.

If you require further information or clarification please do not hesitate to discuss the matter with myself or Mr Peter Jansen on 08 8406 8228.

Yours faithfully

John Harry

Director, Strategic Planning

Telephone: (08) 8406 8293

Email: jharry@salisbury.sa.gov.au

c.c. Australian Local Government Association
Local Government Association of SA

Enc